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This thesis is an attempt to determine the transferability of the findings of some Western studies carried out on Residential burglary, and the applicability of the main methods used for burglary reduction, to societies with different socio-economic structure, in this case Tehran, the capital city of Iran. The thesis will look at patterns of residential burglary found in Tehran and those found by European and American research studies to outline the similarities and differences between them to decide upon the suitability of 'opportunity' theories, and ultimately situational preventive measures implemented in some Western countries for the prevention or reduction of burglary in Tehran.

Following the failure of social and psychological methods in reducing burglary levels, situational crime prevention has received a great attention in some Western countries during the last few decades. Situational crime prevention policies are aimed at the reduction of crime levels by reducing crime opportunities, through i.e. target-hardening techniques, changes in the management, design, and manipulation of the immediate environment in which crime occurs, which lead to an increase in the risks perceived by a wide range of offenders, also by reducing the benefits of crime.

A large proportion of Western criminological studies have carried out their research relying on the assumption which suggests that crime opportunities encourage crime, and that eliminating or blocking crime opportunities will result in the reduction of a large number of residential burglaries. Opportunity theory has adopted the 'rationality' and the 'routine activity' models of crime to explain when, where, and how burglaries occur. It is assumed that offenders are rational in the selection of crime opportunities that are associated with higher rewards and lower risks of detection. It is also suggested that the routine activities of victims, as well as offenders, play a major role in selecting crime targets that present better opportunities for crime.
The main aim of this research is to determine the suitability of situational measures and theories underlying such research to other societies such as Tehran. In order to do so, patterns of residential burglary in Tehran have been examined. An attempt has been made to identify the factors influencing patterns of burglary, and to produce a better understanding of how burglary occurs in Tehran. A comparison between the findings from Tehran and those from Western studies is expected to demonstrate whether the theoretical framework underlying Western studies is capable of explaining burglary patterns in Tehran, and that preventive policies implemented in Western countries are suited to controlling of burglary levels in Tehran. It is hoped that the findings from the current research provide a basis for appropriate crime prevention policies and for future research.
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CHAPTER ONE
1.1 Research Question

The ultimate aim of this research is to study patterns of residential burglary in Tehran—the capital city of Iran— and determine the factors shaping these patterns. It is specifically intended to contribute to an understanding of when, where, and in what manners residential burglary takes place in Tehran, and determine how these patterns are influenced by socio-economic and building structures of various areas in Tehran. The results will hopefully produce an understanding of how burglary occurs in Tehran, and suggest provisions for policy implications and for future research. The project extends its aim by comparing the patterns of burglary in some Western countries with those committed in Tehran, to determine whether the situational solutions suggested for the reduction of burglary in these countries may be extended to Tehran.

1.2 Introducing the Research Problem

The current research consists of two major areas of study:

a) Researching patterns of residential burglary in Tehran, that is when, where, and how residential burglary takes place in Tehran. It will also investigate the socio-economic and environmental factors influencing such patterns.

b) Researching whether the situational solutions suggested for reduction of burglary in some Western societies are transferable or suitable in reduction of burglary in Tehran, by comparing the patterns of residential burglary in these countries with those in Tehran.
The researcher became interested in the study of residential burglary in Tehran following her visit to the country in 1995-6 (when she had just completed her MA in criminology in UK) when she returned Tehran after two years. The problem came into her attention when she realised that almost all members of her family had become the victim of residential or car crime during the past six months. Further socialisation with relatives and friends pointed to a wider number of people being exposed to burglary, also the knowledge gained from other sources such as the media and daily newspapers all signalled an increase in the levels of residential burglary. Although this limited observation could not be taken as evidence to prove an increase in crime levels, and the credibility of information from the media, especially the newspapers, is doubtful due to the possibility of exaggeration or over-presentation of crime incidents, there was a hint or an indication of the existence of a broader problem that was worth investigation. The initial attempt to review the literature in Tehran revealed that no systematic research has been carried out on the subject. This made the researcher determined to begin research on the extent to which residential burglary has increased in Tehran, the times, places and the methods by which burglary is operated, and to seek possible ways of preventing or reducing residential burglary in Tehran.

This research was initially based upon an assumption that the absence or inadequate research on patterns of residential burglary in Tehran had prevented the emergence of appropriate solutions to deal with crime levels, therefore, it was decided to study patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. On the other hand, criminological studies, especially situational crime prevention policies (studied as part of a Master course), attracted the attention of the researcher, and motivated her to examine whether such policies are capable of reducing crime levels in non-western societies (Tehran- as a case study), where the socio-economic and the built structure is substantially different from Western societies.
It is undeniable that crime rates and crime patterns are different from one society to another. Crime rates and crime patterns for example are largely influenced by the political, economic, social and cultural trends. They are also influenced by the legal context used for defining and punishing various types of offenders, as well as the ways in which the Criminal Justice System (CJS) including the police and criminal courts deal with crime situations. Decisions on how to handle crime problems in any particular society are dependent on theoretical perspectives and the ways in which offending is perceived by legislators and by criminal justice agencies. Classical perspectives in criminology hold offenders responsible for their criminal actions, therefore, consider punishment essential for the harm offenders inflict on society. According to this view, the CJS is responsible for protecting members of the public from the criminal intentions of a minority who encroach the rights of others by breaking the law. Positivist perspectives, on the other hand, view offenders as individuals whose criminality has been determined by the inevitable economic and social influences imposed on them. Their criminality is seen as an outcome of oppressive economic deprivation, inappropriate parental control and supervision, imbalanced educational systems, etc., all that have resulted in a system that fail to produce law-abiding citizens. Policies based on positivist/rehabilitative views, are directed at treatment and rehabilitation, with the intention of reversing psychological and sociological effects of such an inadequate system.

Several studies have based their research on these punitive and rehabilitative perspectives of criminality and have attempted to look into the causes of crime. They have rightly identified all the economic and social factors directly responsible for the production of offenders in society; however, such attempts have shown to be less successful in reducing or preventing crime levels. This is largely because crime is a product of several interactive factors. Also there is ambiguity about the extent and the way in which each factor affects different offenders, making the control of such factors almost impossible. In addition, policies aiming at social intervention by several institutions that have influenced the production of criminal situations may take a long period of time to show effects, if successful at all.
In the meantime, some Western countries have attempted to direct attention towards policies and strategies that produce more immediate results in the management of crime levels. They have utilised perspectives which are more focused on the environment and the criminal opportunities produced by them, and have constructed policies aimed at reducing crime levels by eliminating or blocking opportunities for crime (Mayhew, et al. 1976). The recent environmental criminology took the concept of ‘time’ and ‘place’ into consideration and argued that crime occurs at specific times in certain places, where opportunities for crimes are produced. Such perspectives were based upon the ‘routine activities’ and ‘life-style’ of victims, whose daily activities kept them away from home for a considerable amount of time during the day, and facilitated crime by making opportunities available to potential offenders (Cohen and Felson, 1979). Recent situational policies, initiated mainly by the Home Office in the United Kingdom (UK), presented initiatives such as neighbourhood watch to increase surveillance and report suspicious activities to the police, citizen patrol, improving security through target-hardening techniques, etc., all aimed at eliminating opportunities that encourages crime.

Moreover, other studies carried out by Jacobs (1961), Jeffery (1971), Newman (1972), Poyner (1983), and Stollard (1991) have suggested that the built environment has a major influence on crime levels, and that residential areas and buildings should be designed to provide natural surveillance. They were also concerned with the types of housing and suggested that some types of housing are more at risk of certain crimes, i.e. burglary, where houses with little safety and security are more prone to burglary. Houses which are not secured with proper locks and bolts, dark areas with no lights which leave the streets and especially corners a hidden place for burglars, lack of security alarms, etc. make a neighbourhood a suitable target for crime and burglary.

Almost all such work has been carried out in the United States (US) and European countries, and no attempt has been made to experiment with such policies in other non-western countries to determine whether they are capable of producing similar effects. In
Tehran, like any other society, the scope and the shape of crime is also believed to be influenced by its built environment, types of housing, and by socio-economic characteristics of places in which crime occur. The built environment, which through historical, political and social events, have gradually been developed into its contemporary form, seem to contain districts and areas, which differ substantially in respect to their socio-economic features, resulting in attracting different levels of criminal activities. The economic and social diversity of such areas, as well as the variation in housing types and life-style of its inhabitants, have produced other variations in patterns of residential crime in such areas. The initial investigation into the scope and the shape of the burglary problem in Tehran, also made evident that burglaries are time-specific, and that the methods and patterns produced by day burglars differed considerably from those being carried out at night.

Despite the suspicion or assumption that there has been an increase in residential burglary during the last few years, no academic and systematic research has been carried out in Tehran to determine to what extent crime has increased. In addition, the police and the criminal justice agencies are increasingly seeking strategies and policies capable of reducing crime levels. However, the lack of any appropriate research to show when, where and how crime occurs in Tehran, has made the authorities incapable of identifying such policies. This research is an attempt to remedy that: the aim is to examine burglary patterns in Tehran, thereby hoping to generate a better understanding of the scope and shape of the problem. The results may help assist, in the identification of suitable policies in reducing crime levels in Tehran. It is intended to investigate when, where and how burglaries occur with reference to socio-economic features, built environment, and types of housing shaping such patterns. It is also intended to determine whether situational measures utilised by some Western countries in reducing crime levels are suitable in reducing crime levels in Tehran, by outlining the similarities and dissimilarities between the findings from Tehran and those found by Western studies.
1.3 Thesis Design

The current thesis consists of eight chapters including an introduction and conclusion. Briefly, chapter two relies on existing literature in American and European countries, with the main focus on British studies and the British CJS. Chapter three will outline the methodology employed for the conduct of the current research. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will address the research carried out in Tehran. Chapter 7 examines the similarities and differences between the findings from Tehran and those from Western studies, to determine whether the findings and the solutions suggested by such studies are suitable for the prevention or reduction of burglary in Tehran. The final chapter is intended to draw out the concluding comments derived from the issues raised throughout the whole thesis.

To summarise chapter one: the research question has been addressed which also contains the main aims of the current research. Then, the research problem has been introduced describing the initial interest of the researcher in the topic of study, explaining why it is important to carry out research on residential burglary in Tehran, and showing how this research may contribute to contemporary knowledge on burglary issues. The explanation of the research problem has included the main questions asked by the current research. A brief indication has also been made to situational approaches taken by some Western including British studies, to clarify the main approach employed by the current research.

In what follows then chapter two will examine the Western literature specifically on patterns of residential burglary. The first section will briefly discuss the rates and trends in burglary, the risk of victimisation in the UK (and an indication to such issues in other western countries as well as in the US). This follows by a brief discussion on offender profile, to look at the basic demographic characteristics of offenders committing residential burglary. The ensuing section covers the temporal patterns, spatial patterns, as well as the manners by which residential burglary is conducted. It will present findings from existing literature and attempt to explain the criminal behaviour of
offenders within its socio-economic context. The next section discusses the findings from Western literature by identifying the factors which are considered to have greatly influenced patterns of residential burglary. This will be followed by the theoretical framework underlying Western studies, pursued by an analysis to examine whether such theories are adequate in explaining patterns of residential burglary in such societies. This section involves examination of a procedure by which offenders make criminal decisions, select their targets and carry out their criminal activities.

Chapter three addresses the main methodological issues related to the research. It will first outline the aims and objectives for this project, then, will present an overview of the issues that this thesis is intended to cover. The rest of the chapter will describe the methods used for conducting this research, the problems encountered during the research and the solutions employed including a discussion on the validity and reliability of the data.

Chapter four offers a sociological account of the city of Tehran, where the case study has been carried out. It provides a brief description of urban design, housing types, and their social and cultural implications. It will also inspect other social, economic, and cultural features and the life-style of its inhabitants as influential factors shaping and explaining patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The information from this chapter is expected to assist a better understanding of crime issues (discussed in chapter 6) and the way they are constructed and shaped in Tehran.

Chapter five consists of four sections. The first section looks at the existing literature which examines residential burglary in Tehran. This is followed by an account of the legal aspects in regard to the definition of burglary and its punishment in Iran. It will also demonstrate how it compares with the definition of burglary in some Western countries, particularly in UK and US. The third section briefly investigates crime statistics held by the police and other crime-related authorities. The final section addresses the crime recording procedures operated by the police to demonstrate the extent by which crime
statistics held by the police are valid in illustrating the actual crime rate in Tehran.

Chapter six provides a detailed analysis of the findings from the main body of research performed in Tehran; that is the interviews conducted with convicted residential burglars in prison. This chapter will contain several sections. It will first present general background information on socio-demographic variables, including gender, age, marital status, education, employment and socio-economic status of offenders. It will also give data on the past criminal history of offenders and will briefly pay attention to their justifications as to why and how they become involved in criminal activities. The main body of this chapter deals with patterns of residential burglary, i.e. when, where, and how residential burglaries are conducted in Tehran. It will look at the temporal, spatial patterns, and the methods by which burglary is operated, also will address the main factors influencing patterns of residential burglary. Finally, the chapter will provide a theoretical analysis of the procedure by which burglars select their targets and carry out their burglaries.

The data and analysis from previous chapters, that is on patterns of residential burglary in both Tehran and in Western countries, will establish a platform for outlining the similarities and differences documented in both countries, which will be discussed in chapter seven. These similarities and differences will determine whether similar factors influencing patterns of residential burglary in Western countries will produce similar effects in Tehran. In addition, it will illustrate whether criminological theories underlying Western studies may be used to explain patterns of similar offences in Tehran. Chapter eight provides a summary of the main conclusions reached. It will identify the limitations of the current research on burglary and make suggestions on how they may be improved in future research.
CHAPTER TWO
CHAPTER TWO

WESTERN LITERATURE ON RESIDENTIAL BURGLARY

The aims of this research are set out in chapter 3. As set out in that chapter aim 1 is to determine patterns of residential burglary in some Western societies. That is to examine the manner in which burglary is conducted in such countries. It’s sub-aims are:

a) To determine the rates of residential burglary in some Western countries, with special attention to UK; as well as looking at offender’s basic characteristics, to produce a clear picture of the shape of the problem and to determine who commits the burglaries in such countries;

b) To determine the temporal patterns of residential burglary, that is the times at which most burglaries are conducted;

c) To determine the spatial patterns of residential burglary, that is the places at which most burglaries are distributed. This will follow by an analysis of how far from their place of residence offenders travel to commit their burglaries;

d) To determine how burglaries are conducted, that is the examination of a wide range of actions carried out by residential burglars, including their target-selection techniques (selection of areas, selection of houses), techniques of entry, searching methods inside the house, types of properties targeted by offenders, and trading stolen properties;

e) To analyse the main factors influencing the selection of targets by offenders, i.e. surveillance, occupancy, and accessibility; followed by an analysis of the main factors influencing burglar’s decision-making, i.e. association of co-offenders, drug-habits, carrying weapons, security devices and target-hardening techniques, etc.

f) To determine whether a once burgled residential premises are re-burgled
within a short period of time. It will examine the prevalence of repeat victimisation, the time gap between the first and subsequent incidents, and reasons for re-burgling the similar target;

g) To determine theories/perspectives underlying Western literature on residential burglary; this includes examination of decisions made by the offender to become involved, select a target, and commit a burglary with reference to 'opportunity theories', which are explained in terms of 'rational choice' and 'routine activity' perspectives.

This chapter sets out to realise aim 1 and its corresponding sub aims.

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the Western literature on residential burglary, that is to outline the findings from various research studies carried out in some Western countries, including the research carried out in the UK and in the US. It is to produce an insight about the manner in which residential burglary is carried out in these countries. This chapter is intended first to briefly investigate the extent of burglary in some Western countries, particularly in the UK, with special attention to Home Office research studies (section 2.2). It is also intended to look at the basic demographic characteristics of burglars to determine who commits most of the burglaries (section 2.3). Then, it will look at the temporal patterns, that is the times at which most residential burglaries take place (section 2.4). The chapter will be extended to inspect the spatial patterns. The spatial patterns will be addressed with reference to places and locations where most crimes of burglary are conducted, as well as places and locations where most offenders reside (section 2.5). This section will be followed by looking at distances travelled by offenders to commit crimes and will examine theories explaining travelling patterns produced by offenders (Section 2.5.1). Both temporal and spatial patterns have been analysed with reference to 'routine activity' and 'rational choice' theories.
The next section will be an examination of the burglary event (Section 2.6). This section consists of several sub-sections, discussing techniques used by residential burglars to enter residential premises, methods used by burglars to determine occupancy of a target, search patterns inside the house, types and value of stolen properties, trading techniques used by residential burglars for disposing of stolen property, and finally retirement of burglars from criminal activities.

A study of the temporal and spatial patterns as well as operational methods may generate sufficient knowledge to clarify patterns of residential burglary, that is when, where, and how residential burglaries are conducted. The ensuing section (section 2.7) is aimed at providing an analysis on factors which are believed to influence burglary patterns. This section consists of two sub-sections; the first will identify the risk factors associated with selection of targets by residential offenders (section 2.7.1), that is surveillance, occupancy, and accessibility. The second sub-section (section 2.7.2) is concerned with other factors influencing patterns of residential burglary including individual and group burglaries, drugs, carrying a weapon while going to a burglary target, and the effects of security measures on decisions made by offenders to target a residence. Next the chapter will look at 'repeat victimisation' (section 2.8). The final sections of this chapter (sections 2.9 & 2.10) contain a theoretical analysis, examining first the theories underlying some Western studies explaining burglary patterns, followed by an analysis on how decision to offend may be explained in the shed of the 'opportunity' theory including the 'rational choice' and the 'routine activity' perspectives.

The main findings from this chapter are expected to create a platform for comparison of the findings from Western studies with those found from the empirical work carried out in Tehran (discussed in chapter 7). Hopefully, the results will illustrate whether similar factors create similar effects in both Western and Iranian societies. Furthermore, the results from the comparative section are expected to determine the transferability of the situational solutions suggested by the Western studies in preventing or reducing burglary levels in Tehran.
2.2 Rates of Residential Burglary

Rates of crimes including domestic burglary are often shown by the use of recorded crime by the police (in the UK) or by the number of arrests (in the US). A fuller count of the actual number of offences now is demonstrated by the national crime surveys as well as the national victim surveys. In UK, British Crime Surveys (BCS) were initiated by the Home Office in 1982, and have been continued since. They measure crimes against people living in private households in England and Wales.

2.2.1 The Number of Burglaries

The most recent BCS, published in 2001 (counting the incidents occurred in 2000) showed that there was a total of 1,063,000 burglaries against domestic premises (Kershaw, et al, 2001: 23) (over 1.2 million in 1999, and over 1.6 million in 1997), burglary in 2000 comprised 8% of all crimes (Kershaw, et al, 2001: 6) (a tenth- 10%- in 1997) (Budd, 1999: 6). Of burglaries occurred in 2000 more than 4 in 10 (466,000) were attempted burglaries (just under a half in 1999, almost half, in 1997), in fewer than 6 in 10 (597,000) entries were gained (over half in 1999 and in 1997). Not all entries to a residential premises involved theft; close to two-thirds of burglaries with entry in 2000 involved theft of property- a total of 403,000 incidents (three-quarters of burglaries with entry, a total of 664,000 - 41% of all burglaries- in 1997) (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 23; 2000; Budd, 1999: 5). Clear-up rate for burglary is relatively low-13% (Curtin, et al, 2001: 14).

2.2.2 Trends in Burglary

A glance at the extent of burglary, especially successful burglaries (those resulted in entries and theft) clearly show a steady reduction in burglary for the last few years. The overall victimisation rate is at its lowest since the survey's inception in 1981 (Kershaw, et al, 2001: 1). In the UK, according to the 2001 BCS, between 1997 and 1999 there was
a 10% fall in all the crimes (21% between 1997 and 2000, and 33% since 1995) (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 6), whilst burglary fell by 21%, from 1,628,000 to 1,284,000 (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 6). Between 1999 and 2000 burglary decreased by 17% (the largest ever annual decrease), this follows a fall of 27% from 1995 to 1999. The fall between 1995 and 2000 equates to an average of around 7% per year (39% fall overall) (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 23-4).

The overall trend between 1981 and 1999 shows a steady rise over the decade between 1981 and 1991 (an increase of 3% per year), a sharp increase between 1991 and 1993 (11% per year) followed by a levelling off between 1993 and 1995 (less than 2% a year), and by an overall 23% fall between 1995 and 1999 (a 6% annual fall) (Kershaw, et al, 2000:11). Between 1981 and 1993 the total number of burglaries increased by 137%, from 750,000 incidents to 1,776,000 (Budd, 1999: 7). Between 1993 and 1997 the number of burglaries fell by 8% (ibid). These recent falls reverse the trend of increasing levels of burglary during the 1980s and early 1990s, and the estimated number of burglaries in 1999 is below that in 1991 (Kershaw, et al., 2000: 17).

Despite the recent fall, the number of burglaries in 1997 was 119% higher than in 1981 (ibid: 7). Over this period, from 1981 to 1997, the number of successful burglaries increased by 86%, and the number of attempts by 177% (Budd, 1999: 8). According to these trends, the proportion of burglaries in which the offender gained entry has had a slower increase than those being attempted but where no entry was gained. Between 1991 and 1997, the burglaries with entry has fallen from 63% to 54%, also the proportion in which property was stolen fell in the same period, from 52% to 41% (Budd, 1999: 8).

The steep rise in burglary rates in the 1980s and early 1990s presented burglary as one of the most problematic crimes experienced by individuals. In 1992 the Home Office put an emphasis on initiations to reduce burglary, especially in regions and in areas where burglary was the most acute problem (Mawby, 2001). Evidence from the 2000 BCS
suggested that the recent decline in crime rate and reductions in the risk of burglary is probably a result of the increased use of situational measures through target-hardening techniques and the greater use of security measures in various types of households (Kershaw, et al., 2000). Various schemes such as Safer Cities Programme and Burglary Reduction Scheme, implemented by the Home Office to reduce burglary victimisation by targeting high-risk communities, have been assumed to have an important role in reducing crime levels. The 2001 BCS confirms that the increased levels of home and vehicle security, also crime reduction initiatives and local partnerships have played a role in these reductions (Kershaw, et al., 2001).

The picture of declining property crime since the mid 1990s is reflected in many other European countries. It has been reported that between 1996 and 2000 there was an average 15% fall in police-recorded domestic burglary across the European Union (EU) Member States, with the greatest fall were England and Wales (31%), Germany (28%), Ireland (26%), France (21%) and Scotland (20%) (Barclay and Tavares, 2002: 5). For other countries outside the EU there were high falls in Norway (42%), Romania (34%), Canada (28%) and Cyprus (28%), but a large rise in Japan (33%) (ibid.). In 2000 the largest rises were in Austria (31%), and Belgium (22%) but there was falls in most of the other countries, as in Greece (14%), and Italy (11%) (ibid.).

The burglary rates in the US are significantly lower than in England and Wales (about half the rates in 1996) (Langman and Farrington, 1998: iv). However, in the US, over the same period of time, all crimes fell by 16% and residential burglary by 19%. Similar results have been found by the US 2000 National Crime Victimisation Survey, which showed sustained falls in crime and reported the lowest levels of property crime since the inception of the survey in 1973 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Dept of Justice, 2000 National Victimisation Survey).
2.2.3 Risk of Burglary for Different Types of Household and Community

In England and Wales, overall, 3.4% of households had experienced at least one burglary or an attempted burglary in 2000; of these 2.0% of households were the victims of burglary with entry and 1.5% victims of attempted burglary (this risk was 4.3% in 1999 - 2.5% being victims of burglary with entry and 1.9% victims of attempts) (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 24). The national prevalence risk of domestic burglary was 5.6% in 1997- of these 3.2% were burglaries with entry, 2.7% were attempted burglaries (Budd, 1999: 9). This risk was 6.3% in 1995- 3.7% being victims of burglary with entry and 2.9% of attempts. Despite the fact that the risk of victimisation has shown a steady decline since 1995, over the whole period, between 1981 and 1997, the risk of burglary with entry increased by 45%, and the risk of attempted burglary increased by 93% (ibid).

Amongst burgled houses, some types of household faced higher risks than others. The 2001 BCS showed that areas with high levels of physical disorder, and houses containing single parents were at highest risk of burglary - 7.9% (Kershaw, et al., 2001: 25). Similar factors were found to put certain types of households at higher risk, in 1999 and in 1997 (Kershaw, et al., 2000: iv; Budd, 1999: 9). The 1997 BCS also showed that the socio-economic circumstances affected the level of risks, where the head of household was unemployed, the level of income was low, and in privately rented housings there was a higher risk of victimisation (Budd, 1999: 11). Also, flats or terraced properties faced higher risks (ibid). The risk of burglary in rural areas is well below the national average (2.6%), and the chance of rural burglary is a little over half that for non-rural areas (Kershaw, et al., 2000: iv). In general, the findings from the BCS suggest a fall in the rates of residential burglary in England and Wales in recent years, however, it is evident that some areas and households with specific socio-economic characteristics suffer higher levels of crime and are at higher risk of burglary victimisation.
2.3 Basic Demographic Characteristics of Offenders

This section will look at the main and basic characteristics of offenders. Sex and age are two of the most important factors associated with offending. For burglary other factors have been found to be important. In the UK, the BCS have gathered some information on the characteristics of offenders from victims, which will be included in the next sections.

2.3.1 Sex of Offenders

All major crime studies agree that residential burglary is predominantly a male activity. The 1998 BCS showed that the offenders in the majority of burglary incidents (88%) were men (Budd, 1999: 25). Of the remaining (12%), 6% of burglaries were committed by men and women together, and 6% by women alone. Of those committed by women alone, a higher proportion were successful burglaries (9%) than attempts (1%) (ibid). A study carried out by Wiles and Costello in Sheffield confirms this finding and showed that a great majority of offences (including burglary) in Sheffield (as well as in York) are committed by young males. Of the offences examined only shoplifting contained a sizeable proportion of female offenders- 44% (Wiles and Costello, 2000: 11). Almost 95% of burglars studied by the Kirkholt project and 93% of those being studied in Plymouth were male (see Forrester, Chatterton and Pease, 1988). Tarling (1993: 12) by using the official statistics from the police (based on the number of known offenders) also supports the fact that most crimes are committed by young males; he showed that in 1990 there were over five known male offenders for every one known female offender. The difference in the ratio for males and females, according to Tarling is explained by the type of offence; with the highest difference for sexual offences (male/female ratio: 105:1), burglary (22:1), robbery (18:1), criminal damage (11:1) and violence against the person (7:1). The lowest is for theft and handling stolen goods (3:1) (Tarling, 1993: 13-14). Tarling added that this is true for most Western societies. The male/female ratio for countries such as Canada, France, Germany, Sweden and the United States in 1985 was
in the range 4:1 to 6:1 (ibid.: 13). Other past studies have all confirmed crime as being mainly a male activity for almost all types of crime including burglary. Reppetto (1974: 13) used the FBI (Federal Bureau Investigation) statistics and suggested that in 1970, 95% of persons arrested for burglary in Boston were male and young. Similar results were found by Curtin, et al (2001), Maguire and Bennett (1982) as well as Waller and Okihiro (1978).

2.3.2 Age of Offenders

Burglary is a teen-age phenomenon. In half (50%) of all burglaries studied by the 1999 BCS, where the victim could provide details, the offenders were said to be aged 16-24 (Budd, 1999: 25). Offenders were said to be of school age in 16% (ibid). School-age offenders were more likely to be implicated in attempts (24%) than successful burglaries (13%) (ibid). The peak age of offending according to Tarling (based on official statistics) is 18 for males and 15 for females, and offending declines after teen-age (Tarling, 1993: 15). Again, a similar situation occurs for most other Western countries, for example in Argentina, France, Sweden and Japan, offending similarly rises to a peak rate in the mid-teens and declines thereafter (ibid: 16). The average age for offending also varies by type of offence, however the age variation for both males and females is less evident for burglary, meaning that burglary is committed by younger offenders (the peak age for males is 17, 16 for females) compared to violent crimes (18 for males, 15 for females) (ibid: 17-18). Other studies such as by Waller and Okihiro (1978:23) and Reppetto (1974: 13) showed that most persons arrested for burglary in America are under 25 (the median age was 17). Also Maguire and Bennett (1982: 25) found that 40% of burglaries are committed by juveniles, the remaining by young adults and adults. Juveniles referred to courts accounted for half of all persons processed for burglary (Waller and Okihiro, 1978: 23). Their interviews in Canada showed that burglars who broke into houses were even younger than those who entered non-residential buildings (ibid). The average age for burglary according to police crime records was 18 in Canada (ibid: 33).
2.3.3 Number of Offenders

In general, British studies suggest that burglary is a group activity. However, over half (54%) of burglaries in which victims, studied by the 1999 BCS, could give details, involved just one offender; 27% two offenders and 19% three offenders or more (Budd, 1999: 25). Attempts were slightly more likely to involve more than one offender. Young offenders and juveniles mainly commit their crimes in groups, and only one third of juveniles commit offences on their own (Tarling, 1993: iv). It was similarly shown that the extent of group offending decreases with age, that about two thirds of young adults-aged 17 to 21- and 80% of those over 35 commit crimes on their own (ibid.). Since the majority of burglaries are committed by young offenders it may be concluded that burglary is more likely to occur in groups and that in general offenders tend to act alone as their criminal career progresses.

2.3.4 Relationship to Offender/s

Of those burglaries in which the victim could give details, according to the 1999 BCS, almost a half (49%) were committed by complete strangers. 17% involved offenders known casually by the victim, and 34% offenders well known to the victim. Successful burglaries were more likely to be committed by someone well known to the victim (39%), than attempts (26%) (Budd, 1999: 25). Even if assumptions are made that the victim did not know the offender 14% of all burglaries involved offenders who were well known to the victim (ibid). The high proportion of burglaries conducted by offenders known to victims, according to Budd, is because the legal definition of burglary in the UK is broad, including all incidents of trespass in which the motivation is theft, rape, grievous bodily harm or unlawful damage. So, for example, incidents in which ex-partners try to gain entry to the home against the victim’s will and cause damage are classified as burglaries.

In almost half the cases studied by Waller and Okihiro (1978: 33) the incident involved a
stranger, while in the other half the victim had some knowledge of the offender, though there was no indication from their data which was the best description of the relationship—friend, relative, acquaintance, employee, etc. They also found that one third of their victims thought their offenders lived within a half mile of the victimised residence (ibid: 33).

2.3.5 Other Characteristics

Previous studies on burglary show that most burglars are single, unemployed and live in economically and socially deprived areas. A study by Forrester, Chatterton and Pease in Kirkholt in 1988 showed that 70% of their burglars were unemployed and 95% lived in council estates (Forrester, Chatterton and Pease, 1988). The burglary study in Plymouth showed that three quarter of their burglars were single, and almost all (97%) were white. Of burglars studied in Plymouth 31% lived in inner city wards, also known offenders were disproportionately found in areas with high levels of council housing, low owner-occupancy, low social class, high level of unemployment, high levels of overcrowding, and high proportion of one-parent household. They also showed similar disadvantaged areas, where high rates of offenders lived, had high rates of burglary.

Reppetto in his interviews with burglars in Boston found that the majority of his burglars’ population were not well educated and had limited non-criminal work skills. He also found that the highest frequency of drug use for 18-25 age group, of which 68% were drug users (1974: 14). Maguire and Bennett (1982) showed that convicted burglars come overwhelmingly from disadvantaged background. This was also found by Baldwin and Bottoms (1976: 132-4) in Sheffield where offenders were concentrated in ‘difficult’ housing estates. These results, according to Mawby (1979), may be due to the amount of police attention to such areas. One in three of the victims studied by Waller and Okihiro (1978: 33) thought their offender was definitely under the influence of alcohol at the time, but only 12% thought that the offender was under the influence of drugs. Similarly, half of the offenders were thought or known to be unemployed. They used police crime
statistics to show that the majority of burglary is committed by the male population of 15 years and over, who are single and unemployed (ibid: 51). They found lower rate of burglary for owner-occupied and detached dwellings, and houses accommodating two-parent families. A high proportion of burglars were disadvantaged and unattached.

2.4 Temporal Patterns of Residential Burglary

The aim in this section is to determine the times at which most burglaries occur in Western countries. Marcus Felson (1998), the founder of routine activity theory, noted that burglary is a crime which occurs at a certain time in a certain place and under certain circumstances. Identification of temporal patterns of specific crimes, i.e. residential burglary, is important and could have great impact on policies and strategies selected for controlling the burglary rate. Patterning burglary is expected to assist the police and crime prevention agencies to concentrate more effectively on areas and houses at the times when those particular houses are more at risk of being burgled.

Several burglary studies suggest that rates of residential burglary in different areas are higher at certain times of the day, on certain days of the week, or during certain times of the year. The literature on temporal patterns indicates an important finding suggesting that a large proportion of burglary is committed during the daytime. Maguire and Bennett (1982) showed variation in times at which most burglaries were committed, the general finding from this study was that daytime burglaries outnumbered those committed at night. However, most studies have not defined clearly what they meant by night/day, and whether day/night started at a specific time or that simply day referred to when it is light and night referred to when it is dark. In the latter, it is clear that the concept of day/night would be different within different seasons/months of the year. The BCS has appointed a specific time to define what is meant by day/night: day starts at 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., the evening is 6 p.m. to midnight and night is referred to times between midnight to 6 a.m. Time-specific definition of day/night has the benefit of consistency.
and makes recording of crimes by the police as well as interpretation and analysis of findings from various research easier, however, it may has the disadvantage of making it difficult to determine to what extent risk factors such as surveillance and visibility are considered important in the selection of targets (area/house), at different times of day (month or season), by offenders.

According to the above definition, the 1998 BCS showed that in England and Wales, 32% of burglaries occur at evening and 23% at night. Day burglaries formed 29% of burglaries (8% in the morning and 21% in the afternoon). In a further 10% of incidents burglaries took place during the morning or afternoon (Budd, 1999: 19). However, the 1999 BCS showed that night-time burglaries, those that occurred while it was dark, were less likely to be successful (result in entry). Just under a half (48%) of burglaries which took place after dark were successful, compared with 61% of those which occurred during the day (Budd, 1999: 20). Budd suggested that although darkness can provide cover for offenders, however, during the evening or night homes are more likely to be occupied, and this may prevent offenders from completing their offence.

The higher proportion of day burglaries to night burglaries is evidenced by Cromwell and his colleagues Oslon and Wester in 1991, who found that only a small number (3 out of 30) of their burglars committed their burglaries at night, while the majority preferred to work between 9-11 a.m. and in the mid-afternoon. Reppetto's (1974) findings also suggested that burglary is primarily a daytime offence. Scarr (1973: 142) found that nearly 50% of reported burglaries took place between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., compared with 13% between midnight and 7 a.m. For him, too, residential burglary is a daytime, weekday phenomenon. Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 30) reported that only a few of their professional burglars liked to operate late at night, unless under the influence of drugs, and they found that burglars were active between 10-11 a.m. and from 1-3 p.m. The reason given by these offenders for their tendency not to carry out late night burglaries was simply that it was too difficult to tell if anyone was home. Most of their
burglars avoided confrontation with residents and were afraid of sound sleepers who would not respond to rings at the doorbell but might awaken once they had entered the house.

Felson (1998), too, confirmed the tendency of residential burglary to take place during the day. Maguire and Bennett (1982: 47) found that overall only one in four burglaries occur at night-time. They also found that no more than one in five burglaries took place with people actually asleep in the house. The general finding which suggests that burglary is primarily a daytime phenomenon, however, was contradicted by the findings of Waller and Okihiro (1978: 24) who based their studies on information obtained from victims as well as the data acquired from the police. They found that the largest proportion of burglaries occurred at night, and that burglaries occur less frequently in the morning. Waller & Okihiro (1978) like many other researchers such as Reppetto (1974), Walsh (1980), Maguire and Bennett (1982) have attempted to determine the temporal patterns by using the crime information held by the police based upon the reports made by victims. Since in most cases the burglary has occurred at a time when the residents have been absent from home information is often based on an estimate of the time of the burglary, therefore, not totally reliable source for establishing accurate temporal patterns. Maguire and Bennett (1982), for the same reason, have recognised the weakness of the evidence as the temporal patterns are based upon information from the police, or victims of crime.

Similar studies have extended their findings to distinguish between burglaries carried out within weekdays and those committed at weekends. They have explained the difference in the patterns by stating that weekday burglaries are clearly daytime burglaries; Maguire and Bennett (1982: 47) estimate that over 50% of weekday burglaries take place between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. They found that the basic weekday pattern shows a steady rise in the rate of burglaries through the day from 7 a.m. to a peak at 3 p.m., followed by a sharp drop to 6 p.m., a minor revival during the evening, then a decline from 10 p.m. through
the night. Friday appears to be the peak day for burglary and differs from other weekdays in that high rates are maintained throughout the evening. A similar finding is confirmed by Reppetto (1974) and Scarr (1973). The pattern for weekends shows a different picture. Similar studies such as Maguire and Bennett (1982: 47) found that the peak period for burglary on Saturdays is the evening between 9-11 p.m., with few offences occurring in the late morning or early afternoon, and that the daytime total is only half that of any weekday. Sundays are found to be similar to Saturdays at least up to 6 p.m., and with a low number of daytime offences, but unlike Saturdays their evenings do not show an increase (ibid.). Budd (1999) by using the findings from the 1998 BCS showed that the risk of burglary is higher on weekday than on weekends. The 1998 BCS estimated that only 30% of burglaries occurred at the weekend, while 70% occurred on weekdays (Budd, 1999: 19). In addition, burglaries carried out during the weekend are less likely to be successful (49%) than those during the week (56%), probably for higher occupancy rate during the weekend (ibid: 20).

Maguire and Bennett found that these findings held for every month of the year, although, overall the mid-winter months, notably December, produced more burglaries than the summer months, and the proportion of night-time burglaries was higher in summer (ibid.: 45). Walsh (1980) in his study on burglary suggested a peak summer time, explainable in terms of hot weather and open windows. Another possibility for the prevalence of burglary in summer, suggested by Walsh, is that more burglaries are committed by school children who are on holidays during the summer (Walsh, 1980: 68-9). Waller and Okihiro (1978: 25) similarly found a marginally higher concentration of residential burglary in the summer months, while Scarr (1973: 30) did not find any significant difference in residential burglary rates for varied weather circumstances.

The findings on temporal patterns of burglary and interviews carried out with residential burglars across most studies suggest a strong relationship between burglary and occupancy, revealing the fact that most offenders prefer to burgle houses which are
unoccupied. The time pattern found by most studies confirms such findings and suggests that the peak period for offending is the period when houses are most likely to be unoccupied. Conversely, the low point for offending is the time at which people are most likely to be at home but not asleep. The high rate of burglary on Saturday nights, when many people have gone out, is also attributable to the critical issue of occupancy. A Saturday night burglary is made easier when the absence of lights shows that the house is empty. Night burglaries, although low in rate, occurs because the effectiveness of occupancy is reduced when people are asleep. The study by Maguire and Bennett (1982: 49) showed that at least three-quarters of burgled houses were empty at the time, which shows that burglary is a crime in which as far as possible the offender avoids the risk of contact with the victim. Reppetto (1974: 17), too, found that 92% of the houses in Boston were unoccupied during burglary.

Analysis has been made by similar researchers trying to relate the time patterns for residential burglary to the 'lifestyle' and 'routine activities' of victims. Felson (1998), the founder of routine activity theory, has attempted to demonstrate how the time patterns are determined by the every day activities of victims. He related the peak times and the low points for burglary and attempted to relate them to the times when the home residents (the guardians) left the home unoccupied. Felson suggested that burglary is a daytime phenomenon because most houses are left empty during specific times of the day; at night few houses are burgled mainly because most residents are at home. Furthermore, Felson (1998: 72, 148) suggested that residential burglars burgle at times which they know the houses are left unguarded. He considered that the time patterns change with changes to daily life patterns.

The temporal patterns studied by Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) is also consistent with the routine activity model and suggest that the time patterns of burglars are determined by the time patterns of their victims. Burglars work during periods when residences are unguarded. They argued that women who work leave the house unoccupied for most of
the day; those who do not work tend to develop predictable patterns regarding the use of discretionary time for the purpose of shopping, or visiting friends and relatives. Whenever the house is left unguarded it is susceptible to burglary. Similarly, the study of Cromwell, et al. (1991) found that their burglars organised their working hours around school hours, particularly during the times when parents (usually mothers) took their children to school. Most preferred to commit their crimes during hours when they expected people to be at work and out of the home. Those who committed night burglaries usually knew their victims’ schedule and the time that the house was left unoccupied. Cromwell, et al. concluded that a burglar is aware of victims’ use of time.

Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 21-4) explained the routine activity model by dividing the activities of individuals into two categories: those that must be undertaken, termed as ‘non-discretionary activities’, and those that are done by choice, termed as ‘discretionary activities’. They suggested that the times provided by non-discretionary activities create the most important opportunities for burglary, that is the times when, say, a housewife, leaves the home unguarded for accomplishing her non-discretionary tasks, i.e. taking her husband to work, her children to school, or doing her discretionary tasks, i.e. shopping or visiting friends and relatives. The pattern produced by working women is somehow different, leaving the house unguarded for much longer hours, therefore, more susceptible to burglary. Rengert and Wasilchick found that burglaries were high when the proportion of women working in their homes were low, and that their burglary patterns followed more closely the habits of women working outside the home than those who do not. They also found that most of the night-time burglars operated on weekend nights, again with close correspondence with the times houses were likely to be unguarded. Moreover, they found that women, both those who work outside the home and those who do not, were least likely to be home in the late morning (9-11 a.m.) and early afternoon hours (1-3 p.m.).
Selection of time for burglary is also determined by the life-style and routine activities of offenders themselves. Time, according to Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 20-1) is a central concern to burglars for three reasons. First, they seek to minimise the time referred to as "intrusion time", spent inside a premise, or outside a premise forcing entry. The intrusion time, for those who are good at their trade, may be no more than a minute or two forcing an entry, and then only 3-5 minutes inside the house (see also Felson, 1998). Second, opportunities for burglary are time-specific. The best opportunities occur only when target sites are unguarded, and there is a predictable time when this occurs during the day. Third, the time required to plan and execute a burglary has an effect on the potential non-criminal life of the burglar. The burglar must make himself available when the premises are least likely to be occupied. This requirement precludes other activities, i.e. a legitimate job, which starts before, but continues through this time requirement. Although the time used for entry and the time spent inside the house is often short, as much as 3-5 minutes, Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 32-3) showed that the total time spent for burglary - that is the time from the moment the burglar leaves home until s/he returns, excluding the time used to plan the burglary - is much longer, ranging between six hours for a residential burglar who burglarised several houses a day, to fifteen minutes for a "smash and grab" burglar who broke windows and took valuables from the window sill or porch and left. Depending on the burglar's temporal patterns, day burglars often spent about 2-3 hours, searching for an area, searching for a target, assessing it, and doing the burglary, fencing the stolen goods and returning home. This, conflicted with the hours of any day job, and meant that staying in a legitimate job was impractical.

Night burglars, who worked often on weekends, were less affected by times required for burglary; therefore, night burglars could work on weekdays. Many burglars, especially those on drugs or who were gamblers, quitted their jobs and devoted more time to burglary, obtaining a considerable higher income from burglary than their legitimate jobs (Rengert and Wasilchick, 2000, 47; 1985: 34-43). They suggested that time conflicts forced individuals to choose burglary over their jobs; Rengert and Wasilchick believed that unemployment was caused by crime not vice versa.
2.5 Spatial Patterns of Residential Burglary

This section determines the spatial patterns of residential burglary. Spatial patterns are discussed, first in terms of the spatial patterning of offences, that is places (areas, houses) where most burglaries are conducted; and second the spatial patterning of offenders, that is places where most burglars are residents. Examining the spatial patterns of offence/offender then leads to a discussion as how to investigate how far from their place of residence offenders travel to commit their burglaries. The latter will be examined under the heading of ‘the journey to crime’.

The spatial distribution of offences has been a central focus of several crime studies. The Home Office in a booklet published by the Crime Prevention Unit, in 1988, suggested that most crimes tend to be concentrated in particular places. This has been confirmed by the recent BCS, which shows that there are considerable variations in the risk of burglary in different areas (Kershaw, et al., 2000; Budd, 1999). Mawby (2001) used the findings from the BCS and argued that four aspects might be considered to illustrate the extent of variation: area, household characteristics, design and planning features, and other aspects of lifestyle. All these factors are important and are interactive in producing a risk for burglary; however, Tricket, Osborn and Ellingworth (1995: 283) argued that area characteristic is of greater importance than other factors in the selection of targets. Other studies such as Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) suggested that much crime including residential burglary was spatially dependent, and that some places had much higher rates of crime than elsewhere. Identification of crime areas is not new and since the 19th century criminological research has documented the concentration of crime in certain criminal districts, i.e. the criminal areas of Chicago and other major American cities during the 1920s and 1930s, the delinquency areas of Croydon, an industrial suburb of London, the ‘Rookeries’ of the largest British cities, etc.

On spatial distribution of offenders major studies such as Shaw and McKay (1942) and Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) have clearly demonstrated the over-presentation of offenders in specific areas. In addition, they have searched for evidence to link the high
rate of crime with areal characteristics, suggesting that the highest concentration of burglaries appear in or close to socially disadvantaged housing areas.

A large body of Western literature has focused on the urban design and physical layout of certain areas, and their influence on crime rates and crime patterns. Studies such as Jacobs (1961), Newman (1972), Poyner (1983), Stollard (1991) have specifically looked at architectural and environmental design and have advocated crime prevention through redesigning the environment and in the types of housings. Jacobs (1961) suggested that construction of high-rise buildings and the changes made to city planning have resulted in diminished community relationships and have led to an increase in crime rates in specific areas. She is in favour of traditional types of buildings that maintain close relationships between residents. Newman (1972) the originator of ‘defensible space’ was mainly concerned with crime problems in public housing and argued that alterations and manipulation of the physical environment would reduce crime rate in such areas. He suggested schemes involving improvement of street lighting, controlling access to buildings, dividing grounds into identifiable areas, the allocation of windows and entry points that produce surveillance, etc. Newman’s theory attracted considerable criminological research, as well as crime prevention agencies and policy makers, and his ideas created a substantial change in crime perspectives. Studies of Poyner (1983), and Stollard (1991) are among those that link crime prevention to environmental approach. The main theme established by such studies suggest that policies which manipulate environmental design are able to reduce opportunities for committing crime, therefore, leading to a reduction in crime level in high crime areas. The 2000 BCS has confirmed the association of risk with environmental and housing design, and showed that while detached houses were at least risk (2.8%), terraced houses (5.6%) and flats/maisonettes (5.4%) were at most risk (Kershaw, et al., 2000). The 1999 BCS also found that the housing location had an important role in the level of risk of victimisation; those living in cul-de-sacs were at lower risk (4.3%), than those living in side roads (6.2%), with main roads apparently most vulnerable (6.6%) (Mirrlees-Black, et al., 1998). Also Evans and Fletcher (1998) in their research on residential burglary in affluent areas of Stoke, found that houses that produced better access to major routeways were at particular risk.
More recent British and American studies have correlated the prevalence of crime in specific areas with its socio-economic characteristics. In UK, social class and tenure-type have been found to be the most important factors associated with crime rate. The BCS in England and Wales has consistently shown the higher risk of victimisation for households with different characteristics and situated in different localities (Kershaw, et al., 2000; 2001; Budd, 1999). The 2000 as well as 2001 BCS showed that low-income households are more likely to be found in poorer urban and inner-city areas (see also Evans, 1989) and are likely to have fewer home security measures, therefore, more at risk of victimisation. The findings from the 1999 BCS showed that households located in areas with higher levels of physical disorder (12.0%), in inner-city areas (8.5%), in council estate areas (8.1%) are more at risk of burglary (the average risk of burglary was 3.4%) (Budd, 1999: 12). These findings lend support to the analysis of the ecology of crime emerged with the Chicago School in the USA, where the inner 'zone of transition' was identified as the source of much crime. Evans and Oulds (1984) in their research in Newcastle-under-Lyme showed that all eight enumeration districts with high crime rates were areas of low socio-economic status. Similar findings were shown by Evans (1992) and Herbert and Darwood (1992). Maguire and Bennett (1982) found that in Reading victimised property tended to be either on or near council estates or wealthier properties, the most heavily victimised being high-value properties in the centre of or near poorer areas. Herbert (1982) showed that burglaries in Oklahoma City were relatively rare in more affluent suburbs, however, it was shown that a wealthy neighbourhood in close proximity to a poor one is more likely to suffer high rates of burglary (Waller and Okihiro, 1978). In the US, public housing seems to be regarded as being associated with higher burglary rates. Scarr (1973: 105) found a positive correlation between high burglary rates and a high percentage of over-crowded housing units, while Reppetto (1974: 32, 38-9) reported association of crime areas with multi-family dwellings, low levels of social cohesion, and low average income.
Moreover, although the general findings suggest that most burglaries are carried out in socially disadvantaged areas, the finding of the majority of burglary studies suggest that within these areas the most affluent houses suffer the highest rate of victimisation (Repetto, 1974: 39). It was also found that wealthy areas that are close to poorer areas suffer crime the most. Tricket, Osborn and Ellingworth (1995: 291) showed that while 'richer people in poorer areas suffer property crime particularly heavily, relatively low risk is faced by poor people living in rich areas'. Walsh (1980: 126) and Sparks (1977: 86) found no statistically significant relationship between wealth and burglary.

Burglary studies have explained the offender's tendency in targeting neighbourhoods with adverse socio-economic characteristic through the age factor, and showed that while the most disadvantaged inner-city areas are burgled predominantly by young burglars, the affluent areas acted as an attraction to older and more experienced offenders (Repetto, 1974; Waller and Okihiro, 1978; Maguire and Bennett, 1982). From interviews with a wide range of burglars Repetto suggested that age was the most important factor in deciding where an offender operated, the younger tended to steal within their own neighbourhood, the older moved to more affluent suburban houses. Similar finding was confirmed by studies of Maguire and Bennett (1982) suggesting that wealthy housing located in suburban settings and smaller towns creates an attraction to the more professional burglar. Repetto also found that his older offenders more frequently tended to operate in single-family housing, the younger preferred multi-family houses and public projects. Similar higher rates of burglary are evident by Jackson and Winchester (1982), Waller and Okihiro (1978), and Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) in Sheffield for high rateable value of properties.

On the other hand, the recent BCS showed that not only the age of offender but also the age of victims plays a part in the risk of victimisation. The 1999 BCS clearly identifies households where the head of household is younger as particularly at risk. The rate in 1999 was 12% where the head of household was aged 16-24, declining to 2.3% for 65-
74 year olds, with a slight increase to 3.2% for those aged 75 and over (Budd, 1999). Similar source showed an increase of risk for one-parent families (11.7%), economically inactive groups such as students and the unemployed (7.2%). It also confirmed the findings from previous studies suggesting the higher risk of burglary for households with low levels of income (6.5% for income under £5,000), and tenure type, with the highest risk for council house occupiers (6.7%) and private renters (7.5%).

Similar studies that documented the spatial distribution of offences within socially deprived areas have suggested that similar areas contain higher rates of offenders living within those areas. Concentration of delinquents and juveniles in socially deprived areas has been documented in the literature of crime since the 19th century. The correlation between the crime phenomena and other socio-economic characteristics has been documented by studies carried out by Shaw and McKay (1942), followed by more recent studies of environmental criminology. Environmental criminology, at its early stages of research, concentrated on an uneven areal distribution of offenders, demonstrating that offenders were over-represented in some areas than others. Studies such as Reppetto (1974: 22), Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) noted the concentration of crimes in low-income and disadvantaged areas, and they argued that similar areas contained high rates of offenders. In other words, it was argued that a high proportion of burglars came from lower-income families, living in socially disadvantaged areas.

Spatial patterning of offender/offence, which concentrates on the movement of offenders in place, is the major focus of contemporary criminology. The latest interest of environmental criminology is laid on how far offenders travel to commit their crimes. Therefore, contemporary environmental criminologists are engaged in analysing and modelling the “journey to crime”. The major finding of such studies was that the journey to crime is short. The finding by Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) suggested that the majority of detected burglaries take place within two miles of offender’s home. In nearly 70% of those committed in Sheffield by people aged 26 or over, the burglar had
travelled less than two miles, and in over half of offenders he lived within one mile of his/her victim (Baldwin and Bottoms, 1976). Baldwin and Bottoms argued that the young burglar is more likely to offend in an area close to his/her residence or other places where s/he legitimately spends much of his/her time, e.g. workplace or pub. In Sheffield 54% of breaking offences occurred within one mile of the offender’s residence (76% of those committed by 10-15 year olds). The journey to crime is discussed in the next section in more detailed form.

2.5.1. The Journey to Crime – Distance Travelled by Offenders

The journey to crime is an investigation of the movement of burglars in place for committing burglary, in other words, it will examine how far from their place of residence burglars usually travel to carry out their burglaries. To answer this question it has to be asked what particular areas/properties are selected by burglars and why. In order to document the pattern of offender’s movement in place, reference will be given to the findings of various research studies to determine if there is a correlation between such movement and age and experience. Also to explain the movement of burglars in place with reference to the ‘life-style’ and ‘routine activity’ theories, and to demonstrate how this pattern is influenced by the life-style of offenders as well as victims. The findings from this section will be used to determine whether the findings from the empirical work in Tehran are similar to the findings of Western studies.

Empirical work in criminology has repeatedly demonstrated that most offenders commit a large number of their offences close to their homes. Since the mid 19th century it was always assumed that burglars were poor, lived in poor areas of the city and travelled a long way to rich areas to select their targets among houses located in such areas. This assumption was altered later, especially by the work of Shaw and Mckay (1942) who made it clear that offenders, especially juveniles, committed most of their crimes in poor and deprived areas. Similar findings were shown in studies by Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) in Sheffield, which showed that juvenile offenders chose their victims within
their living neighbourhood. This is especially true in cases of volume crime i.e. burglary appears to be a localised phenomena.

There is no clear definition of what is meant by "close" but research indicates that crimes usually occur in only a short distance from the offender’s home, in other words, the journey to crime is short. This pattern has been found for residential burglary, and similarly for many other types of offences. For example Bullock (1955: 571, in Barantingham and Brantingham, 1991: 28) found that 40% of all Houston homicides between 1945-49 occurred within one city block of the offender’s residence and 74% occurred within two miles. Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) showed similar results for larceny, breaking offences, and taking and driving away offences in Sheffield; they also found that there is a decrease in crime with an increase of distance. This pattern is evident, especially for property offences, and research into these types of crimes has shown that most property offenders conduct their crimes in working class areas, not far from home. Reppetto’s (1974) sample of Boston burglars, although it identified other areas with better targets, nonetheless these burglars operated their own in the neighbourhood. Reppetto (1974: 18) found that one-half of his interviewees, mostly the young and non-white groups, showed a reluctance to travel more than one hour from their homes for burglary.

Rengert (1975) showed that Philadelphia burglars, too, committed most of their crimes (residential burglaries) close to home. Research carried out by Rengert and Wasilchic (1985) on burglars in Delaware County, Pennsylvania (a suburb of Philadelphia) showed a very strong relationship between the crime location and the main pathways from home to work, and from home to recreation. Poyner (1983) supported the findings from studies carried out in England and Wales and in the US, suggesting that offenders, who tend to be from poor areas, travel relatively short distances to commit burglary (Poyner, 1983: 31). Wright and Decker (1994) like other studies found that burglars choose areas close to where they live. In Philadelphia, in 1969, it was shown by Turner (1969 in Davidson,
1981: 67) that most offenders lived a short distance from the location of their offence. The median distance was only 0.4 miles: some 73% travelled less than one mile, 87% less than two miles.

By using offender's address locations, extracted from police recorded crime data and comparing it with 'hot spots' (areas with high concentration of burglary) within the city of Cambridge, between 1994 and 1996, Bennett and Durie (1999) found that the three largest 'hot spots' of offender's addresses almost completely overlapped the largest 'hot spots' of offence addresses. In other words, Bennett and Durie found that offenders tended to live in, or close to the offence 'hot spots'. Furthermore, similar results were found from interviews with burglars currently convicted of burglary and those under the care of a probation department in Cambridge. Bennett and Durie by using these interviews examined the relationship between the location of the offence address and the location of the offender's address, and showed that most of the interviewed offenders committed most of their offences less than a mile from their homes. The majority of these offenders gave nearness of the offence site (target area) to their homes as their primary reason for selecting their offence locations. Tilley and Webb (1994) from their Safer Cities Burglary Reduction project showed that the bulk of the persons carrying out burglaries came from within the scheme areas. This may explain the findings from the 1999 BCS suggesting that some victims had some knowledge of their burglar's identities, and that in a third of these the burglar was well known to them (Budd, 1999). The local aspect of burglary is confirmed by Baker's (2000) research; and was also proved by Forrester, Chatterton and Pease (1988: 3) who found that 77% of their offenders had walked to the target address.

In 2000, Wiles and Costello conducted a research investigating the extent to which offenders travel to crime. This research is based on assumptions suggesting that the increased facilities in transportation and higher mobility would make it easier for offenders to travel further to commit their crimes, therefore, expecting larger distances to
be travelled by offenders. This view is mainly held and supported by the police, in the UK, however, this research which aimed at analysing offender travel pattern, by using geo-coded police recorded crime statistics, DNA records, and interviews with a sample of offenders finds little evidence to confirm such a view. The main finding from this research was that new travel opportunities have little effect in increasing the travel to offend, and the vast majority of offenders still conform to the traditional travel patterns which shows that offender’s movements are fairly short (1.88 miles on average for domestic burglary) (Wiles and Costello, 2000: 11). This distance slightly varied where an offender acted alone (1.73 miles) or where the offence was carried out by two or more offenders (1.35 miles for the shortest journey and 3.17 miles for the longest journey) (ibid).

Another major finding by Wiles and Costello suggested that burglars are more likely (than thieves) to commit offences in situations where an opportunity for an offence present itself during non-criminal routines, and are less likely to travel with the intention of offending (planned offending). They made evident that only 30% (38% for thieves) of their interviewed burglars were present in an area with the intention of offending (actively searching for targets), 36% (29% for thieves) were tempted by opportunities present in the nearness of their homes (unplanned burglaries), and 29% (30% for thieves) committed an offence by chance, while visiting a friend, or when shopping and in their leisure time (Wiles and Costello, 2000: 36). They concluded that offending patterns may be largely driven by routine activities but offenders do not intentionally separate the criminal routines from non-criminal ones. Offending therefore may be explained by opportunities, needs or temptations present themselves, and routines can include both deviant and non-deviant behaviour.

Several studies have correlated the distance travelled by burglars to their age and experience, and generally found that the older age groups showed more willingness to travel further (Reppetto, 1974). In contrast, the majority of younger offenders were more
likely to offend in close proximity to their residence or other places where they legitimately spend much of their time (e.g. workplace or pub) (Davidson, 1981). Similarly, Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) argued that more experienced offenders gained more confidence to move away from their immediate area of residence to less familiar territories. Walsh (1980) showed that adult (older) offenders were prepared to travel further to commit their offences, especially if the target attraction was high. The finding of Walsh showed that although some burglars were prepared to travel a long way to commit their burglaries most of them lived at a distance of up to two miles from the last house they broke into (Walsh, 1980: 72). The travel-to-crime pattern studied by Wiles and Costello (2000) does not support the findings from the previous studies, and for burglary shows no statistically significant correlation between travel-to-crime and age. There are no clear findings as to whether gender differences may affect the distance travelled by offenders, as most studies have concentrated on male offenders and have ignored gender variation in this regard.

Wiles and Costello (2000) by using DNA matches, where it showed that the same offender was responsible for more than one offence in the same police division or where offences conducted by one offender were coded by different police stations, found that the vast majority of matches were within the force, and half of all matches were within the same police division, confirming the short distance travelled by volume crime offenders to commit their crimes. They also found in the comparison of Sheffield with North Yorkshire that there are variations in patterns by type of area (i.e. urban and suburban or rural areas). The difference made evident that rural forces show more non-adjacent matches whilst urban forces and adjoining suburban areas contain adjacent matches, suggesting the shorter travels-to-crime within urban areas.

'Travel to crime' has been explained with reference to offender's rationality. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) have proposed a rationale for such a pattern, by suggesting that it takes time, money, and effort to overcome distance. There is also a
more important rationale suggesting that offenders in their constant movement in their close locations sustain more information about their homebase locations than about more distant locations. They, therefore, get well-informed about the available targets in their immediate neighbourhood. In response to the prediction made by the Brantinghams, a model produced by Rhodes and Conly (1991) advise that while offenders are undoubtedly familiar with the area, they are also likely to be well known, so regardless of how good the targets are in the immediate vicinity of their home, offenders may choose to travel away from home to commit their crimes, hoping to reduce their risk of detection. According to this model, it is expected that the tendency for crime commission will be reduced according to the immediate closeness of the homebase location. The model suggested by Rhodes and Conly concluded that offenders might commit their crimes in areas that are several blocks away from the offender’s residence, but close enough to be regularly visited during their every day activities.

A theoretical analysis on the journey to crime and the distance in which criminals travel to commit their crimes has been offered by several studies, i.e. Reppetto (1974), Rengert (1975), Baldwin and Bottoms (1976), Brantingham and Brantingham (1991), Wiles and Costello (2000), almost all relating it to the life-style and the pattern of offender’s social activities. A comprehensive analysis is presented by Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) who argued that criminals like any other people move around the city, through working, going to school, shopping, or seeking out entertainment and recreation. Offenders sustain information of other parts of the city through these movements, which provide them with some information, called “awareness space” by the Brantinghams. This information may not be as uniform or as detailed as the knowledge of their homebase location, but it is most likely that criminals commit most of their offences close to home, work, shopping, and their entertainment area, or along paths between these areas. The Brantinghams concluded that offences should occur within the criminal’s awareness space, and it seems unlikely that they commit their crimes in unknown areas of a city. They have elaborated their argument by stating that it is
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unlikely that an offender penetrates into totally foreign areas where s/he will feel uncomfortable or stand out as different or not belonging. A similar reason was offered by burglars interviewed by Wiles and Costello (2000). They showed that areas with high offender/offence rate, unpopular housing areas, and a specific shopping and entertainment area in north Sheffield, were known by 66% of their interviewees. Moreover, the main reason presented by their offenders for avoiding some high rate crime areas was fear of a particular individual or being too well known by the local police; and not being able to fit in or would stand out, for avoiding middle class areas (Wiles and Costello, 2000: 32). According to the Brantinghams offender’s awareness space will be expanded, to include adjacent areas, over time, by recurring the commission of crime and accumulation of more detailed information about the areas in which s/he has searched and found good targets. Where the targets are not evenly distributed in the criminal’s awareness space, they tend to commit their crimes in the sub-areas within the awareness space, spaces which are perceived as “good” target areas.

Other studies similarly suggested that most offenders would not commit offences in poorly known areas, and that offenders in their ‘search patterns’ search for crime opportunities in areas known to them. For instance, Rengert and Wasilchic (2000, 1985), in their studies on burglary in Philadelphia, found a strong correlation between burglars’ ‘preferred’ areas and burglars’ ‘known’ areas. Rengert and Wasilchicks (1985: 54, 59-61) said offenders came mainly from middle or lower middle class families living in suburban areas, and they mainly selected areas which they were most familiar with, areas close to their homes were far more popular as burglary sites. These offenders preferred less wealthy houses close to their own homes to more affluent distant homes; therefore, they concluded that distance and familiarity are as important as economic consideration in the criminal evaluation of places. Wright and Decker (1994) said offenders stressed the importance of blending into the area and looking as ‘normal’ as possible. This issue was investigated further in studies carried out by Carter and Hill (1979) in Oklahoma. Their study too, showed that offenders committed offences in areas with which they were familiar, and where they felt comfortable. They took the ‘social
status' dimension into account and found that offenders tend to avoid affluent
neighbourhoods where the takings were likely to be especially high.

Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) like many others believed that the spatial awareness,
which directly leads to the selection of a specific area for burglary, is accomplished
through a learning process, however, they distinguished between the opportunistic and
planner burglars depending on the extent of their activities. This process of learning,
they argued, may be either active or passive depending upon the information source.
Passive spatial learning occurs through day-to-day activities such as travelling to work,
shopping, or a social occasion. The active evaluation and exploration of space for
obtaining spatial knowledge is a purposeful learning process for later use, and in this
process, the environment is actively examined and evaluated for its usefulness. This may
entail entering unfamiliar areas, by travelling into new areas; the environment is actively
evaluated for its utility and for the purpose in mind. The information about an area may
be obtained through secondary sources such as friends, the media, working partners or
fences. Active spatial learning, Rengert and Wasilchick argued, is less useful in the
interpretation of opportunistic crimes, where opportunities present themselves to the
criminal in the course of every day events, and are just too good to pass up, but more
useful for interpretation of planned burglaries, where an offender seeks targets with the
best potential located within his/her spatial exploration.

Rhodes and Conly (1991) supported the analysis made by Rengert and Wasilchick. They
said that confrontation including controlling the victim is not anticipated by the burglar,
so that crime involves entering a facility surreptitiously, locating valuables, escaping and
marketing whatever is stolen. Crimes committed in the immediate neighbourhoods are
more likely to be induced by opportunities than anything else. On the other hand, crimes
carried out in longer trips are often planned, associated with more time and expense, and
are carried out by more experienced burglars who demonstrate a greater willingness to
take risks.
Rhodes and Conly, in their analysis on the selection of targets and the extent by which offenders travel from their own neighbourhoods, distinguished between two aspects of attractiveness, what they labelled as "target attractiveness" and "spatial attractiveness". They argued that areas that provide good crime targets, which are of high gain to offenders offering low costs and low risks of apprehension, may be highly attractive targets, but they will not be highly spatially attractive to offenders unless the vulnerability of these areas becomes situated in the cognitive maps constructed by offender’s minds. On the other hand, areas which are situated at the cognitive maps of potential offenders—the more familiar areas to offenders—if represent attractive targets, will be heavily victimised. Therefore, Rhodes and Conly (1991) concluded that offenders commit their crimes in the vicinity of their domiciles, being high in both target and spatial attractiveness.

Rhodes and Conly, by recording the residential addresses of offenders and areas where they committed their crimes, showed that on average burglars travel about 1.62 miles (1991: 178). In investigating the rate of offending around the offender’s home, Rhodes and Conly found that 30% of burglaries occur within one-half mile of offender’s home. These findings confirmed the hypothesis that offenders victimise areas they know best, concentrating on targets within their immediate environments and surrounding areas. They also confirmed that closer targets are more frequently hit simply because the costs of seeking out the victim and travelling to his/her location are less (ibid.).

2.6 The Burglary Event

This section examines the manner by which burglars carry out their burglaries, that is to examine how most burglaries occur. It will examine the techniques and methods used by residential burglars and include a series of regular actions taken by offenders following a decision made on a selection of a specific area/residence. This section will trace burglar’s activities with regard to the risks associated with the burglary site, selection of
the most suitable technique for entry, types of properties targeted by burglars, searching for valuables, and finally disposing of stolen properties and converting them into more usable items, cash or drugs. Similar issues have been addressed by the study carried out in Tehran, the findings from Western studies will prepare the grounds for comparison, to determine similarities and differences in patterns.

2.6.1 Probing Occupancy

As it was mentioned earlier, occupancy is considered by most studies to be a crucial factor in selecting a target for burglary; almost all burglars avoid selecting as targets houses that are occupied. Over 90% of Cromwells' (1991: 30) offenders stated that they would never enter a residence that they knew was occupied. Most burglars often develop some techniques to probe the potential target to determine occupancy. These occupancy probes are quite similar across studies, this according to Cromwell, et al. (1991) is the result of simple common sense, or may be the result of sharing techniques by burglars on street corners, in bars, or/and in prisons.

The most common probe used by Cromwells' informants was to send one of the burglars, usually the most presentable or the woman, to the door to knock or ring the doorbell. If someone answered, the prober would ask directions to a nearby address or for a non-existent person. The prospective burglar would apologise and leave when told that he or she had the wrong address. Burglars also occasionally ring the doorbell and ask the resident for use of the phone by making up a legitimate-like excuse (e.g. a broken down car), if the resident refuses, the prober can leave without arousing suspicion, if the resident agrees, the prober has the additional opportunity to assess the quality and quantity of the potential take and to learn more about the security, location of windows and doors, dogs, alarms, and so forth.
Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 29-30) distinguished between day and night burglars using various signs of occupancy. For night burglaries (mainly weekends, Friday and Saturday nights) burglars determined occupancy by whether the TV was on or not, through the noise or glow a TV created, while day burglars drove round in the area and looked for residents going out, dressed for work, between 7.30 to 8.30 in the morning. If not, they often ring the bell; phone the house by reading the name on the mailbox and looking up the number. Burglars also use every indication and are very alert to clues about when someone is at home, they notice subtle things like closed windows and air conditioners that are not on during very hot days. Some residents pull down all the curtains when leaving the house inviting burglars to an empty house. From burglary studies it may be concluded that although the techniques used by burglars determining occupancy may be numerous, the main issue remains constant that empty houses are to be preferred.

2.6.2 Gaining Entry

British and American studies demonstrate variations in the methods used by burglars to gain entry to the selected houses. The methods suggest that at least two factors play a key role to the ways in which houses are entered. First, the type of housing, and second, the level of professionalism of offenders. Variations in types of housing in America and Britain have produced different results. Maguire and Bennett (1982) showed that unlike the public image involving sophisticated methods of entry, most house entries takes place through windows (smashing windows or through windows left open) rather than main front doors. Differences in the types of housing in America resulted in a different experience; most American studies have shown entry is through front doors. Waller and Okihiro (1978: 26) found that 77% of their offenders entered dwellings through doors. This was supported by Reppetto (1974: 18) who also found that 68%, of entries were made through doors. That a high proportion of the Americans live in high-rise apartments may explain why doors are chosen as the main means of entry, as the door is
often the only practical way in this sort of housing type. On the other hand, a higher proportion of the British living in detached, semi-detached types of housing may explain the methods used by burglars to gain entry to these houses.

British studies have shown that smashing or removing a window is a popular way among British burglars. The use of an instrument (normally an ordinary long screwdriver) is a less common method of entry. Maguire and Bennett (1982: 50) found that 27.4% of burglaries occur through glass smashed or removed, over 25% through bodily pressure, in 11.2% instrument is used, in 0.9% the structure of the house was attacked, and in 35.4% no force or instrument recorded. Cromwell, et al. (1991) as well as Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) showed that a popular way of entering a residence is by sliding a glass patio door. These doors may be slipped out of their sliding tracks by hand or with aid of a crowbar or a screwdriver. The findings from the 2000 BCS showed that in 21% of burglaries with entry the burglar gained access through an unlocked door, and in 6% via an open window (Kershaw, et al., 2000: 21). Patterns produced by British studies for gaining entry to the house also indicate that with the exception of flats, most dwellings are entered from the rear of the building. The 2000 BCS confirmed this finding and showed that detached types of housing are more at risk of victimisation (Kershaw, et al., 2000: 19). Maguire and Bennett (1982: 51) showed that 65% were entered from the rear and 27% from the front, whilst 73% of the entries that were made at the front were through a door, and 76% of those at the rear were made through a window. Of those all but a few were made at ground level. A large proportion of burglars using entry through the rear indicate that most burglars while selecting a technique that provides easy access to the dwelling, also prefer to choose a means of entry that is associated with the minimum risk of being observed (by neighbours or passers-by). Covert entry through the rear is the most popular route; especially in semi-detached type of housing that then produce easy access through the rear or through the side of the houses.
Similar studies have correlated method of entry with level of skill and professionalism, suggesting that the less experienced burglars use the presented opportunities and easy means of access, while the more experienced use their expertise to overcome more sophisticated means of entry. Burglary studies i.e. Reppetto (1974), Maguire and Bennett (1982), Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) have reported that a considerable proportion of houses are entered through unlocked doors or windows, or simply by pushing or smashing their way in; there is less evidence to show more sophisticated methods are used such as glass-cutting or picking locks. This indicates that the majority of burglars select targets that present an opportunity that provides easy access to the dwelling, with little effort and skill for entering the house. These patterns also indicate that most burglaries are carried out by ‘unskilled’ offenders. Cromwell, et al. (1991) supported this finding and argued that means of entry is a factor that separates the novice from the professional. Cromwell observed that the less skilled involved inserting a screwdriver between the door and the frame, breaking the usually cheaply built locks and slide the door open; entering through a rear door by forcing the door with a tool or by simply kicking it down; or entering an open garage door and then forcing open the door between the garage and the house.

The least sophisticated methods are found to be used by drug addicts who were desperate, or by the least experienced and non-skilled burglars. According to Cromwell, et al. (1991) these offenders often use the most risky methods of entry, by simply kicking down a door or smashing a window with little concern for noise. The tactics used by more professional burglars, according to a similar study, were: removing or breaking a window pane, or cutting the glass and crawling in through the opened window. Some used large channel lock pliers to twist the doorknob off the front door of the residence, a technique that works so quickly on most doors that the burglar appears to be using a key to enter. The main burglary studies made it clear that the majority of burglaries are carried out by less professional burglars who use presented opportunities to gain access to a residence that is most likely unoccupied.
2.6.3 Search Patterns, Types and Value of Stolen Properties

The type of property targeted by residential burglars plays an important role in the exposure or concealment of offender’s activities, and therefore, largely affects their chance of apprehension. Selection of a specific type of property, specially the rare types such as antiques or highly valued pictures, may lead to the identity of offender by tracing his/her trade in places where that particular type of property is more likely to be sold. The type of property selected by an offender therefore determines the search patterns employed by burglars, as to where in the house that type of property may be kept or hidden.

The type of property selected by residential burglars, according to Western studies, is dependent on a few factors, of which access to a buyer or a market for rapid disposal of stolen property seems to be of prime importance. Other factors such as age, level of skill, nature of burglary (opportunistic/planned), means of transport, size and weight of property, all contribute to the selection of a specific type of property. For obvious reasons all burglary studies are in agreement that cash is the most favourable target. It eliminates the necessity of any contact with a buyer, it is light weight and can be easily concealed, so that the offender once safely outside the house can get away from the target, even if on foot.

Almost all burglary studies also reveal that access to a ready buyer and successful disposal of stolen properties plays a major role in the selection of type of property. The successful disposal of stolen property is usually related to the age and experience of the burglar. Reppetto (1974: 20) said that cash, and electrical equipment are stolen by younger and less experienced groups of burglars with a lower level access to a market or a ready buyer. Electrical equipment is easy to dispose off and may be sold directly to customers or to most second-hand shops. Age and level of experience not only determine the type of property stolen by offenders, but also affects the value of stolen
goods. Since the majority of burglaries committed by young offenders are opportunistic in nature, and are carried out in areas close to their residence, or in areas where they are most familiar with, then, as Davidson (1981) argued they end up stealing very little. Davidson showed that based upon the findings of the Sheffield study, in 91% of all thefts carried out within one mile, less than £25 worth of property was stolen. On the other hand, a survey by Davidson revealed that the total value of stolen property in rich areas exceeds the much higher number of burglaries carried out in poorer areas (six burglaries in richest areas involving a loss of $1,204 whereas $7,044 was stolen from 46 burglaries in five poorest areas) (Davidson, 1981: 41)

The value of items in relation to their size and weight seems important. As Felson (1998) noted items such as washing machines might be valuable but they are never stolen. He found that offenders mainly preferred targets which are lightweight, such as durable goods like small television sets, video-cassette recorders, portable computers, stereo components, compact disks, VCRs, jewellery and bicycles (Felson, 1998: 61). The 2000 BCS similarly found that the most commonly stolen items in burglary were cash, jewellery, videos and stereo equipment (Kershaw, et al., 2000). The 1998 BCS showed that cash was stolen in 41% of burglaries with loss, jewellery and video equipment in over a third, and stereo equipment in a quarter (Budd, 1999: 26). The burglary study by Waller and Okihiro (1978: 28) showed that the most frequently stolen properties were cash (29%), jewellery (13%); and to a less extent electronic equipment (7%), and then mainly those which are portable and more easily fenced, as well as alcohol (6%, probably for personal consumption). Reppetto’s (1974: 20) findings showed that, based on police records, cash and electronic equipment were the most common items stolen in reported burglaries.

The search pattern employed by residential burglars has shown to be similar in most studies, and is mainly determined by the type of targeted property. Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) have distinguished between the less professional/opportunistic
burglars and professional/planning burglars, in their search patterns, and argued that the latter have a well developed plan they follow once inside the home. They have a good idea what they want and where to find it. Professional burglars first decide on possible routes for escape before they go after the valuables. For example, they unlock the back door, or crack open a window to facilitate an escape if necessary. They also select their “intrusion time” carefully to avoid being observed by others.

The prime aim of most burglars within the house is the master bedroom, a place where usually most valuables are kept. High on the list of things burglars are looking for in the master bedroom, according to Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 93) are cash; gold and silver jewellery; other valuables and guns. They also stated that most burglars, both professional and unprofessional, conserve time by dumping all closet shelves, drawers and jewellery boxes onto the bed or floor rather than carefully searching each. Other areas searched by burglars are the dining area (in search of silverware, candlesticks and such valuables), the study room (that may hold a stamp or coin collection), followed by a quick check for household money left in a kitchen desk or pitcher. Many burglars do not bother with the kitchen at all. Burglars, at this point often leave the house by walking out the front door. Cash and other things easily converted to cash are high priority (ibid.: 95). The general conclusion from various burglary studies suggests that the type of property and the search patterns although varied among different offenders, are similarly influenced by the extent to which burglars have access to the market for stolen properties.

2.6.4 Crime Duration

Almost all studies consistently demonstrate that although the burglaries carried out by residential offenders are frequent; the duration of residential burglary is considerably short. Crime duration, referred to as “intrusion time” by burglary studies, includes the time spent in the locations offenders intention to burgle; it also includes time spent on
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the outside forcing entry. Several studies have shown that burglars seek to minimise intrusion time as much as possible (Walsh, 1980: 89, Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985: 20).

Felson (1998) confirmed that burglary like most other crimes is quick, it takes a burglar only two up to five minutes (3 to 10 minutes according to Reppetto’s findings) to enter, search the house, steal things and get away. Accordingly, burglary has been defined by Felson as a “stop-and-go” activity. Since burglars try to minimise their intrusion time, the profit gained from each burglary is often low, and most burglars produce chaos when looking for valuables. The more professional burglars usually take as little as a minute or two to force entry, and no more than a few minutes inside the house, if only to ensure that where the alarm is connected to the police station they would be gone by the time the police arrived. Almost all burglars interviewed by Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 93) stated that they try to minimise as much as possible the amount of time they spend in the home, because once the burglar is inside s/he has no way of knowing what is going on outside the house, or when someone may come home. A ‘rule of thumb’ often used by offenders, is no more than five minutes inside, preferably less. These burglars similarly stated that in the suburbs, if they are out of the house within three minutes of entering, even the fastest response to a silent alarm would not catch them. Obviously more time is available if the alarm does not go directly to the police or requires a verification procedure.

2.6.5 Trading Stolen Property

Almost all studies suggest that without a fence, (someone who buys stolen properties from offenders) very little burglary may occur. In other words, few thieves could survive without having access to a market to dispose of stolen goods obtained from burglary. Sutton (1998) rightly argues that markets for stolen goods have considerable influence upon decisions to begin and continue stealing. The market readily available for the disposal of stolen properties is provided by what Croall (1998) called “the hidden or
informal economy”. Croall describes the administration of such economy by stating that burglars who steal goods have to convert them into cash by selling them. Since stolen goods cannot be sold through legitimate retail outlets or in public, the informal economy provides a vast range of alternative opportunities for selling stolen goods, i.e. street markets, car boot sales, pubs, second-hand shops, professional buyers, etc. The informal economy depending on the extent to which it provides a ready market for stolen goods, indirectly affects the level of property crime. Many electronic consumer goods such as audio and video recorders, televisions and computers are relatively easy to steal and sell. The regular updating of these items by their manufacturers also assists the trade in stolen goods by creating a market for second-hand items to poorer consumers who cannot afford new ones, or to poorer victims, with little insurance, who may have to buy cheap second-hand items to replace those that have been stolen (Croall, 1998). The informal economy also creates a market for stolen new products such as video cassette recorders, mobile telephones, personal computers or camcorders, to buyers who cannot afford or are unwilling to pay high street prices (Sutton, 1998).

Felson (1998: 37) has defined a fence as ‘someone who deliberately and knowingly receives stolen goods for resale’. Cromwell, Oslon and Wester (1991) have described fencing as a crime with low visibility, which is conducted in great confidentiality, where the burglar’s ability to market stolen property determines the success or failure of his/her criminal activities. Findings from various research studies suggest that there are a few ways by which offenders can benefit from stolen goods:

a) Personal consumption,

b) Selling to friends and acquaintances,

c) Selling directly to the customers, often in pubs or informal trades made in underprivileged areas,

d) Selling to the pawn and second-hand shops,

e) Selling to professional criminal receivers.
CHAPTER TWO

It is evident from most research that selling methods are dependent upon age, level of experience, and drug-use. It is also imperative to note that the capacity to sell stolen property safely and profitably is predominantly determined by the relationship of the burglar with others—thieves or fences. More successful trades often occur only when a thief is fully accepted and trusted by professional criminal receivers. A young and inexperienced offender, who has little access to important buyers, is often restricted in what he steals, such as cash or easily saleable consumable goods such as cigarettes and alcohol. These offenders, if tempted to steal items of high value and take things without thinking where they might convert them into cash, would often end up selling them to second-hand shops, local jewellers, or alternatively sell them on market stalls (Clarke and Hope, 1984), sometimes give it away to friends, or unwisely keep them for personal consumption (Maguire and Bennett, 1982). Personal consumption and keeping anything that can be identified as stolen is highly risky, and easily discovered in a search of the offender’s house. Many inexperienced thieves tend to rely on a single ‘residential fence’\(^1\), which is usually either a relative or a neighbour. Selling goods to second-hand shops is similarly dangerous, and burglars are likely to receive a very low price for such goods. Other offenders tend to sell their stolen goods openly, i.e. in pubs, or night-clubs\(^2\). However, only inexperienced and incompetent offenders sell their goods in this way, using methods that contain great risks of detection and apprehension.

Offenders with some experience, called the “middle-range” burglars by Maguire and Bennett (1982), who constitute the majority of offenders, gradually establish some contact with criminal receivers. Although it takes some time for a new burglar to become known and trusted, s/he eventually finds more reliable receivers. The first step, according to Maguire and Bennett, is to sell something to ‘agents’ or to ‘middle-men’. These agents are often introduced by a friend or another burglar, the agents will handle new clients carefully and cautiously. The middle-range offenders may consistently sell

\(^1\) ‘Residential fence’ is defined by the Home Office research as a ‘neighbourhood dealer in stolen goods operating from their own home or lock-up garage’ (Sutton, 1998: 28).

\(^2\) The term used by the Home Office is ‘hawkling’, means selling goods door to door, around pubs and...
their stolen goods to specific shopkeepers or small businessmen. There are a wide range of other dealers, for example, many second-hand shops, pawnshops, discounts shops, parts dealers, junk dealers, etc. who knowingly, unknowingly, or half-knowingly provide an outlet for the sale of stolen goods (Felson, 1998).

Stolen goods, according to Cromwell, et al. (1991) and Felson (1998) may be sold locally to legitimate used-merchandise stores, i.e. to those who can not afford to pay high rent, and so rent low-rent fore stores in low income areas and sell used (often stolen) goods locally. Some low-income areas, in this way, can provide a market for stolen goods, buying them from burglars and selling them to local customers. Felson emphasised that the higher rate of crime in low-income areas is not because its people are more criminal but because it provides more “crime chances”. This type of outlet is used by offenders who have less access to ready buyers or to professional receivers. This line of debate has been supported by Davidson (1981) who suggested that the majority of those handling stolen goods are in parts of the city and in areas where the thieves also reside. Sutton (1998) also found from the British Crime Survey (BCS) that a large number of people are offered stolen goods, and those living in poorer areas are more likely to be offered stolen goods and buy them than others. ACORN housing areas classification showed that those living in deprived areas bought more than twice as many as those living in affluent areas (Sutton, 1998: 9). Of those a large proportion, (70%) believed that some of their neighbours also bought stolen goods (ibid.:10).

Highly experienced offenders, who constitute only a small number, are those who have access to a broad range of outlets. They deal in significant quantities of high valued stolen properties, and are normally very careful in conducting their transactions discreetly. Professional criminal receivers reveal their identity and maintain their contact only with a few highly professional burglars who can be trusted. Professional burglars often receive fairer prices for their stolen goods than those younger and less professional clubs or on the street (Sutton, 1998: 28).
offenders, due to the mutual and consistent trusted relationship between the buyer and the offender.

Stolen items are never sold at their actual value, never giving the offender what the goods are worth, but usually, according to Felson (1998: 61), only about one tenth of their value. Reppetto's (1974: 21) offenders estimated and expected to receive about 60 to 80 per cent below the actual value of the item. Stolen goods, depending on their type, are sold in particular ways, at certain prices. Jewellery is usually sold to jewellery shops; thieves selling gold jewellery to jewellery shops are paid the going rate for scrap gold (Sutton, 1998). A commercial fence is often capable of selling stolen jewellery in his/her jeweller's shop for the same price as legitimate jewellery. Corner shop owners can act similarly with packaged goods. Second-hand items are usually sold by thieves for a third of the retail value. If a thief sells a residential fence a stolen item, the fence usually sells the item to a consumer for half the retail value. Goods sold to second-hand shops are usually sold on to the public for two thirds of the retail value (ibid.: 57-8). Those involved in frequent use of illegal drugs are much more likely to take risks and accept lower returns for stolen goods (ibid.: 42). Using a reliable fence, however, ensures that thieves can sell stolen goods quickly and at prices that are fair.

Stolen goods were often disposed of and converted into cash or drugs, immediately by older burglars (Repetto, 1974; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985). Younger burglars were most likely to take the goods home or to a friend's house, leaving the disposal more to chance than to planning. Several factors, according to Sutton (1998) affect the need for a quick sale. The least experienced and less active thieves tended to be less hasty, as some described holding on to stolen goods for a number of weeks while seeking out a buyer. Not surprisingly, those who regularly used heroin and cocaine were keen to sell stolen goods as quickly as possible (similar findings by Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985) and were also least interested in securing the best prices. Delays in selling stolen goods, and returning home holding the stolen property, as was stated by more experienced
offenders, increases the time they have the stolen property in their possession, and consequently, increases the risk of apprehension.

The money obtained from burglary is often used to finance a lifestyle based on stylish clothes, alcohol and drugs (Bennett and Wright, 1984; Wright and Decker, 1994). This is summed up by the often-used phrase ‘life is a party’, and the pursuit of the ‘high life’ (Croall, 1998: 221). Amongst Bennett and Wrights’ (1984) offenders, who expressed economic need as the main reason for offending, some noted that rewards were spent on pleasure seeking activities, the remainder gave the need for money for daily subsistence. From the findings of various research studies it can be seen that success or failure to convert stolen property into cash appears to play a key role in whether offenders continue to offend or not. Trading in stolen property can therefore be a central issue for any burglary reduction programme. Reducing markets for stolen goods may result in the elimination of many criminal careers.

2.6.6 Retirement from Criminal Activities

It has been suggested by Western studies that the majority of crime is conducted by male teenagers who may be motivated by several social factors such as peer pressure, the influence of others, financial needs, etc. It is also believed that most young offenders becoming involved in petty offending will grow out of criminality, as they grow out of teenage phase and reach maturity. Older convicted burglars and repeat offenders, however, may retire from criminality as they get older, or as they face new responsibilities, i.e. getting married, or engaging in legal employment.

A debate has been put forward by criminologists questioning whether conviction and long-term imprisonment has a major impact in deterring offenders from re-offending. Sentencing as a form of deterrence, and its impact on preventing burglary has been
examined by Clarke and Hope (1984). They argued that the prospect of receiving a lengthy prison sentence must play some part in deterring potential burglars, but how great a part and whether this might be augmented by knowledge of sentences handed out to convicted burglars is not known. The conventional view of deterrence is that the major effect lies not in the severity of punishment but in the certainty of apprehension; this statement is confirmed by the results of interviews that Clarke and Hope (1984) have undertaken with convicted burglars. Studies of Maguire and Bennett (1982) showed that conviction and offender’s attitudes towards its unpleasantness, and increasing the chances of getting caught play a major role in a decision made by an offender to retire from criminal activities.

Clarke and Cornish (1985) suggest that the rationality process is not only applicable to the decision to commit a burglary but also is applied to a decision to abandon criminal activity. Offenders make tactful assessments about the probable consequences of continuing in crime, and prudently evaluate the alternative opportunities and risks. Cornish and Clarke (1986) explained that offender’s experiences during the course of offending could be altered by changes in personal circumstances (i.e. getting older, getting married), and by changes in policing and in community potential targets. These changes may lead an offender to either abandon criminal activity, entirely in favour of legitimate courses of actions, or to take up other types of criminal activities.

2.7 The Main Factors Influencing Residential Burglary

This section represents an analysis of the main factors influencing selection of targets by burglars, followed by an outline of the main factors influencing patterns of residential burglary. Several studies on burglary such as those by Reppetto (1974), Waller and Okihiro (1978), Walsh (1980), Maguire and Bennett (1982), Bennett and Wright (1984) asked burglars how they choose their targets. In other words, what factors did they consider important in selecting a target, and in preferring it over others. The following
factors of surveillance, occupancy, and accessibility have been considered by several studies as the main risk factors that influence the selection of a target by an offender (section 2.5.1). Similar studies have shown that issues such as whether a burglar works on his/her own or in a group with co-offenders, the drug-habits of burglars, carrying a weapon when going for burglary, and the target-hardening techniques and security devices used by a household can largely effect the pattern in which a burglary is conducted, and the target-selection procedure employed by offenders (section 2.5.2).

2.7.1 The Risk Factors Influencing Selection of Targets

2.7.1.1 Surveillance

Surveillance, as defined by Cromwell and his colleagues (1991: 35), refers to 'the extent to which a house is overseen and observable by neighbours or passers-by'. Surveilability cues include the location of the house on the block/street, the visibility of the target site from the neighbour's houses, and the visibility from doors and other entry points. They found surveilability of a potential burglary target is a primary factor in target selection. Their results also showed that the location and type of windows both at the target site and at neighbour's houses were considered critical by almost all burglars. The importance of surveillance was supported by other studies. Surveilability, according to the findings of Bennett and Wright (1984), was influenced by: the degree of "cover" or "openness", i.e. whether the property was overlooked, and the presence or proximity of neighbours.

Surveillance also includes the extent of natural cover such as trees, shrubbery, fences, and other landscaping. Rengert and Wasilchick (1985: 92) reported that bushes, shrubs, walls and hedges are used by burglars to force a window or door without attracting attention. Waller and Okihiro (1978: 57) measured surveillance by the distance of houses from street, the distance to the next residence, and the presence of obstructions to a clear
view of the side of the house from the neighbouring house. They found that most victims of burglaries were living in houses with a lower level of surveillance. Similar findings were sought by a Home Office study in Kent carried out by Mayhew (1984). The Kent study showed that empty houses, which a burglar can approach and gain entry to without being seen, were the most vulnerable, irrespective of their security. High privacy fences, a high board or masonry fence enclosing a backyard was considered important by some burglars studied by Cromwell, et al. (1991). These burglars stated that although there was a risk while climbing the fence or entering through an unlocked gate, once inside they were effectively protected from prying eyes by the fence.

Surveillance has been considered by most crime prevention studies as a main determinant factor in the prevention of burglary. It has been suggested by these studies that increasing surveillance, that is increasing the chance of burglars being seen by others, could be a deterrent, which enables observation of any criminal activity, and increase the chances of offenders being caught. Surveillance and its influence on crime prevention has been of special attention to Oscar Newman (1972) who believed that increasing formal and informal types of surveillance should be the main concern of policies aiming at crime prevention. This is based upon the common assumption that thieves try to avoid being seen in residential burglary, and increasing levels of surveillance makes it easier for them to be seen. This deters offenders and assists catching them. Therefore, this study suggested that increasing the amount of formal surveillance, by security personnel and existence of police patrol, improvements of the lighting in the streets and valleys, as well as informal surveillance by the members of public, are factors which have a deterrent effect to illegal activities.

---

Formal surveillance, according to Graham and Bennett (1995: 56-8) comprises of the defence of property and the detection and deterrence of offenders by people specifically employed to do so, such as the police and security guards. Formal surveillance may be achieved through patrolling police (either increase in the number or in the density, for specific periods of time and in specific locations); field interrogations (police stops); residential private security and neighbourhood patrols.
This assumption was supported by Mayhew et al. (1979), who studied the effect of surveillance on crime prevention, and suggested that in residential cases it may be possible to create conditions under which crime is generally more visible, for instance through improved street lighting. It was also suggested by this study that residents felt more responsible for neighbourhood security, where the number of windows that produced constant overlook, were increased. Therefore, the results from their studies support some deterrent effect from actual or potential surveillance by householders but at the same time they noted that some factors might limit this function. The effectiveness of surveillance may be limited by the fact that many people are away from their homes for much of the day, or that those inside their homes may spend little time looking out of windows, and where the offender is careful not to make a noise, no attention may be drawn. Mayhew, et al. also brought to the attention that offenders are entirely aware of the importance of this point and carefully choose their moments for offending that minimise the chances of being seen.

It was also noted by Mayhew (1991) that in exceptional cases when offenders are seen while committing a crime, the consequences of being seen will depend on the point at which their activity is witnessed, residents often justify the illegal activity they have observed as legal, or are unwilling to intervene for safety reasons, therefore, in general the chance of intervention from residents are generally fairly low. Mayhew concluded that increasing surveillance in some areas, or by some individual households may influence the opportunistic burglaries but may have little effect on the more determined.

---

4 Street lighting is considered as a form of natural surveillance, by Graham and Bennett (1995: 61), and has attracted many studies to examine the effect of street lighting on the level of crime in various areas. Studies such as Reppetto (1974) argued that since most burglaries occur in the daytime, the issue of lighting is rendered to be irrelevant. He found that the most poorly lit area, in his study, suffered from large number of daytime burglaries but experienced few night-time burglaries, therefore, concluded that lighting had a little impact on burglary rate (Reppetto, 1974: 49). While a study carried out in Scotland contradicted the finding of Reppetto and showed that improvement in street lighting is a good thing, it heightened feelings of local community safety, this led to some general reductions in the fear of crime and created a consequential fall in the crime rate, including burglary (Ditton, Nair, and Phillips, 1993: 111). Lighting was similarly regarded as effective by Werekle and Whitzman (1995: 29) in enhancing informal, natural surveillance and reducing crime and fear of crime. Ramsay (1991: 24 in Crawford, 1998: 92) suggests that while good street lighting contributes to the quality of urban life, 'better street lighting by
who will continue to seek out their best chances. Surveillance also increases the chance of burglary being displaced to other less protected areas/households.

Cromwell, et al. (1991) have similarly demonstrated some of the limitations associated with surveillance. They noted that although the average burglar fears being seen, the professional is less concerned with being seen but more with being reported, thus, the more experienced appear and behave in a way to fit into a neighbourhood or a situation. They attempt to make their presence in a neighbourhood seem normal or natural, e.g. driving in a car that fits the socio-economic level of the neighbourhood, or dress befitting the circumstances, as a plumber, deliveryman or a businessman. They pretend a situation which is not real, but seems legitimate to possible onlookers. Therefore, such behaviour may not be recognised as criminal, and obviously goes unreported to the police.

Social cohesion has been cited as a factor influencing crime rate, by deterring criminals through the informal but effective surveillance it produces. Social cohesion was measured by Reppetto (1974) using the following criteria: the extent to which people did things together, or helped each other in a neighbourhood; the extent to which people knew each other; and the length of time they had lived in that particular neighbourhood. A strong negative correlation was found between social cohesion and crime rates, areas with higher social cohesion were shown to have lower crime rate, while areas with lower social cohesion suffered higher rates of crime.

The general conclusion drawn from discussions on the effect of surveillance on the burglary rate suggests that some form of surveillance may have a larger impact on the prevention of crime than others. It is clear that although increasing surveillance may increase the likelihood of criminal activities being observed, its effect is offset where
residents do not recognise its criminal potential, and therefore, do not report it to the police. Overall, then studies have been unable to show the level of effectiveness of surveillance in the prevention of crimes, including residential burglary.

2.7.1.2 Occupancy

Almost all studies on burglary have consistently found the risk factor relating to occupancy important for selecting or rejecting a dwelling as a target. Kershaw et al (2000: 19) by using the findings from the 2000 BCS concluded that low level of occupancy was a factor that increased the risk of burglary. Over 90% of burglars interviewed by Bennett and Wright (1984: 195) were deterred by the presence of occupants. The key signs of occupancy are: a light on in the house, a vehicle parked in driveway or garage, visible residents, noise or voices emanating from the house, and any other cues that indicate someone is at home. Occupancy was also of prime concern to burglars of all age groups (Repetto, 1974). Jackson and Winchester (1982: 21) found in their Kent study that 80% of the victimised houses had been unoccupied at the time. Waller and Okihiro (1978: 57) found that victimised houses that were left vacant for more than 47 hours in a week had a greater chance of being burgled (30%) compared with non-victimised houses (16%). The findings from the 1998 BCS similarly found that the risk of victimisation was higher for households being left empty during weekdays, for five or more hours on average (6.2% compared with 5.6% the average risk of burglary) (Budd, 1999: 11).

The research findings have shown that since the majority of offenders are reluctant to confront householders, they carefully select targets that they believe to be unoccupied at a time of burglary. The level of burglary and the risk of victimisation therefore, appear to be reflected by occupancy patterns of residents; that is the amount of time people leave their homes empty. The hypothesis suggesting that occupied houses will have a lower

---

3 The influence of occupancy on burglary patterns has been examined in discussions on 'temporal patterns', earlier in this chapter.
chance of victimisation has been supported by Stangeland (1998: 63) who studied patterns of residential burglary in Malaga (a city in southern Spain). His studies showed that the rate of residential burglary is lower in parts of Malaga where most dwellings were occupied day and night. The constant occupancy of such dwellings was attributable to the large family size that increased the chances of somebody being at home. The low rate of burglary in Malaga was also believed to have contributed to the high level of security used by the households, that is the prevalence of the use of iron grilles in front of ground and first floor windows that makes entry and access difficult. It may be concluded from the findings of Stangeland’s studies that the large proportion of houses, which are currently left unoccupied during the day,\(^6\) poses the households with inadequate security and gives a greater risk of victimisation. Bennett and Wright (1984) revealed that the actual occupancy and the perception of it result in decreasing the likeliness of victimisation. They suggest that the appearance of occupancy can be achieved by leaving a light on inside, parking a vehicle outside premises, or cancelling daily deliveries.

2.7.1.3 Accessibility

Access is defined by Felson as ‘the ability of an offender to get to the target and then away from the scene of a crime’ (Felson, 1998: 58). The general rule is that the easier the access to a target the higher the chance of being burgled. In crimes of residential burglary, in addition to easy access and easy entry, the offender is even more concerned with his/her exit, also with being able to carry away easily the goods after crime (ibid.). Accessibility cues, according to Cromwell, et al. (1991), are those factors that indicate how easily the residence can be entered, and how well the site is protected. These cues include location and type of doors and windows, as well as the extent of target hardening such as locks, burglar alarms, fences, walls, and burglar bars.

---

\(^6\) It was shown that half of the households interviewed in the 1982 BCS said their homes were empty for three or more hours each day (Mayhew, 1984: 30).
Hope (1984) examined the ways in which various types of buildings would encourage burglary by providing a set of cues and opportunities which result in the offender’s choice by informing burglars about the probability of a successfully accomplished offence. In his study, Hope developed ways of finding how offenders might view buildings when deciding to commit offences. He classified buildings with reference to the risks which might be attached to them, and investigated two elements of accessibility, and visibility. Accessibility, according to this study, allows a burglar to approach the property; visibility allows a burglar to do so without being seen. Hope, in his study, found that measures of visibility and accessibility i.e. access to the rear of the house; houses adjacent to non-residential land, particularly privately owned open space such as farmland; were considered important by burglars in their selection of a target. Visibility of a target, that is placing valuables by the front window, making obvious the lack of locks, etc. was also considered as generating crime risks. Kershaw et al (2000: 19) confirmed that detached and semi-detached types of housing provided easier access to the rear of the house, therefore, at higher risk of victimisation. Reppetto (1974), too, examined the selection of targets by residential criminals with reference to different types of housing, and found that whereas older offenders pointed out the apparent affluence as the prime factor in their choice of targets, therefore, preferring single family houses to other types of housing, the younger age groups of burglars indicated that their choices were dictated much more by the accessibility of the structure than by the probability of substantial gain, they preferred public housing projects and multifamily homes.

A study carried out by Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) showed that a house accessible by more streets has higher risk of burglary than the ones with less access. Studies of Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) showed that burglars select houses within a street that produces better access to inside the home, with as few close neighbours as possible, and better access to the main roads for getting away from the target in as little time as possible. Corner properties, as well as properties that back onto open or unused
land were found to be more desirable to burglars. From the findings of the 1988 BCS, Mayhew et. al. (1989) showed that a large proportion of houses in England and Wales provide easy access to the back of the property. Bennett and Wright (1984: 195) found that the use of security locks, in order to making entry difficult, was considered to be unimportant and non-deterrent. Only 11% said that they would be "put off" from selecting a target by additional security locks.

2.7.2 Other Factors Influencing Burglar’s Decision-Making

2.7.2.1 Individual and Group Burglary

Decisions made by an individual or sole offender who performs his/her act of burglary individually may differ from those made by offenders working as a group-depending on their role in the group. Cromwell, et al. (1991) in their interviews with past convicted residential burglars reported a greater willingness of offenders to take chances and to engage in risky behaviour when working in groups. This finding was contradicted by other offenders. When they were taken to streets, and were shown a reconstruction of the actual scenes of crime, referred to “staged activity” by Cromwell and his colleagues, these offenders demonstrated more cautious attitudes in making decisions in groups compared to individual decisions made by each member. Cromwell explained that in a decision made by a group to select a target for burglary, more eyes observe the environmental cues (risk cues), producing more cautious decisions.

This increased caution in group activities, however, does not imply the lower rate of apprehension. Burglars working in groups reported at least five times greater risk of apprehension than those working alone. Cromwell, et al. explained that this might be for the impairment in performance on complex tasks in group situations, that may occur even in non-criminal activities performed in groups. Moreover, it was shown that the level of crime activity is increased in groups, which thereby, increases the number of times the burglar is at risk (ibid.).
The findings of Maguire and Bennett (1982), as well as Reppetto (1974: 18) from interviews with convicted offenders showed that the majority of offenders expressed a tendency towards group offending, or at least working with another co-offender. Co-offending was preferred for various reasons, such as producing psychological support, i.e. making them feel safer, keeping each other company, providing help in transporting of goods, acting as a look-out, or driving the car to a pick-up point. It, conversely, created some problems of trust, and often increased the risk of grassing (informing against the partner) and thereby getting caught by the police. Social networks with fences and co-offenders may be seen even for those who often operate alone, they may rely on others to find a target, provide information about a target, or in the disposal of stolen property.

2.7.2.2 The Effects of Drugs

Almost all research on residential burglary has shown a large proportion of burglars are drug users. Reppetto (1974) showed a close correlation between drug use and property crime (burglary and robbery). He, however, questioned the causality, and stated that large variation was evident from the findings of various studies, some showed the start of criminality prior to addiction, others showed the reverse. Whatever the direction of causality, in general, it should be seen whether drug use may affect the decision making model and the level of rationality utilised by this process.

In the sample studied by Cromwell, et al. (1991) there were a surprisingly high percentage of drug users. Indeed, all the 30 respondents in the Cromwell sample were found to be either drug addicts or regular users of illegal drugs. This was much higher than the percentage found in other studies. Cromwell suggested that other studies have underestimated the prevalence of drug use among burglars as a result of not spending sufficient time to develop rapport and trust, and for gathering data in circumstances that might appear threatening (in prison, probation offices, etc.).
Cromwell's studies revealed interdependence between drug abuse and residential burglary, but did not imply that burglary was caused by drug use; in fact most of their respondents committed their first burglary before they began regular drug users. An association between drug and crime was confirmed by Wiles and Costello (2000: 31); they showed that about 40% of their convicted thieves had hard drug problems; this was increased to 69% for burglars. Taylor and Bennett (1999) by subjecting prisoners to urinalysis similarly found that drug use was widespread among prisoners (including property offenders). For example, about 71% of US and about 64% of English prisoners arrested for property offences tested positive, while a higher proportion of US property offenders used cocaine, English property offenders were more likely to use marijuana (Taylor and Bennett, 1999: 34-35). Recent English research on urine testing and self-reported drug use evidenced an increased drug use among arrestees. Bennett and Sibbitt (2000) showed that 47% of arrested drug users had supported their habit through property crime, compared with 19% who had supplemented their income through dealing. They also found that drug misusers were three times more likely to commit burglary than were non-users.

Offenders interviewed by Reppetto (1974) whose criminal activities started prior to becoming addicted to drugs showed that once they began to use drugs regularly, they usually began to rely on criminal activities to maintain the habit. Intensification of drug use, established association with other criminals for buying drugs, drew people into a network of drug-using, criminal subculture, which contained full-time criminal activity to feed the drug habit. Drugs and burglary became gradually inseparable, and facilitated each other. The use of some types of drugs such as depressants, prior to burglary made the burglaries easier by reducing fear; on the other hand, profits made from burglaries were used to buy more drugs. Most respondents (28 out of 30) studied by Cromwell, et al. (1991: 59) stated that they 'fixed' before entering a target site, and claimed that they were better burglars when under the moderate influence of drugs (different types producing different effects) or alcohol. In contrast, excessive drinking, or the use of
some other stimulants such as cocaine reduced burglar's effectiveness. A similar line of argument has been presented by Rengert and Wasilchick (2000) to support the calming effects of some drugs on criminals.

Brantingham and Brantingham (1991), and Brown and Altman (1991) suggested that factors such as habitual drug symptoms or drunkenness may alter the states of arousal and may inhibit, distort, or in some way short-circuit the normal decision making process. Reppetto (1974) similarly found that drug use, reduced the capacity for careful planning of burglary; it also accelerated the pace of offenders' burglary activity. These studies showed that drug users because of the urgency with the need for money were more likely to work around or in their own neighbourhood, particularly as their habit increased. Drug users compared with non-drug users were more easily deterred by complex security devices, although they were less concerned with other risk factors such as occupancy, when they desperately needed money. Reppetto concluded that if the addiction of burglars was treated or if their habit was met in some way other than stealing, a major drop in burglary rates would be observed. The findings from studies on offender's drug use conclude that burglary may be committed, continued, or increased to fund a drug habit. However, it should be noted that a drug habit might be satisfied by utilising other illegal sources of income, commonly by prostitution (for women) and/or drug trafficking (Bean, 2002; Mawby, 2001). It is also true that not all burglars are drug users. Moreover, it is not known to what extent burglary is carried out by drug users and what extent by non-drug-users.

2.7.2.3 The Effects of Carrying a Weapon

It is difficult to find studies researching the effect of carrying a weapon on patterns of burglary, or influencing target-selection. Some evidence is produced by Felson (1998) who noted that in ordinary life, those who are smaller or weaker are more likely to be tempted to carry guns, because they feel, and indeed they are more likely to become
victims. Weapons are often used by this group of people for self-defence. Despite the fact that most house burglars enter the home when it is most likely to be empty, in most cases they will not have to confront occupiers. Yet it is undeniable that as Ronald Clarke (1997: 12) stated, a firearm may be used as a “crime facilitator”, when the confrontation with householders become unavoidable. Reppetto (1974: 18) showed that only one fourth of his interviewees admitted to carrying any weapon (knife, gun) when going for burglary. Future research might usefully compare those burglars who are not prepared to carry any kind of weapon, and those who carry a weapon and are prepared to use it against others. Research might also focus upon issues such as the burglar’s attitudes towards being equipped with a weapon and its influence on the nature and pattern of burglary.

2.7.2.4 The Effect of Security Measures

The examination of target-hardening techniques and determining to what extent these techniques influence the selection of targets by offenders, is an issue which will be examined in the following section. It is often conceded that the most professional offenders will overcome security, but for the bulk of burglars it is seen as a crucial deterrent (Mayhew, 1984). Much research has differentiated between the decisions made by older, more experienced and younger, less experienced burglars, of which the latter are expected to more clearly be deterred by security measures.

Target-Hardening through Locks on Doors and Windows

Target-hardening techniques, according to Pat Mayhew (1984: 29), are referred to measures that make immediate access to dwellings more difficult. Mayhew, with particular reference to the 1982 BCS, documented that over 80% of houses in England and Wales had inadequate security hardware and were poorly protected, and that some 95% of householders in Kent needed an improvement in security to achieve the
standards usually recommended by the police, while over a fifth said they had left at least one door or window open the last time they had left the house empty during the day (Mayhew, 1984: 30). The more recent BCS has produced evidence to show an increase in the use of security measures since 1992, which has resulted in the decline in the burglary rate since 1993. Between 1992 and 2000 levels of home security continued to increase, for example, in 2000, 75% of households said they had window locks and 75% had double or deadlocks (Kershaw, et al., 2000: 18, 71). The figure in 1992 was 52% and 61%, respectively (ibid). The fall in the number of burglaries since 1993 is suggested by Budd (1999) as well as Kershaw et al (2000) to be the result of the higher use of home security measures. Budd (1999: 11) showed that in 1997 households with no security measure faced much higher risk of victimisation (15.2% compared to 5.6% national average). Furthermore, it was shown that victims of burglary are less likely to have security measures in place at the time of incident than non-victims, and that victims of burglary with entry tend to have less security than victims of attempted burglary, suggesting that security is effective in thwarting at least some offenders (Kershaw, et al., 2000: 18).

Waller and Okihiro (1978: 58) found that many burglars tend to take advantage of the victim’s carelessness, i.e. by leaving a door or window open. The results of Mayhew studies, however, showed that security was of little importance to prevent burglary. She suggested that although increased security may fail to prevent burglary, with regards to younger offenders, poor security increases the vulnerability of their favoured targets in lower-income areas. It also showed that some houses might benefit from paying more attention to simple precautions, although those houses which are frequently unoccupied and are at risk by virtue of their location, elementary security will pose little threat for most burglars, except perhaps the most amateur.

Scar (1973) and Rengert and Wasilchic (1985) found that burglars consider the type of lock installed at a prospective target site, stating that most of the burglars they
interviewed were easily discouraged by a tough lock (Rengert and Wasilchic, 1985: 90), while others such as Bennett and Wright (1982), Reppetto (1974), and Walsh (1980) did not find locks to be a significant factor in the target selection process. Cromwells' informants, in their interview, stated that they were not deterred by locks, however, during burglary reconstruction, they showed that given two potential target sites, all other factors equal, they preferred not to deal with a deadbolt lock. About 30% of Bennet and Wrights, (1984) burglars said they were sometimes put off by additional security locks. Some of Maguires' (1982) burglars, too, admitted that aluminium-framed windows or mortice deadlocks presented problems.

A common result drawn from most burglary studies suggest that the deterrent effect of locks on doors and windows is reduced by skill and experience (Mayhew, 1984; Reppetto, 1974). Reppetto (1974), in Boston, found that houses with doors reaching a high security standard presented some protection, particularly where unskilled burglars were operating. Mayhew (1984: 36) argued that good security is an effective deterrent against most burglaries. She believed that the level of security that is relevant for those at one end of "inexperienced-professional" continuum will be very different from that which will deter those at the other. While the younger, inexperienced, and casual offenders may give greater weight to conventional security, a higher level of security, i.e. using high-quality hardware, restricting access to their housing plot, or using devices which suggest that someone is at home, will probably deter most offenders.

A similar line of reasoning has been presented by Cromwell et al. with reference to the degree to which burglars are either planner or opportunistic. They argued that to the extent to which burglars are primarily opportunistic, locks appear to have some deterrent value. The opportunistic burglar chooses targets based upon his/her perceived vulnerability to burglary at a given time. Given a large number of potential targets, the burglar tends to select the most vulnerable of the target pool. A target with a good lock and fitted with other security hardware will usually not be perceived to be as vulnerable
as one without those items. On the other hand, the rational, planner burglar chooses targets on the basis of factors other than situational vulnerability and conceives ways in which he or she can overcome impediments. Thus, to the rational planner deadbolt locks have a limited utility for crime prevention. The reconstructed burglary sites for Cromwells' (1991: 31) respondents showed that 75% of burglaries were opportunistic, and could have been prevented by the presence of a quality deadbolt lock. With so many opportunities many burglars will move elsewhere rather than struggle with a deadbolt lock.

Burglar Alarms

The influence of burglar alarms installed in a house is investigated by many burglary studies. They show that almost all agree that burglar alarms have a deterrent effect on burglars. Burglars studied by Bennett and Wright (1984) were deterred by burglar alarms, while one third of Reppetos' offenders expressed their unwillingness to target a house with burglar alarms. The oldest age group, however, had the ability to overcome alarms and were least likely to be deterred (1974: 18). Over 90% of Cromwells' (1991: 29-30) respondents stated that they would not choose a target with an alarm system, with most of them admitting that they did not know how to disarm the alarms. Of the 30 offenders interviewed by Cromwell only 2 knew how to disarm an alarm, and were not particularly deterred by them. These offenders stated that the presence of an alarm system gave them additional cues as to the affluence of the residence, telling them that there was something worth protecting inside. One said that a burglar alarm did not deter her because she still had time to complete the burglary and escape before police or private security arrived in response to the alarm. However, despite a small number of burglars who are familiar, and therefore, are not deterred by burglar alarms, the majority of residential burglars avoid houses secured by burglar alarms. The findings from the 2000 BCS supports this by showing that the increase in the use of burglar alarms, from 13% of households 1992, to 26% in 2000, has probably had a major effect in the decreased rate of successful burglaries. The proportion of burglaries in which the offender gained entry declined by 13% between 1997 and 1999 (Kershaw, et al, 2000: 18).
CHAPTER TWO

Police Patrols

Burglary is accomplished quite quickly, it usually takes less than a minute to enter or exit the house. According to research carried out by the Home Office a patrolling officer might expect to be within 100 yards of a burglar entering or leaving a house once every eight years, but not necessarily aware of the burglary in progress. In addition, burglars usually take some care in choosing a suitable time. Interviews with residential burglars confirm that they do not believe that the chance of being caught in the act by the police is great. It has been similarly showed that burglars are also aware that the chances of the police identifying them through detective work are limited, provided that they take some elementary precautions such as wearing gloves. Moreover, because of the vast geographical area to be covered, patrols, even if doubled in intensity, could not present a very significant threat of apprehension to the residential burglar. Clarke and Hope found that the clear-up rate for burglary in London is as low as 6% (1984: 5-6).

A few of Reppettos' interviewees were concerned or spent time in assessing the frequency of police patrols, but only the oldest burglars, with their greater attention to planning, were concerned about police patrols. The police effectiveness against residential burglary, according to Reppetto is highly doubtful. Of approximately 2,000 reports on burglary, studied by Reppetto, less than one per cent of them were discovered in progress by the patrolling police, i.e. burglary is a low-visibility crime (Reppetto, 1974: 50). In general, the findings from studies on the influence of the police patrols show they have a limited effect in deterring residential offenders.

Dogs

Almost all studies agree that dogs are effective deterrents to burglary. The general rule is to bypass a house with a dog - any dog. Large dogs present a physical threat to the burglar and small ones are often noisy, attracting attention. Studies by Reppetto (1974), Walsh (1980), Bennett and Wright (1984) found similar findings suggesting that dogs in
general are a deterrent to burglars. According to Bennett and Wright (1984) dogs had similar deterrent effect as occupancy and were regarded as an alternative to human presence. However, it was found by Laycock (1989: 7) that only 18% of the owner occupiers of households requesting security surveys kept a dog. In addition, some burglars stated that they knew how to handle a dog, as Cromwell, et al. (1991) found that many burglars, especially the more professional, have developed contingency plans to deal with dogs, i.e. petting them, feeding them, or even killing them. However, most burglars prefer to avoid houses with any type of dog.

2.8 Repeat Victimisation

Western criminology and patterns of crime have documented repeat victimisation (RV), i.e. that a high number of burgled targets get re-burgled within a short period of the first offence. The phenomenon of the multiple victimisations and its significance in crime prevention has been recognised over the last two decades, and has been discussed by many criminologists. RV was identified first through a household victimisation survey, carried out by Sparks, et al. in 1977, and was subsequently studied by several others. Ratcliffe and McCullagh (1998) used a standard Geographical Information System (GIS) confirmed the immediate higher risk of re-victimisation after the initial burglary.

Ken Pease (1992, 1993, 1997) found that the likelihood of being victimised is lower for those who have never been victimised than for those who have already been victimised once. Hence, a household that has been burgled once has a high probability of being targeted again. The risk of being burgled increases for third and subsequent burglaries. The repeat offence rate in the city of Cambridge was 8%, which meant that 8% of dwellings have been burgled more than once (Bennett and Durie, 1999: 12). Pease (1998: 14) by using analysis of the 1992 BCS suggested that some 75% of all repeats probably have the same perpetrator.
Farrell and Pease (1993) emphasised that the highest rate of RV takes place in similar places where the concentration of crime rates is greatest. Bennett and Durie (1999) also examined the offence rate within the various areas of the city of Cambridge and compared it with the repeat offence rate, and confirmed that areas with high total offence rate also have high repeat offence rate. Tricket et al. (1992: 85) and Bridgeman and Sampson (1994) supported this finding by showing that a person is about four times as likely to experience one or more property crime in the highest crime area compared to the lowest.

In the period between one burglary and the next, Polvi et al. (1990; 1991: 412), based on the data from his study in the city of Saskatoon, in 1987, showed that the likelihood of a repeat burglary within one month was over 12 times the expected rate. Half of the second burglaries occurred within 7 days of the first, but this declined to less than twice the expected rate when burglaries six months (representing the period after which replacement of goods through insurance is virtually certain to have occurred) apart were considered. The risk is on average once every six months. Ratcliffe and McCullagh (1998) confirmed that the highest chance of a repeat is in the first few weeks after the initial incident.

Several studies such as Polvi, et al. (1991), Tricket et al. (1992), Farrell (1992), Bridgeman and Sampson (1994), Pease (1998), Bennett and Durie (1999) have attempted to explain the recurrence of burglary. Multiple victimisations are explainable through the following factors: A house may be burgled because it is generally an attractive target to all potential burglars. Factors such as vulnerability of some premises, due to the long period of non-occupancy, poor natural surveillance, or lack of security may provide the opportunity, and therefore, be attractive to different offenders. The same characteristics contribute to the second or multiple burglary against the same target, thus, creating, a multiple victimisation pattern. Familiarity with the features of the house, i.e. learning the entry and exit points, the hidden places for valuables, etc. will
encourage the offender to go back to the same house for goods s/he had left behind, and goods that have been replaced. The original offender discusses the availability of opportunity factors to others, and them to their friends, who then commit the repeats.

Ken Pease, the father of the “repeat victimisation” has made a major contribution to both science and practical crime prevention. Pease (1997) argued that realisation about repeat victimisation and concentration on areas with a high burglary rate, has great potential for burglary control. Pease (1998: 6) argued that changes in situations facing the perpetrator on ‘cacoon’ projects in areas where repeat victimisation has been documented; it has shown to be successful in reducing repeat victimisation.

Tilley and Webb (1994: 17) also showed that hardening the targets in high burglary rate areas reduced the proportion of repeated burglaries in most areas, for example in the Meadows in Nottingham the proportion of repeats fell from 22.8% to 13.6%, and in St Ann’s the re-burglary his/her return diminish the likelihood of repeat burglary. He explicitly supported the theory of ‘broken windows’, by Wilson (1982), suggesting that neglect of the first attack means that no one cares, and that the attacks can continue without impunity. On the other hand, ‘fixing broken windows’ should be used to prevent repeat victimisation by changing what the offender first encountered.

Pease initiated a focused approach towards those specific residencies, by enlisting the residents of the five or six homes nearest the burgled unit to keep an eye on it, a “cacoon” neighbourhood watch, instead of unfocused neighbourhood watch. He also helped improve locks and doors, and otherwise reduced the risk. Those housing units in the experimental group saw a declining risk in burglary. Many studies such as Chenery, Holt and Pease (1997) in Huddersfield, and Bennett and Durie (1999) in Cambridge, have implemented rate for target hardened victims was 10.5% compared to 17% of those not target hardened. It also increased the time period of re-victimisation during the
scheme from an average of 80.5 days to 136.5 days in the Meadows. From these findings the authors concluded that victim target hardening was successful in reducing vulnerability to repeat burglary.

2.9 Contemporary Theories Used to Explain Patterns of Residential Burglary in Western Societies

As seen in previous sections in explaining patterns of residential burglary in Western countries and in the UK in particular, contemporary criminology has changed its focus in the search for the causes of crime. The past theories, regardless of being biological, psychological or social in orientation, sought to explain why some individuals offended. The more recent theories, however, saw such approaches which looked at factors such as child-rearing practices, genetic makeup, and psychological and social processes as irrelevant, extremely complicated, and beyond the reach of those who have to deal with offenders in the real world (Felson and Clarke, 1998). Instead criminological theories have occupied themselves with explanations of criminal behaviour, which are more compatible with preventive measures. These theories, in order to achieve reductions in crime levels quicker, looked at environmental characteristics and ‘opportunities’ which facilitate the engagement of motivated offenders with criminal activities (known as environmental criminological theories). These criminological theories, which aim at achieving more immediate remedies to respond to high crime rate, attempt to explain burglary in the light of ‘opportunity theory’, with the presupposition that “opportunity makes the thief”.

Opportunity theory, initiated by the Home Office in 1976, suggest that crime is most likely to occur where the opportunities for it are greatest. Opportunity, therefore, in this study was considered to be the relevant variable to explain the crime patterns (Home Office, 1988). Opportunity theory concentrates on environmental settings and shows how some settings provide many more crime opportunities than others. Felson and
Clarke (1998) although have admitted that no crime is committed as a result of a single cause, yet have argued that opportunities above all others are the necessary condition for crime occurrence. They say no crime can occur without the physical opportunities to carry it out, and have concluded that opportunity has as much or more claim to being a "root cause". They have claimed that such theories are more successful compared with those searching for individual crime propensities, not only in gaining empirical verification but also in reaching consensus. This theory is desirable in formulating practical crime control policies and rests on a single principle: 'easy or tempting opportunities entice people into criminal action' (Felson and Clarke, 1998: 2). This principle is found in each of the opportunity theories of crime: the routine activity approach, and the rational choice perspective; and although they differ in orientation and purpose, they all lead to the inescapable conclusion that opportunity is a cause of crime (ibid). Opportunity theory is discussed, in the next sections, with reference to the following perspectives: 1) the routine activity approach; and 2) the rational choice perspective.

2.9.1 The Routine Activity Approach

The routine activities perspective, originally developed in an article by Cohen and Felson (1979) and subsequently elaborated mostly by Marcus Felson, gained popularity in the 1980s, and was viewed as an important contribution to the explanation of crime, and a very practical approach to crime and crime prevention. Cohen and Felson were concerned with the distribution of crime and changes in crime rates over time, and in their theory mainly suggested that the extent of criminal offences is closely related to the nature of everyday patterns of social interaction. Routine activity theory emphasised that routine activities such as going to work, entertainment areas, shops, and sleeping are an essential part of everyday life. By routine activities they meant any daily activities that are carried out for providing the basic needs. Changes in the social life, however, disrupt or change routine activities, then, social disorganisation can occur.
The central hypothesis of routine activity theory is that ‘the probability that a violation will occur at any specific time and place might be taken as a function of the convergence of likely offenders and suitable targets in the absence of capable guardians’ (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Thus, according to Cohen and Felson, in order for an offence to occur, there must be three elements: a likely offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian. This approach takes the ‘likely offender’ as given and was not concerned with factors that motivates the offender. By the guardian they did not mean a police officer or a security guard but anybody whose presence could prevent or discourage crime. Therefore, the absence of a housewife from the house, or the neighbour or a co-worker from the neighbourhood or from the workplace could all create a suitable target for the potential offender. If one of these elements are missing crime is unlikely to occur.

Cohen and Felson in explaining the procedure by which crime opportunities are produced by the routine activity of victims, emphasised changes in society. They suggested that social changes, since World War II, have led routine activities to occur farther from the home. Those able to offer ‘natural surveillance’ (home occupiers) will be absent for a longer period of time, thereby increasing crime opportunities against unattended residential properties. They also argued that crime rate trends are affected by the economic changes and the higher presentation of women in workplaces, as well as an increase in the number of divorced persons, which result in a larger number of houses left unattended and producing opportunities for residential crime.

2.9.2 The Rational Choice Perspective

The old concept of rationality, which has its origin in the ‘Classical School’ of the 18th century, conceptualised humans as free-willed, rational beings, and utilitarian. They basically assumed that people would automatically attempt to maximise pleasure and minimise pain. Classical criminologists, in explaining the criminal behaviour, assumed
that criminal motivation was always the same, a rational calculation of self-interest. Patterns in crime were the products of variations in the distribution of criminal opportunities working together with variations in legal rules and the efficiency of criminal justice administration. The current rational choice theory contains elements which are partially similar to the concepts from the old Classical School; and its main assumption is that offending is a purposive behaviour, designed to benefit offenders in some way.

The rational choice perspective focuses upon the offender’s decision making, and suggests that decision-making on crime commission is based on the rational process by which an offender chooses a criminal career, selects targets, and carries out criminal acts. Rational choice theory emphasises the process by stating that individuals evaluate alternative curses of actions, weighing the possible rewards against the costs and risks, and choosing the action that maximises their gain and minimises their risks (Vold and Bernard, 1986; Cromwell, et al., 1991; Heal and Laycock, 1986). The benefits of crime, according to Cromwell, include any psychological and emotional satisfactions as well as material gains. The emotional satisfaction, Cromwell added, is any satisfaction from the excitement of the crime, from the independent and luxurious life-style afforded only by crime, or from revenge or outwitting the authorities. The ‘risks or costs’ of crime, as described by Sullivan (1973), are possible discovery of criminal action by authorities and subsequent costs of apprehension, payment of fine and going to prison, as well as psychological feeling of guilt, social disapproval and family consequences of the crime.

The contemporary concept of rationality suggested that offenders make informed decisions to commit crimes, which are largely influenced by opportunities and the environmental conditions for offending, at the time. These opportunities and environmental conditions are expected to reflect an ease of committing crime and the availability of worthwhile targets (Williams and McShane, 1994). Specific categories of offences, however, have different purposes and are influenced by different situational factors. Thus offender’s choice and calculation of benefits/costs of a specific category of
crime may be entirely different from those for a different type of offence. Cook (1980) distinguishes between crimes and the extent to which may benefit from the rationality model, and suggest that rationality is more related to those crimes which involve calculations (or guesses) about potential gains and risks and consequences of apprehension. Such considerations, he added, clearly apply to instrumental crimes, i.e. property crimes, and particularly those committed by habitual offenders, and less to violent crimes such as murder, rape and other so-called expressive crimes (Cook, 1980).

The policies based on the rational choice theory are punitive in nature and tend to punish offenders, as this theory sees criminals as individuals who make informed decisions in committing an offence. The more recent policies with preventive approach, however, tend to intervene with potentially criminal situations before they lead to crime. The rational choice perspective, therefore, may be used to prevent crime and to produce grounds for policy formation aimed at reducing opportunities for crime through better environmental design, increased neighbourhood surveillance, hardening targets with deadbolt locks and burglar alarms, and placing more lights in poorly lit areas (known as 'situational crime prevention' policies). Such policies also inform potential victims to recognise the risks and take preventive measures to avoid being a target.

The goals and purposes aimed by an offender in committing a crime, also the offender's rationality may be constrained by several factors such as the amount of time and effort that an offender can give to the decision and by the quality of information available to him/her. Therefore, rational choice theory attempts to see the environment from the offender's perspective, and look at a specific setting which present the opportunities to satisfy the motivated offender. It is interested in the way an offender thinks before making a decision to commit a crime; although it recognises the short and limited rationality on behalf of offender in his/her calculation which is mainly based on taking into account the immediate, while neglecting the more remote risks and benefits of crime. The level of rationality, the extent to which an offender calculates the gains and risks associated with an offence and its influence on decision making for offending, has
raised considerable disagreements among those who have placed rationality as the main assumption for their studies.

The notion of 'limited rationality', which argues that criminals make their decisions merely based on availability of opportunity, in contrast to the 'absolute rationality', which suggest that offenders make highly rational choice by careful and stage by stage planning and calculating the precise gains and risks involved in any criminal action, is subjected to much debate and has major implications for patterning, and therefore, preventing burglary. However, most studies such as Clarke and Cornish (1985), Cook (1980), Felson (1998), and Felson and Clarke (1998) advocate the 'limited rationality' model and believe that an accurate assessment of criminal situations by criminals is not feasible and criminals only pay limited attention to some of the consequences of a criminal action. Felson (1998), in his book of 'Crime and Everyday Life' explains that everyday life delivers temptations, criminals can not think of all the consequences that may follow their action, and certainly do not consider ones that are more distant in space or time. Cornish and Clarke (1985) support the same model and suggest that when an individual decides to commit or avoid a crime in a particular situation, they only seek to gain quick pleasure, while staying out of immediate trouble.

Whatever the level of rationality, most studies have identified the factors influencing the procedure of decision making by an offender, which indicates that offenders weigh potential gains, levels of guardianship (e.g. signs of occupancy), and risks of detection at possible sites of residential burglary. Calculating gains and risks, however, vary between different burglaries, some being more opportunistic and some more carefully planned. It has also been shown by most studies that drug-addiction is a significant factor influencing decision-making, concluding in a different pattern of burglary. Offenders may also perform poorly as a result of fatigue, alcohol, and under pressure of time where they may make last minute changes of plan. The next section will examine the offender's decision-making procedure in more details.
2.10 Examination of Offender’s Decision leading to Commission of Burglary with reference to ‘Opportunity’ Theories

In the previous section it was seen that in some Western countries patterns of burglary have been examined with reference to opportunity theories which are explained in terms of ‘rational choice’ and ‘routine activity’ perspectives. These theories are concerned with the offender’s decision-making and make an attempt to examine how the minds of offenders work when they decide to engage in a burglary activity, select a target, and conduct a burglary. This section will examine how these theories explain burglary patterns (explained in previous sections) in such societies. In other words, this section intends to provide a theoretical analysis of the offender’s actions and their decision making process in relation to theories underlying this research, specifically the ‘rationality’ and the ‘routine activity’ theories. It intends, first to examine the procedure by which an offender becomes involved in burglary (section 2.10.1), second, it will inspect the procedure by which an offender selects various targets (section 2.10.2). The latter will respond to the question as to what extent the availability of presented opportunities would influence the level of rationality of offenders in committing a crime, as well as the factors influencing rationality of offenders (sections 2.10.3 & 2.10.4). The concluding section will evaluate the adequacy of ‘opportunity’ theories in explaining patterns of residential burglary in Western societies (section 2.11). The analysis made in this section is hoping to enable theoretical comparison with the analysis of findings from Tehran, to determine whether similar theories may be used to explain decision-making procedure employed by burglars in Tehran (which will be discussed in chapter 7).

2.10.1 Offender’s Initial Involvement with Burglary

Despite the fact that many recent environmental studies have attempted to search for cues in the environment (producing crime opportunities) to explain criminality, the majority have admitted that the initial decision to offend is less directed by environmental opportunities. The procedure by which an offender becomes involved in criminal activities has been explained by Cornish and Clarke (1986). They proposed that
the decision that leads to involvement in crime is reached through two stages. The first is that an individual recognises his/her needs, which may be money, goods or excitement (as motivating factors), and his/her 'readiness' to commit this particular crime in order to satisfy his/her needs. This decision implies, according to Cornish and Clarke, that the individual has used his/her rationality to evaluate other ways of satisfying his/her needs, has found this form of crime as a solution to his/her needs and has decided that under the right circumstances s/he would commit the offence. This evaluation, they added, is influenced by 'his previous learning experience, his moral code, his view of the kind of person he is, his personal experience of crime, and the degree to which he can plan and exercise foresight', and these variables are in turn influenced by 'his psychological, familial, and socio-demographic background' (Cornish and Clarke, 1986: 9).

The second decision stage is related to the actual commission of burglary, which takes place by 'some chance event', when s/he encounters a situation (a suitable opportunity). For example peers may suggest committing a burglary while have been drinking together, or s/he may observe an easy opportunity for the offence during the course of his/her routine activities (also Bennett and Wright, 1984). The criminal event, which involves the search and selection of a target by an individual who has made a decision to commit a burglary, occurs the use of rationality that is by his/her estimate of risk factors such as house occupancy, the chance of being seen by others, and by estimate of ease of access, etc. (explained in previous sections as factors influencing patterns of burglary).

Cornish and Clarke (1986) in their analysis suggested that although the second stage, that is committing of the crime, is directed by the influence of presented opportunities, encouragement of peers or consumption of excessive drink, the first stage, that is the initial decision to offend, which result is his/her readiness to commit a crime under the right circumstances, is based on rationality. It is important to note that, according to Cornish and Clarke, although the decision to offend may be influenced by offender's need for money, excitement, etc., the offender has made evaluations and has reached a decision implying that crime is a preferred mean of satisfying his/her needs, and that s/he is ready to commit a specific type of crime, if the situation is right. Regardless of the
decision to offend, which has been made by the potential offender, in most cases, s/he is not consciously aware of the rational decision that has been made by them. Cornish and Clarke (1986) have addressed this issue and have noted that for many offenders initial involvement in theft or burglary can seldom be described as a decision to take up such a career, and that people drift into criminal activities. Commitment to crime is something that emerges gradually.

Bennett and Wright (1984), too, in their examination as to whether or not the decision to offend was determined by the presented opportunities, found that the initial decision that motivates offenders into getting involved in criminal activities are not environmentally determined. They argued that a distinction has to be made between the original decision to offend, which was in the majority of cases independent of situational temptations, and a decision which is committed by the potential offender upon finding of a suitable target. The latter (the decision related to the selection of a target) was found plausible to be situationally influenced. Bennett and Wright (ibid.) similarly believed that in some cases, the existence of other factors such as pressure from others, financial needs, access to suitable transport, etc. influenced the offenders’ behaviour.

Involvement with burglary, as suggested by Cornish and Clarke (1986) as well as by Heal and Laycock (1986), will be continued by successful accomplishment of the first few burglaries and the offender’s readiness to commit burglary will be reinforced. The frequency of burglary will be increased by gaining experience, skills and knowledge, as s/he will learn to use criminal opportunities more effectively. The burglar will gradually recognise his/her financial dependence on burglary, and become closely associated with criminal groups of friends. The burglar will enjoy the life in the fast lane, and will develop excuses and justifications for criminal behaviour. These trends, according to Heal and Laycock (1986), may be accelerated by criminal convictions as opportunities to obtain legitimate work decrease and as ties to family and relations are weakened; or they may be terminated if alternative opportunities with similar gains and less risks become available.
2.10.2 Offender’s Decision leading to Selection of Targets

Target selection behaviour of offenders has attracted the attention of several criminologists. Most studies have tended to explain the ways in which criminal decisions are made by offenders, and the procedure by which crime sites are selected by the use of ‘opportunity’ models of crime. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) recognised that for a crime to be committed there should be a motivated offender who seeks out and identifies a target or a victim positioned in time and place. They stated that the stronger the influence of motivational factors, the lower will be the number of stages for the decision process. The Brantinghams in their analysis of crime occurrence refer to the environment as an instrument which assists the previously motivated individuals to select a suitable target for crime.

A model describing the procedure by which an offender selects a burglary site, a decision which leads the burglar to select a particular house/area (spatial patterns of burglary), has been proposed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1991). They describe the process of target selection with reference to the environment which presents many signals or cues about its physical, spatial, cultural, legal, and psychological characteristics, and an individual who is stimulated to commit a crime uses these cues to locate and identify targets or victims. They show that an individual would learn (by using his/her rationality) which environmental cues are associated with “good” targets. These cues can be considered a template which is used in target selection. Potential targets will be accepted or rejected compared to that template. The existence of a motivated individual with an accepted target (which is associated with higher level of profit and lower level of risk) will result in the actual commission of crime. Other studies such as by Bennett and Wright (1984), Bennett (1986), Cromwell, et al. (1991), and Rengert and Wasilchic (1985) support a similar line of argument on target selection procedure. The criteria used for the identification of a “good” or a “bad” target is defined by Reppetto (1974) and Waller and Okihiro (1978), to include the potential payoff, and the risk of apprehension or confrontation associated with it.

Rhodes and Conly (1991) have also proposed a similar theoretical model of criminal choice, which involves two equally important elements, motivation and opportunity.
They considered criminal decision as an outcome of interaction between these important elements, and suggested that availability and accessibility of opportunities encourage the motivated offenders to commit their crimes by learning about available targets through their daily activities, often located in their immediate environment. Rengert (1991) similarly argued that a criminal activity is influenced not by the 'existence' of physical features deemed desirable for criminal activity, but by the 'accessibility' of these features to potential criminals. He concluded that a criminal activity entails two additional factors: the existence of potential criminals, and the ease with which the potential target can be reached.

It has generally been approved by most burglary studies that environmental cues and availability of opportunities determine the decision made by offenders to select a target. It was recognised by Maguire (1980) that a decision about target-selection is not always relied upon the 'presented opportunities' but is by 'seeking opportunities'. Targets are sought in terms of familiarity with an area, likely rewards, aspects of surveillance, access, and occupancy factors which can be assessed before an approach to a house is necessary. The final decision is made by choosing a target that poses lower risk and higher gain (also Mayhew, et al., 1983).

2.10.3 Level of 'Rationality' in the Selection of Target

This section intends to determine whether or not the process of selection of a target, which determines the spatial patterns of burglary, is based on rationality. That is to discuss the assessment of risks and rewards associated with burglary, which leads to a decision on selection of a particular target. The level of rationality on which a decision to select a target is based, has been of interest to some criminological studies that have tended to evaluate the level of rationality by measuring the extent of planning prior to a burglary. Hence, a higher amount of planning for selection of a target has been taken as an indication of a higher level of rationality of the offenders.
The decision to select a target, as was mentioned earlier, is based primarily on environmental cues and opportunities. However, the level of rationality in making such a decision varies among offenders. The concepts of rewards and risks have been defined by Bennett and Wright (1984: 66-7). Rewards were characterized as making anything out of offence, and perceived rewards included cues relating to the house, garden and immediate area, wealth of the occupants (appearance and condition of the house) and the likelihood of cash or goods being in the house. They defined risks as the chances of getting away with the offence. The risks associated with crime have been defined by Graham and Bennett (1995: 55) as 'the real or perceived threat of detection, apprehension, and/or conviction'.

Regarding the amount of calculation of gain-V-pain made by offenders Cromwell's (1991) studies as well as those of Waller and Okihiro (1978) showed that in most cases burglary is not an act involving lengthy planning, and that limited rationality is employed by the majority of offenders. They argued that burglaries are carried out based on an assumption that all residents contained something worth stealing. This meant that most burglars had established minimal expectation of gain and spent very little time assessing gain cues. The gain cues of individual target sites are usually assessed by offenders based upon their evaluation of the general affluence of the neighbourhood in which the target is located. The assumption is that most residences contain essentially the same quality and quantity of "stealable" items. As burglars gain experience their minimal expectation from each burglary increases and they may move their search area to higher income neighbourhoods. Offenders, by assuming the minimal gains potential at each site, may concentrate on assessing risk cues during the decision process. Assessing immediate risks, according to Cromwell, unlike immediate gains, are not assumed to be constant, and burglars assess risks only when they are expected to exceed the expected gains.

Cromwell, et al. in explaining the decision strategy, and the calculation made by offenders to assess risks against gains (to measure the level of rationality), used the term "argument by contradiction". They explained this by showing that burglars make an
initial assumption that 'someone will see and report my activity'. They then search the immediate physical environment for evidence to contradict it. If a contradiction is found, i.e. the neighbourhood appears deserted, then the initial assumption is rejected. The same procedure is applied to occupancy and accessibility, in sequential order. Although the order in which the three components may be addressed may vary, all the three components must be addressed before a decision to burgle is made. This procedure will result in minimising the risk of burglary, and if any component is not contradicted by environmental risk cues, the decision is reached to abort the crime activity in favour of the personal safety of the burglar. The burglar may decide to return later to the same site or displace to a new target site, in which the same decision-making procedure will be repeated (Cromwell, et al., 1991). The immediate risk cues considered by burglars in target selection decision, suggested by this study, are of three types: surveillance, occupancy, and accessibility. Other major burglary studies have consistently described the same factors as risk cues.

2.10.4 The Influence of the Availability of Opportunities on Offender's Level of 'Rationality'

It was advised that the amount of planning, that is weighing the target regarding to risks and gains associated with a particular target, is an indicator suggesting that planners are more rational in their target selection than opportunistic burglars who 'hit' a target immediately, or following a short period of discovering the target, have little concern for the risks associated with it. The level of planning by offenders is determined by a few factors:

a) The time gap between the selection of a target and committing of the crime
b) The age, experience, skill, and possibly previous convictions
c) The drug-drink habit

1. The time gap between the selection of a target and committing of the crime

Bennett and Wright (1984) distinguished between the opportunistic and planning burglar
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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Aims

There are five main aims for this research. They are as follow:

1) To determine patterns of residential burglary in some Western societies. That is to examine the manner in which burglary is conducted in such countries;

2) To determine some of the social, cultural, and environmental factors shaping or influencing patterns of residential burglary, in Tehran;

3) To look at the existing literature on residential burglary in Tehran. Also to examine its legal definition, statistics held by the police, and police recording procedure;

4) To determine patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. That is to examine the manner in which residential burglary is conducted in Tehran;

5) To draw out similarities and differences between the findings from the current research and those from the Western studies, to determine whether the theories underlying Western studies are capable of explaining patterns found in Tehran, and whether the situational solutions offered in Western countries are transferable and capable of reducing burglary in Tehran.

The main aims can be broken down into the following sub-aims:

Main aim 1: To determine patterns of residential burglary in some Western societies. That is to examine the manner in which burglary is conducted in such countries.
Sub-aims are:

a) To determine the rates of residential burglary in some Western countries, with special attention to UK; as well as looking at offender’s basic characteristics, to produce a clear picture of the shape of the problem and to determine who commits the burglaries in such countries;

b) To determine the temporal patterns, that is the times at which most burglaries are conducted;

c) To determine the spatial patterns, that is the places at which most burglaries are distributed. This will follow by an analysis of how far from their place of residence offenders travel to commit their burglaries;

d) To determine how burglaries are conducted, that is the examination of a wide range of actions carried out by residential burglars, including their target-selection techniques (selection of areas, selection of houses), techniques of entry, searching methods inside the house, types of properties targeted by offenders, and trading stolen properties;

e) To analyse the main factors influencing the selection of targets by offenders, i.e. surveillance, occupancy, and accessibility; followed by an analysis of the main factors influencing burglar’s decision-making, i.e. association of co-offenders, drug-habits, carrying weapons, security devices and target-hardening techniques, etc.

f) To determine whether a once burgled residential premises are re-burgled within a short period of time. It will examine the prevalence of repeat victimisation, the time gap between the first and subsequent incidents, and reasons for re-burgling the similar target;

g) To determine theories/perspectives underlying Western literature on residential
burglary; this includes examination of decisions made by the offender to become involved, select a target, and commit a burglary with reference to 'opportunity theories', which are explained in terms of 'rational choice' and 'routine activity' perspectives.

Main aim 2: To determine some of the social, cultural, and environmental factors shaping or influencing patterns of residential burglary, in Tehran.

Sub-aims are:

a) To examine the geographical, and demographic features of Tehran and their economic implications;

b) To examine the changes in the urban environment and types of housing in Tehran, during the last few decades. This is used to provide background information for explaining patterns of residential burglary, which is discussed in chapter 6;

c) To determine the social and cultural implications of such built environment, areal division, and types of housing influencing offender's target-selection. It will specifically focus on factors such as population density, structure of the family, immigration, modernisation, unemployment, and areal characteristics; and will demonstrate how changes in such factors have shaped the life-style, as well as the crime patterns in Tehran today.

Main aim 3: To determine residential burglary in Tehran in terms of its legal aspects, crime statistics and police recording procedure

Sub-aims are:

a) To look at the existing literature on residential burglary, in Tehran;
b) To determine the legal aspects, that is to examine the definition of burglary and its punishment in Iran. Also to demonstrate how it compares with the definition of burglary in some Western countries, particularly in UK and US.

c) To look at crime statistics held by the police and other authorities;

d) To examine the police crime recording procedure, that is the way in which burglary is reported by victims and recorded by the police, to determine to what extent crime statistics are representative of the actual crime level, and to outline limitations with crime statistics produced by the police.

Main aim 4: To determine patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. That is to examine the manner in which residential burglary is conducted (when, where, and how residential burglaries take place).

Sub-aims are:

a) To determine the socio-economic features of the interviewed offenders, and to demonstrate their distribution in terms of gender, age, marital status, education, employment, income, etc.

b) To determine the factors that have motivated offenders to become engaged in criminal activities, especially in residential burglary;

c) To determine the times at which the occurrence of burglary is more prevalent; it includes the seasons, the times of the year or special occasions in which offenders are not prepared to commit any crime, or on the contrary, are more likely to commit crimes; the days of the week, and the times of day or night when offenders prefer to commit their burglaries;
d) To determine the spatial patterns of residential burglary, that is 'where' crimes occur. This section is focusing on areas more at risk of burglary and attempts to explain the socio-economic characteristics of such areas. It is also concerned with the types of housings (i.e. bungalows, apartments, high-rise buildings) more at risk of being burgled, and intends to determine whether the location of houses within specific areas determine their selection as being targets of crime;

e) To determine the influence of factors such as occupancy, areal density and community relationship, surveillance, and accessibility on the selection of targets by offenders, and to determine the target selection procedure, that is the availability of opportunities, or the amount of planning involved in the selection of specific targets for burglary. It will also determine the influence of preventive measures and security devices, i.e. burglar alarms, and target hardening techniques, i.e. use of proper or advanced locks and bolts on burglary;

f) To determine 'how' burglaries occur, including the techniques which are often used by residential burglars to enter residential properties, and identification of the routes often used for escape; to examine and monitor the searching places and types of valuables targeted by residential offenders; as well as the trading techniques employed by offenders to market their stolen properties.

Main aim 5: To draw out similarities and differences between the findings from the current research and those carried out in some Western countries, to determine whether the theories underlying Western studies are capable of explaining patterns found in Tehran. The findings are hoped to assist predicting whether the situational solutions offered in Western countries are transferable and capable of reducing burglary in Tehran.

Sub-aims are:

a) To outline similarities and dissimilarities between the patterns found in both
studies, that is the findings from Tehran with the findings from Western literature;

b) To determine whether 'opportunity' theories underlying some Western studies, including 'rationality' and 'routine activity' perspectives, could be similarly used to explain patterns of residential burglary in Tehran.

3.2 Overview

This research is intended first to look at patterns of residential burglary in some Western societies (aim 1). It will examine when, where, and in what manners most burglaries occur in such countries. It will also address the target-selection procedure and will determine the factors which influence decisions made by offenders as to select and prefer a target over another. The target-selection procedure will be examined with reference to explanations offered by 'rational choice' and 'routine activity' theories.

Second, it will present an introduction to familiarise readers with a city, in which the fieldwork has been conducted. It will specifically look at the its urban environment and housing types, and their social and cultural implications, to identify how these factors may influence patterns of residential burglary in Tehran (aim 2). Realisation about such issues are expected to assist with better understanding of crime patterns in Tehran, i.e. why burglaries occur at certain times, what factors contribute to the selection and preference of some areas/houses to others, and why burglaries are conducted the way they are and not in another manner. It will focus on the ways in which major facilities, i.e. industrial, commercial, residential, have been distributed in the city of Tehran; it will also address the growth of population, changes in the structure of family, modernisation and its impact of the life-style of inhabitants, and immigration and its influence on crime patterns. Examination of these issues may assist with the recognition of those factors which explain crime in Tehran, especially helpful for those, who may not be familiar with social, cultural and environmental aspects of the city.
The next section of this project is intended to look at the literature, crime statistics, and legal aspects of residential burglary in Tehran (aim 3). The first part is intended to look at previous studies carried out on residential burglary in Tehran. Examination of the level of residential burglary in Tehran is not the major focus in this research and is only used as an indication to demonstrate the level and seriousness of residential burglary, compared with other types of property crimes, in Tehran. It is also intended to look at crime reporting and recording procedure, that is to determine the procedure and the manners of the public in reporting crime incidents, and the way in which police records crime reports. Answers to questions such as whether a burglary is investigated only following a report from a victim or whether there are any other circumstances where the police detect a crime by the use of other sources, whether all crimes reported by the public are recorded and illustrated in official crime statistics or crimes are recorded on a discretionary basis, will significantly effect the extent of crime being reflected in crime statistics. The police recording procedure is, therefore, investigated to assist evaluation of the validity of crime statistics indicating the true extent of crime in Tehran. This part is also intended to look at legal aspects of residential burglary. It is believed that the crime definition, types of punishment, and the way the criminal justice system deals with offenders, greatly influence the level and crime patterns in every society. Therefore, it was decided to briefly look at the definition of burglary and its punishment according to Iranian Criminal Law, and determine how it compares with similar issues in some Western societies i.e. UK and US.

The next aim (aim 4), which is the major focus of this research, will look at patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. First of all, it is important to explain what is meant by 'pattern' in this research, what approach is taken in this research to examine the crime of residential burglary, and what aspects of burglary are investigated. In general, pattern is referred to when, where and how residential burglary is conducted. Patterns of residential burglary are investigated by looking at a broad range of issues, i.e. the times at which burglaries are more likely to be committed, the areas and types of housing more at risk of burglary, the process by which burglars select their targets, the influence of
opportunities or the amount of planning in the selection of burglary targets, entry
techniques, the behaviour of burglars inside the house, security measures and target
hardening techniques and their influence on burglary, marketing stolen goods, the effect
of drug use on the way burglary is operated, etc.

Data collection and analysis of data from the empirical work on patterns of residential
burglary in Tehran should produce a clearer view of the main findings from the
empirical work. In the next section of this thesis, the main findings from the Western
studies, as well as the main findings from burglary patterns in Tehran will be outlined. A
comparison between the findings will determine to what extent, and in what aspect
patterns present similarities or dissimilarities. In other words, it is intended to examine
whether patterns of residential burglary in some Western societies are identical to
patterns discovered in Tehran. Finally, similarities and differences found between the
Western studies and that from Tehran, will show whether a similar theoretical
framework underlying Western studies are capable of explaining patterns of residential
burglary in Tehran. The results from the current study may enable identification and
establishment of the most appropriate methods and strategies for future control of
residential burglary in Tehran.

3.3 Research Methods

Criminological research and theories have implications for the kinds of methods that are
used. In other words, the types of data required to produce the findings and conclusions
will direct the researcher towards the appropriate methodology for the research. The
current research is intended to use the following methods for reaching the above aims
and sub-aims:

The main method for aim 1 is the study of Western literature, analysing a wide range of
environmental studies, carried out in the last few decades, and outlining the main
findings of such studies to produce a platform for comparison with the main findings of
the current research.
A multi-approach has been taken for the aim 2. First of all, analysis of information about the layout and the built environment of the city of Tehran, has been carried out through some interviews with city planners and architects seeking information on the development of the city, the built environment, the types of housing in Tehran, and the changes occurred, during the last few decades. General maps of Tehran and maps produced by the sources from the Ministry of Urban Planning, and some photographs, taken by the researcher, from different areas of the city were also used for demonstrational purposes. In addition, information on economic, social and cultural issues, aimed at providing an understanding of existing crime patterns were obtained from a wide range of sociological and historical sources, supplemented by the researcher's own personal views and as a result of contacts and communication with the public, with various social and economic background.

Aim 3, which is to determine the rate of residential burglary in Tehran, will be achieved through the use of official crime statistics (OCS) as well as the study of crime recording procedure (CRP). OCS, as it is a tradition with all other crime studies, is used as the main method for examination of the rate of burglary in Tehran. OCS are hoping to serve three purposes:

a. To determine the rate of burglary, in general, and residential burglary in particular, compared with other types of crime, and to determine its crime occurrence and the extent it requires attention;

b. To obtain the rate of types of theft and burglary for the last 5 years to determine the current figures and to illustrate to what extent they have increased compared to other types of crime;

c. The wider purpose is to obtain areal rates of residential burglary, for each 20 districts of the city of Tehran, and to illustrate and determine areas with the more acute problem of residential burglary. It is intended to
demonstrate the distribution of residential burglaries, determine the problematic areas, and to concentrate on areas with high rate of residential burglary.

Crime statistics (CS) will be collected by consulting the following sources: 1) the Statistical Year Book, published by the Statistical Centre of Iran, published annually with reference to several statistical subjects including crime statistics produced by the Ministry of Justice; 2) the head office of the Central Police Station (CPS) which is the main office for holding the main crime statistics for the city of Tehran. CS are examined for the last 5 years, to show the current figures and the extent to which crime has increased, within the last five years. CS will be collected for various types of property crimes, including residential burglary to enable a comparison to be made between burglary and other types of crime.

Moreover, the research is intended to examine crime reporting and recording procedures, as a method for evaluating CS produced by the police, and to analyse how the crime figures recorded by the police may be different from the true extent of crime being committed. Police crime recording procedures will be obtained by attending District Police Stations (DPS), through observation of crime reported by victims, investigation and filing procedure, observation of the manners of police officers dealing with burglary cases, and detection and possible arrests. An examination of CRP is expected to draw out and demonstrate factors contributing to the possible gap between the police crime statistics and the actual crime rate.

The method for aim 4 is to determine the patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. This contains an empirical study, which uses mainly semi-formal interviews with some of the convicted residential burglars in prison. The main body of data collection on patterns of residential burglary, therefore, is central around these interviews with convicted residential burglars. Interviews with imprisoned offenders, are assumed to be the most appropriate method for learning about the patterns of residential burglary in Tehran,
because it will enable direct contact with burglars themselves and allow first-hand data to be obtained about the manners in which offenders carry out their burglaries. Attempts will be made to include a fair combination of age and gender in the sample, coming from different blocks, i.e. blocks keeping female offenders, young property offenders, and other property offenders. Interviews will be semi-formal and will be tape-recorded, where permitted. Each interview is expected to take about one and half to two hours.

A pilot study was conducted prior to the actual data collection through interviews. The pilot was aimed at testing the practicality and feasibility of interview questions, establishing an approximate time consumed for each interview, and assessing the responses to the questions designed. The pilot study involves interviews with a number of residential burglars; offenders were selected whereas they had similar features to those interviewed for this research. The results from the pilot study enabled an evaluation of interview questions; amendments were made accordingly.

3.3.1 Interview Questions

Interviews with convicted burglars were selected as the main tool for aim 4. Interview questions were designed by the researcher and were based mainly on previous empirical studies, with an environmental approach on residential burglary. In this regard, the researchers and the authors of the two main studies of burglary in England, Mike Maguire and Trevor Bennett were contacted and enquiries were made about the availability of their questionnaires and interview question used for their studies. One did not respond, and the other responded negatively. Therefore, the researcher designed the questionnaire based on issues aimed by this research, with taking into consideration the theories behind the research. Interview questions consisted of 124 very detailed questions, confirmed by the then supervisor (Dr. J. Vagg). They were then translated to Persian (Farsi) by the researcher. An Iranian specialist in English language was asked to do his own translation; comparison was made with my translation, resulting in some amendments. Similar procedures were accomplished, translating the questions back from Persian to English.
As it can be seen in appendix I, the majority of questions used for producing patterns of residential burglary, were open-ended, and the researcher allowed offenders the time and the space to express themselves freely, to supplement and produce a more comprehensive view on offenders' criminal behaviour. The researcher designed the questions in a way to obtain adequate information for drawing out the patterns of residential burglary.

3.3.2 Sample-selection Procedure

The population of residential burglars consisted of all offenders who committed acts of burglary in a residential setting, at any time of their criminal career. This population, however, could be found in widely varied places or spread among the ordinary people living in the whole society, where access to the whole population was impractical and impossible. The population of residential burglars who, at the time of interviews, spent their time in custody, was thought to be only a partial constituent of the whole population of residential burglars. This made the random selection of a sample from the true population impossible, therefore, the population who ended up participating in the interviews for the current research are not representative of the true population, the most practical technique was to interview some of residential burglars living in prison, at the time of the research data collection.

The nature of the offence studied in this research would have led the researcher to an assumption to expect that males would be the main constituents of the population engaged in this type of offence. It was, therefore, expected that the majority of interviewees would be males. This research relied predominantly on interviews with a number of convicted residential burglars as its main method of data collection, and accordingly it intended to interview offenders who satisfied the following set of criteria:

1) To be convicted, i.e. not on remand awaiting trial; past experience of working with offenders had shown that on remand offenders are reluctant to answer
questions producing insufficient information for the research, because they have the impression that any information they produce may influence their court decision and sentencing. Offenders on remand normally refuse to admit to offences that have still not been proven. They are also less likely to be prepared to talk about their previous experiences, (those offences which have not been discovered by the police), and consequently they have not been convicted for those offences.

2) Offenders should be currently serving sentences for residential burglary, or, should have admitted to previously committing residential burglary in their criminal career. Since the main aim of the current research is intended to search for patterns of residential burglary in Tehran, it seems reasonable to interview offenders who are convicted of residential burglary. However, it was assumed that there may be offenders who have extensive experience of committing residential burglaries but are not serving sentence for residential burglary. Therefore, it was decided to include such offenders, because they are likely to produce similar results.

3) Offenders should be willing and consent (implicitly or explicitly) to participate in the interview. This criterion was decided on because it was thought unethical to interview offenders who are reluctant to be interviewed. In addition, it would certainly influence the quality of interviews and the amount of data collected from those reluctant offenders. Reluctant offenders were thought to co-operate less, therefore, producing unreliable data.

Offenders were selected among those who meet the above requirements. It was intended to select them randomly from the prison computing services database. This was found to be impossible due to problems with prison records, which will be outlined in the section 3.4.3.
3.3.3 The Size of the Population

Following the confirmation of the interview questions by the supervisor, discussions were made to determine the number of interviews that would produce sufficient grounds for analysis. As a result, agreements were made on numbers between 25 and 30, considering the length of interview, and the type of analysis intended. It was apparent, that since interviews were carried out in a country, which does not have a strong research tradition, this number is only an estimate. The possibility of interviewing anyone, will of course depend upon decisions made by prison authorities and determined by the circumstances imposed upon the researcher, at the time of interview. The number of interviews were also influenced by the amount of information produced by offenders, as well as their co-operation, and interviews were terminated beyond saturation point.

3.3.4 The Pilot Study

Despite the fact that the suitability of the interview questions was confirmed by the supervisor, their feasibility had to be tested. The conduct of a pilot study was particularly important, as interviews were to be made in a different country. The suitability of interview questions had to be tested to determine the time required for each interview, to observe the response and reaction of offenders to each question, and their ability to produce data suited to the aims of the research. The pilot study was carried out by interviewing 4 convicted residential burglars, and it showed that major amendments had to be made to the questionnaire. However, most of the questions which needed to be amended, were questions that focused on obtaining information about the offender's socio-economic and familial background. It showed that these offenders were less willing to go into details about their family and their economic background, especially at the beginning of interviews, when still unsure about trusting the researcher. It was also found that these offenders were less able to link the questions to the ways in which they operated their burglaries. This made the researcher aware that such detailed information was indeed less relevant to the aims set for the research. Therefore, amendments were
made, and the amended questionnaire was faxed to the supervisor and confirmed by him. Also, negotiations were made with the researchers from the prison organisation and amendments were made, accordingly. The amended questionnaire was then thought to be able to improve the quality of interviews. It produced more relevant data, and prevented the study from accumulating additional information which may have made data analysis more complicated. It also reduced the time taken by each interview. Offenders were less bored and their attention was focused on more relevant issues.

3.4 Methodological Problems

3.4.1 Problem of Definition and Classification

An act or a type of behaviour which may be regarded as criminal and made punishable by the law in one society, may not be counted as criminal in another society. Or it may be counted as criminal in both societies but defined and punished in different manners. Burglary in Iran is defined as a crime and is made punishable by the law. Its definition, classification and the means of punishment, however, is different from the UK. These differences are not believed to create a major impact on this research, as legal accounts are less focused upon throughout and are less relevant to the aims and objectives of this research.

A major problem was encountered during the interviewing of convicted offenders in prison, which derived from differences in burglary classification made by various institutions. The police recorded crimes by classifying burglary into two categories: armed and unarmed burglaries. However, suspects of burglary when were sent to criminal courts, and where convicted, were done so according to the classification made by the law, which was different from that used by the police. These offenders when were sentenced to imprisonment, the prisons organisation allocated such offenders by their broad type of 'theft and burglary', (which included all different types of theft), and did not distinguish between residential burglary and other types of theft, i.e. shoplifting,
burglary from business, auto-theft, etc. These differences made a systematic study of residential burglars difficult, as the crime records held by prisons organisation was sufficient only to recognise offenders being imprisoned for 'theft and burglary', but were unable to recognise residential burglars from other burglars.

3.4.2 Problems with Collection of Crime Statistics

The use of criminal statistics (CS) as a main method for aim 3, i.e. determining the rates of residential burglary encountered several problems which will be outlined below:

The main problem is the absence of any published CS which can be used for Tehran. The only source available for CS is the census book published by the Statistical Centre of Iran. The statistics appear in this source contained burglary data, which was based not on crime figures recorded by the police, but on the number of cases of various types of crimes being dealt with in criminal courts. These figures in themselves were inadequate and incomprehensible, as they only gave information in terms of the broad 'theft and burglary' crimes and did not contain separate figures for residential burglary. In addition, they did not distinguish between cases resulting in convictions and those that did not.

Crime figures taken from the police, therefore, had to be obtained by personal enquiries by the researcher made to the Central Police Station (CPS). Those had to be made formally, listing the types of information required. A wide range of information was requested by the researcher including: crime figures demonstrating the number of crimes for various types of theft and burglary, and for residential burglary in specific, for the last five years (to determine comparison between the rate of residential burglary with other types of theft), areal burglary statistics and areal crime maps (to determine distribution of burglary in various areas of Tehran—areal offence rate), and the clear-up rates for such offences. Burglary information was also requested for age, gender, drug-use, method of entry, items stolen and their estimated value, time and place of burglary, etc.
Access to the data from the CPS was a complicated and lengthy task. Several meetings with senior authorities from the police department were held, to discuss accessing statistical data for the research, and to gain permission for accessing such data. Permission for accessing data from the computing resources of the CPS was granted, but only to those not labelled as 'classified', after six months. Most crime data kept in CPS, however, was labelled as 'classified' and confidential, therefore, the data obtained was insufficient to produce the information required for the current research. Several pieces of information were missing. Also, the data available did not cover the time period of 5 years, which was included in the research design. Only general information was available over the last 3 years. Areal crime maps and areal statistical crime figures were also unavailable.

It was decided to investigate the police crime recording procedure (aim 3, sub-aim d) by visiting District Police Stations (DPS). This was intended to serve two purposes: one to obtain areal crime maps and areal crime statistics, to enable demonstration of areal distribution of crime; another was to look at the manners in which the police collected their data, the criteria used by the police for recording reported acts of residential burglary, the process of investigation of burglary by the police, and the information included in crime records. However, collection of such data from the DPS was also problematic. The areal crime maps were unavailable, making data on the areal distribution of crime impossible.

The data from the five major DPS, in Tehran, however, showed that each DPS comprised about 12-13 local police stations, dealing with all types of crimes. Local police stations had to report their crime rates to the DPS, in which they were subsequently responsible to the CPS for provision of monthly crime sheets, for various types of crimes. A biennial report was produced. Examination of such information was problematic and significantly time-consuming. All the crime records and crime sheets were hand-written, noticeably disorganised, several pieces of information were missing with huge time-gaps in between. These visits, however, were useful in one respect that is
of an examination of the manner in which crimes are reported and recorded, but were unsuitable for collection of crime rates in Tehran. I also managed to interview the chief constable of DPS and asked his opinions on various aspects of burglary in their districts. Areal crime figures and areal crime maps were either non-existent or not available; they were kept in local police stations, covering only the local areas.

Accordingly there were many limitations and difficulties associated with collecting quantitative data in Tehran. Similar limitations and difficulties were encountered, when requesting crime statistics from prisons, about the number of offenders kept in prisons for burglary (either convicted or on remand awaiting trial) as well as the statistical data from the judiciary showing the number of cases being dealt with in criminal courts for burglary.

3.4.3 Problems Associated with Sampling

The nature of the research made it clear that selection of a true sample representative of individuals constituting the whole population of burglars was impossible. A complete population of residential burglars were inaccessible for various reasons. First, a large number of offenders, who have possibly committed a large proportion of residential burglaries, live free in society and could not be identified. These offenders may have never been caught by the criminal justice system, therefore, could not be accessed or included in the population. Similarly, many offenders may have been caught by the police, but have been freed for the lack of sufficient evidence for prosecution. This is also the case for those who get sent to court but receive non-custodial sentences. In addition, a large number of offenders have previously served custodial sentences and have been freed following the completion of their sentence in prison. All these groups of offenders, who probably constitute the majority of residential burglars, are practically excluded from the accessible population of burglars. The accessible population was therefore limited to convicted residential burglars currently spending time in prisons.
CHAPTER THREE

The initial research plan was to select offenders randomly from the prison computing services database, producing a list of offenders who were convicted for residential burglary. The sample would include three age groups, one third of younger offenders (18-25), one third of middle range age group (26-35), and one third of older offenders (36 and over). This was expected to enable the researcher to observe variations in methods used by various age-group of offenders. Selection of the sample based on gender, offered less choice, but it was decided to include as many females as possible. This method of sample selection, however, proved to be impractical, because it was found that the type of burglary (i.e. residential, commercial, auto-theft, etc) was not specified on prisoner's records. All prisoners convicted for various types of burglary were kept in the same place and were all known by record, as 'burglars'. This prevented distinguishing residential burglars from other theft offenders, as it was unknown how large is the population of residential burglars, and how they could be identified.

These difficulties led the researcher to stick to practicalities. Following the negotiations with prison authorities, it was decided that the most practical way of accessing residential burglars was through the personnel in charge in the prison. First of all, they knew the offenders and the types of crimes they committed. Second, offenders were known by others living in the same block in respect to the type of crimes committed. The personnel went to the cells, where burglars were kept, asked offenders who are convicted for residential burglary, or have previously committed residential burglary, to come forward. Then, a list of residential burglars was produced. By matching the requirements about 2-3 were brought for interview every day. At the beginning of every interview the requirements were double-checked by the researcher.

The personnel were informed of the criteria for inclusion, and were asked to check the offender's eligibility before being brought for interview. The main criteria were to interview offenders whose main criminal activities were residential burglary, and were convicted for residential burglary. This created problems, and despite the fact that many were regular burglars, they were not prepared to be interviewed. The main reason for this was that many offenders who were convicted of residential burglary, were reluctant to
reveal their past burglaries that had not been revealed to authorities, as they believed admitting to such activities to the researcher would affect their sentences or their chances for parole. Therefore, it was decided to include only those offenders who had previous burglary convictions but the current sentence was not for the crime of residential burglary. They were mainly offenders who were regularly involved in residential burglary but currently in prison for other types of crime. This seemed an appropriate solution to the problem.

Selection of female offenders encountered similar problems, i.e. the difficulty in identifying residential burglars. Similar method was employed for interviewing female offenders. However, in the block of cells, containing 700 female offenders, only 5 were brought for interview by the prison personnel. Of the 5 female offenders who were brought for interview, only 3 met the criteria, one did not consent to the interview, another insisted on being interviewed, and the other although was initially reluctant to be interviewed, eventually changed her mind.

3.4.4 Problems Associated with Conduct of Interviews

The interview was used as the main method for an examination of crime patterns in Tehran (method used for aim 4). Obtaining access to imprisoned burglars was a long and sequential process, requiring lengthy negotiations with higher authorities to gain permission for interviews. In general, it was felt that prison authorities held a very negative attitude towards interviews being carried out in prison, especially by a female researcher, and it would take a great deal of effort to make the authorities convince them of the research requirements and the importance of interviews for obtaining data for conducting a research. However, and despite my success in obtaining a letter from senior authorities, there were still several problems raised when attending the prison to carry out the interviews. Further meetings and negotiations had to be undergone with the inner-prison authorities. Considering the administration procedure and security process in which I had to go through every morning that I went to prison, it was taking about an hour each day to be let in. Then there were further delays waiting for offenders to get ready for interviews, and additional time was spent waiting for the personnel to bring the
offenders into the interview room. In addition, since interviews were to be carried out with offenders, individually, controlling other offenders who had to wait in corridors raised problems, therefore, not more than 2-3 interviews were allowed each day. There were some occasions where I had to undergo the primary routine but still returned empty-handed.

Another problem with interviews was the gender difference of the interviewer. In a male dominant environment, there is little sympathy for a female researcher, who is perceived to be intruding into the private world of males. The prison authorities, the personnel, the prison guards, and to a less extent offenders, all seem to be uncomfortable with having a female researcher around for a long period of time. However, the prison authorities had very little problem about permitting interviews to be carried out by a female researcher in blocks accommodating female offenders. In addition, it was felt that offenders were uncomfortable in answering questions such as 'how did you spend the money gained from burglary?' that often required mentioning how they spent their leisure time. They were particularly unwilling to mention 'women', and as they started smiling, the researcher knew that it was time to reassure them that things said by them was used only for research purposes, if only to make them less embarrassed. However, this question was not key to determine patterns of burglary. It was asked only to demonstrate the lifestyle of offenders and their expectations of an ordinary life. Moreover, the researcher was prohibited from going into cells containing adult male offenders. This eliminated the chance of explaining the aims of the research, which could have had a positive influence on offenders encouraging them to participate in interviews. Visiting male offenders in their cells was, of course, unwise for security reasons, as well as producing an inappropriate environment for conducting interviews.

Since interviews had to be conducted in a relaxed and peaceful environment, the educational staff lent their room to the researcher to carry out her interviews. However, their repeated question 'when will the interviews be terminated?' was a constant reminder of the researchers' invasion into their occupational space. Nevertheless, their friendly remarks, made on the last day, made up for their former behaviour. In one occasion the tape-recorder stopped, but was soon repaired by the technical staff. Also
one offender objected to being tape-recorded, but once he was given the explanation about the aims of the research, he consented.

3.4.5 Problems with Collection of Other Forms of Data

Examination of areal characteristics and housing types and their influence on selection of targets by offenders required collection of data on geographical and areal characteristics, types of housing in Tehran, areal classification and socio-economic characteristics of various areas in Tehran (aim 2). The method for this aim was the collection and examination of relevant information from various governmental and non-governmental organisations. Again, systematic information was in most cases unattainable. Several private and governmental organisations were approached to obtain geographical and architectural information on the city of Tehran. Despite a great deal of effort no official information became available. The sociological and architectural books and articles written on the development of the city of Tehran and the way the life-style of its inhabitants was affected by urban design formed the main source of information for achieving this aim. In addition, some informal and non-systematic information was gathered, by interviewing a number of city planners and architects on the historical development of Tehran, focusing on changes in the types of housing, allocation of different social class distribution in different areas of the city, and the most prevalent types of housings used in different areas with different socio-economic implications. It was also decided to obtain some information through personal observation of different localities to determine differences in social characteristics and differences in housing types. Some photographs were taken to demonstrate differences in different socio-economic areas.

3.4.6 Personal Problems

In addition to the methodological problems, noted above, some personal problems were encountered, which were the result of conducting the empirical work outside the UK. As
mentioned earlier, research and especially crime related data collection in the Middle-East countries has its own problems, which makes data collection significantly different from the European countries. Absence of research-based crime data, confidentiality of crime statistics and unavailability of those figures to the public, difficulties associated with obtaining access to imprisoned offenders and other sources, (where direct information may be obtained), are among many problems associated with this type of research.

Moreover, there is a major difference between research and data collection where the results are used inside Iran, and those which are intended to be taken abroad. The latter is treated with much more caution and careful attention is paid not to reveal classified and confidential information. In this particular research, the data collected from Tehran, had to be taken to the UK for analysis and the findings had to be used for the current thesis. It was decided not to reveal the intention of transferring the data collected from the officials and the data from interviews to the authorities, except to the head of the Prisons' Research Centre who made arrangements for my contacts with other institutions. This, however, placed the researcher under constant worry and anxiety, especially when conducting interviews, where regular visits were made to prison. At a time when several attempts were made to gain access to prison, as well as during the conduct of interviews themselves, significant levels of stress and pressure was felt by the researcher, I felt very tense, insecure, bearing the burden in my mind what would happen to me if the prison authorities found out the information was to be taken abroad. During the last few interviews the prison authorities suspicions was raised; consequently more pressure was put on the researcher to produce reports to the prisons organisation outlining the number of inmates interviewed, explaining in what context the data obtained from interviews were going to be used, and which organisations will receive the final results. This was as a result of contacts being made between the prison authorities and the head of research centre, who facilitated the initial permission for the research. This suspicion made the prison authorities ask for the termination of interviews.
3.5 Validity

The two components of objectivity, issues of validity and reliability, inevitably arise for every research, and research methods and conclusions have to be justified accordingly. Validity of the two methods used for the collection of data obtained from the empirical work will be discussed as a method used for examination of the rate of burglary; and validity of interview, as a method used for determining the patterns of burglary.

Validity of crime statistics, in this study, may be discussed in two terms:

1) Validity of the methods of research, as generating accurate data,
2) Validity of data, as indicating the true extent of crime,

Attempts have been made to obtain official crime statistics that show the current extent of crime in Tehran. Whether these data are valid in representing the actual rate of crime is open to question, as it is with all official crime statistics. The official crime figures, recorded by the police, was used as an essential tool to illustrate the rate of residential burglary, as it is traditionally used by almost all other research, whether for showing the extent of crime, or for any specific location or community. The crime figures obtained from the police are believed by the researcher to be all that was available, or accessible. Validity of data obtained from the CPS is ensured by the personal extraction of data from the computers.

The validity of such data, as indicating the true extent of crime was tested by visiting the five District Police Stations, each of which produced crime figures for their districts. These figures enabled the researcher to establish an estimate of the overall crime figures in Tehran, as a whole. It also assisted the researcher in identifying and producing a general picture of areas with higher crime rate, either indicating higher crime occurrence or the higher tendency to report crime to the police.

Interviews with convicted residential burglars were used as the main method for learning about the patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. This method is assumed to produce
the most relevant data suitable to the aims of this research, because, as discussed earlier, it located the researcher in direct contact with offenders, enabling the generation of first-hand data. The circumstances, especially the relationships with offenders in which the interviews were carried out, to a large extent were controlled by the researcher, increasing the chance of gathering more accurate information. Demonstration of the offender's personal experiences, as well as the feelings and attitudes of offenders towards their criminality, is more plausible if obtained through face-to-face interviews. The researcher managed to carry out interviews with 41 offenders, 39 men and 2 women, aged between 14 and 47.

The information produced by offenders had to be validated by building in some validity tests. Testing the validity of the data from interviews through cross-examination of offender's statements with the data found in their criminal records is probably the most desirable way of validating the data. Attempts were made to do so and criminal records were requested from the prison authorities, but the problem with the classification of those records made them in many occasions inaccessible, or poor in producing useful information. Validity tests, however, were built in by other means, i.e. negotiations made with the prison governors. Moreover, prior to the conduct of interviews, interview questions were put into the 'research group' of Prisons Organisation, a group of experienced researchers who had carried out extensive empirical work in prisons, and was confirmed by them to be suitable for producing the data required for demonstrating crime patterns in Tehran.

Furthermore, attempts were made to carry out the interviews in a way which maximises the possibility of producing accurate information. Interviews began by asking general questions about the criminal career of these offenders, and then progressed towards more detailed and more specific questions. Therefore, offenders were asked, more than once, about the patterns of crimes committed. This assisted the researcher in identifying any inconsistencies in the information produced by offenders. In addition, an assurance on confidentiality, conducting the interviews where the prison authorities were absent, explaining the aims of the research and ensuring offenders that interviews and
information given in any way would not effect their conviction period or their incarcerational circumstances, helped offenders to tell the truth, enabling the researcher to collect accurate data and represent analysis based on true information. The researcher also ensured that offenders gave their consent, that they were willing to take part in interviews and were not pressured into them.

The number of offenders interviewed by the researcher was thought to be adequate, although it was partially affected by prison circumstances. Since most of the questions asked about patterns of residential burglary, and were open-ended, (enabling the attainment of more detailed information), it was believed that a larger number of interviews would produce a huge amount of data, which would get out of hand and becomes uncontrollable. In addition, the prison authorities did not allow a longer stay in prison. Also, the prison circumstances dictated the termination of interviewing procedure.

In terms of the concepts used, careful attention was paid to the use of equivalent terms representing similar meanings. Translations made by the researcher were assessed by an additional translator, some one in the academic profession of both Persian and English languages. Legal definitions of theft and burglary were handled attentively.

In general, it was thought that the researcher has been fairly successful in the collection of all the information necessary for the research, and the research methods employed has sustained 'on the face of it' validity. Considering the difficult situation in Tehran, where every piece of information related to various aspects of crime is considered highly confidential, the fact that most data were obtained from numerous sources strengthens its value and validity.

3.6 Reliability

All the research data was collected by the researcher herself, therefore, removing the
problem of inter-rater reliability. Interviews were undertaken by tape-recording where verbatim transcription was made at a later stage. Although most questions producing the data on patterns of crime were open-ended, all questions were uniformly and consistently asked of all respondents, and it was also ensured that they understood the question.

Although according to research plan, an agreement was made between the researcher and her first supervisor to conduct between 25 to 30 interviews, the researcher, after facing so many problems in accessing offenders in prison, assumed that she may never be given such an opportunity again, therefore, decided to carry out as many interviews as possible. This decision was made for a number of reasons: first of all, it is generally known to researchers that interviews are one-off data collection process, missing or incomplete data are very difficult to compensate for; second, since the fieldwork was carried out in another country, under enormously difficult circumstance, there was absolutely no chance of adding-on or repeating the interviews, at a later stage. Moreover, a considerable amount of money and time was consumed on these journeys; therefore, it would put the researcher in great difficulty, if she had to travel again to gather more information. For all these reasons, attempts were made to include as many offenders as possible in the interviews. However, as interviews were progressing, it was felt that interviews were beginning to produce similar information, in other words, the research had reached saturation point. Also, as mentioned earlier, the prison authorities decided that it was time to terminate the interviews.

Hopefully, the working environment and the stress associated with interviews, did not affect the researcher's data analysis, as there was a sufficient gap between the conduct of interviews, their transcription, translation, and analysis of data. In addition, the researcher left Tehran, as soon as she gathered her information, the remaining work was carried out in England, therefore, sufficient time and space was given to the researcher to carry out her work in a more peaceful environment.
The past experience of the researcher in conducting interviews with offenders enabled her to handle interviews calmly and rationally. However, as interviews were progressing the researcher sustained more confidence as how to deal with more difficult offenders. Elaborating on the point, every offender had to be dealt with according to his personal characteristics, some were fairly easy to communicate with, very co-operative, willing to share their knowledge and experiences with the researcher. Interviews carried out with these offenders were conducted in a much more relaxed environment, data were easily gathered, giving the offenders the space and freedom to express their opinions and describe their prior experiences in more length and detail to trace the patterns they followed in conducting their crime activities. The main problem with these offenders, however, was controlling them and keeping them to the research question, which was not always an easy task to accomplish.

At the other extreme, there were some offenders, with whom communication was extremely difficult. They offered fairly brief statements, they barely elaborated on the points made in their answers, and in general, kept their information to themselves. These offenders were much more difficult to handle. The researcher asked several detailed questions to obtain as much information as possible. In these situations where offenders were less willing to talk, and were reluctant to share their experience- perhaps because they thought it might affect their sentence, the researcher tended to spend more time and effort to explain the aims of the research, ensuring these offenders that the information was to be used for academic purposes only, and would not affect their prison sentences. Some of these offenders were stressed by the formality of being interviewed. In such situations the researcher attempted to create a more relaxed and calm environment, by spending some time speaking about social or daily topics, in order to “break the ice” and create a friendly atmosphere for the interview. Also, conducting a pilot study gave the researcher confidence, as the questions asked were relevant and appropriate.
The criteria set for these interviewees, that they were convicted offenders, increased the reliability of the data. Since the criminal activities of convicted offenders were revealed to the police and courts, the majority of these offenders described their experiences to the researcher. In many occasions, these offenders talked about burglaries that were not known to the police. Of course, all these offenders were promised confidentiality at the beginning of every interview.

3.7 Obtaining the Data

3.7.1 Sources of Data

Examination of patterns of burglary in Tehran (aim 4) was assumed to be possible using different methodologies:

Data for producing patterns of residential burglary could be collected from various sources, i.e. victims, the police crime records, suspects arrested while kept in police station or in prison awaiting trial, convicted offenders serving prison sentence, etc. Whatever the source, the data could be collected by the use of face-to-face interviews or mailed questionnaires. Interviews, however, were preferred to questionnaires for a number of reasons. The main reason was that interviews located the researcher face to face with the respondents. Interviews are direct and involve first-hand data collection, therefore, produce more reliable data. Face-to-face interviews also enable the researcher to obtain more detailed information, and permit further investigation on subjects which are answered briefly by offenders. Direct interviews also increase the response rate, as they give the researcher the opportunity to explain the aims and objectives of the research. They also enhance the researcher’s control over respondents, by encouraging them to answer questions as fully as possible. This method of research is preferable to mailed questionnaires, especially in countries and environments where respondents are not used to filling in questionnaires, and where authorities are less likely to co-operate with research.
Of course, face-to-face interviews have disadvantages. Whilst interviews have the advantages of producing first-hand more detailed information, they have their disadvantages too. Interviews are time-consuming, exhaust the researcher as they must be performed with care and attention, and the time restriction imposed by authorities may limit their number. Furthermore, tape-recorded interviews take a considerable amount of time to transcript. Since detailed interviews are very time-consuming, they are often conducted only on a small number of offenders, and this of course may effect any generalisations of findings in the population. In cases where random sampling is not possible, the sample may not be representative, and again may not allow generalisation. Some of these limitations have been compensated here by obtaining information on patterns of residential burglary from other sources. It is expected that interviews with the head of DPS and police officers, the statistical data from the police, geographical, social and cultural studies, studies of housing types, etc. will supplement the interviews with offenders, and produce a more comprehensive picture of criminality in Tehran.

The sources that could be consulted for data collection, to a large extent, were determined by the subject studied. It is believed by the researcher that no source of information is more reliable than interviews with offenders, as they are the perpetrators, and they decide when, where, and how to commit the burglaries. However, there are other sources that can be consulted. For example, interviews with victims, interviews with arrested suspects, or by examining police crime records. These sources of information were assumed to produce less reliable information for various reasons. The crime records held by the police, as it has been mentioned above, are unreliable, a great deal of data is missing and there are inconsistencies in the records.

Also, interviews with suspects of residential burglary, was another option. This method however has a number of problems, namely that the police disliked the idea of interviews being made with suspects before their investigation was completed. Also, suspects are likely to be reluctant to be interviewed at a stage before trial. The results of such interviews, even if permitted, were likely to generate unrealistic and unreliable
information. Data collection through interviews with victims was also problematic, as the police are uncomfortable about giving access to victim's residential addresses. Moreover, since this method of research is uncommon in Tehran, victims are unlikely to co-operate in such situations.

It is important to note that accomplishing the fieldwork was feasible, only because of the contacts the researcher had established with various institutions and certain key authorities. Although she was resident in UK for over a decade, during the two visits (each lasted six months) that she had to Tehran, she had the opportunity to work on crime projects for the police, and for the prisons organisation, which made her fully familiar with the ways in which the system work. The familiarity with the system and the good relationships with the authorities, greatly facilitated the conduct of this research, a task which would be almost impossible for any other researcher who lacked such facilities.

However, and despite these factors that helped put the researcher in a better position to carry out her fieldwork, the fact still remains that sources of information such as crime statistics in Tehran, not only are kept confidential and inaccessible, but also are basic and disorganised. This makes them inadequate for any type of advanced statistical analysis. Also, the absence of other empirical studies prevents the production of profound and extensive quantitative and qualitative research, a matter which is hoped to be resolved in time.

3.7.2 Conducting the Interviews

In general, and despite all the problems, interviews were accomplished successfully, with few administrative difficulties. There was fair co-operation by the prison authorities, prison staff, and the prisoners themselves who were in charge of the audiovisual equipment and on one occasion repaired my tape-recorder. They also provided lunch and cups of tea every hour. They also provided me with prisoners and supervised
the burglars while waiting for their turns to be interviewed.

Interviews with the 39 men and 2 women were carried out in a small room, originally allocated for educational purposes. Each interview took about 1 hour to 90 minutes. Interviews were carried out in a quite and peaceful environment, no members from the prison authorities were present. All interviews were tape-recorded. Personnel in charge of providing offenders for interviews were asked not to exert any pressure on offenders to participate in the interviews. To ensure the offender’s consent, all offenders were given an explanation about the nature of research. This ensured confidentiality, and they were given the choice about whether they wanted to participate. Once they had consented to the initial interview and started answering the questions, they were encouraged to complete the interview.

Moreover, some interviews were made with the head of the District Police Stations, seeking their comments on similar issues asked from offenders. This additional information from key authorities, who have extensive experience in dealing with enormous amount of crimes, was believed to enrich and validate the information from offenders.

3.8 Personal Observations from Interviews

It was learned during the interviews that almost all these offenders came from poor and lower class families. However, the majority of them were big-spenders, and they spent the money earned from crime, generously and easily. No matter how poor they were, they were very ambitious and determined to lead a more comfortable life, when they are older. With crime many offenders were able to enjoy the luxuries of life they always dreamed about, but maintained the absolute hatred for the rich and wealthy people.

It was interesting to observe the physical build of these offenders. The majority, almost
all residential burglars, were short in height, slim (fit), fast, and lightweight. This made me wonder how people with a tendency to offend select, or get selected, intentionally or unintentionally, by their physical characteristics. The sample I interviewed was physically very fit in order to commit the type of crime they had chosen (except one offender, who was tall, heavy with a strong build, whose main activity was dealing in arms, and he claimed to be mainly leading and supervising the gang rather than conducting the burglaries himself).

In general, the researcher found the interviews with residential burglars stimulating. When talking to residential burglars in a friendly environment, where they can express their feelings and speak their minds, they give the impression of being reasonable individuals, not much different from ordinary people. However, it is imaginable that the same innocent-looking individual would give a victim enormous fright and hatred, in a different situation.

3.9 Theories Behind the Research

The previous sections made clear that the research intended is based upon the 'opportunity' theories including the 'rational choice' and the 'routine activity' perspectives. The hypotheses made by this research in relation to both rationality and routine activity models of crime are as follow:

1) Burglars are rational in relation to times selected for conducting their burglaries.
2) Burglars are rational in relation to places selected for conducting their burglaries.
3) Burglars are rational in selection and employment of operational methods for conducting their burglaries.
4) Both victims' and burglars' routine activities strongly influence the times selected for conducting burglaries.
5) Both victims' and burglars' routine activities strongly influence the places (areas/houses) selected for conducting burglaries.
The results from this research, depending on the confirmation or rejection of the hypothesis, and depending on burglary patterns found in Western countries and in Tehran, may be analysed accordingly:

1) Similarities in patterns of burglary, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to similarity in factors producing similar effects.

2) Differences in patterns of burglary, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to differences in factors producing different effects.

3) Similarities in patterns of burglary, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to capability of 'opportunity theory' in explaining burglary patterns in both countries.

4) Differentiation in patterns of burglary, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to incapability of 'opportunity theory' in explaining burglary patterns in Tehran.

5) Similarities in both patterns of burglary and in the theoretical framework underlying such patterns, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to transferability of situational solutions for reduction of burglary in Tehran.

6) Differentiation in both patterns of burglary and in the theoretical framework underlying such patterns, in both Western countries and in Tehran, may be an indication to unsuitability of situational solutions for reduction of burglary in Tehran.

In this research, residential burglary is counted as the independent variable; the physical environment, the social, economic and cultural factors are counted as the dependent variables. These variables are used to explain and describe patterns of residential burglary in both countries.
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SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF LIVING IN TEHRAN AND THEIR IMPACT ON CRIME

As set out in chapter 3, aim 2 is to determine some of the economic, social, cultural, and environmental factors shaping or influencing patterns of residential burglary, in Tehran. It’s sub aims are:

a) To examine the geographical, and demographic features of Tehran and their economic implications;

b) To determine the changes in the built environment and types of housing in Tehran during the last few decades. This is used to provide background information for explaining patterns of residential burglary, which is discussed in chapter 6;

c) To determine the social and cultural implications of such built environment, areal division, and types of housing influencing offender’s target-selection. It will specifically focus on factors such as population density, structure of the family, immigration, modernisation, unemployment, and areal characteristics; and will demonstrate how changes in such factors have shaped the life-style, as well as the crime patterns in Tehran today.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended to determine some of the social, cultural, and environmental factors shaping or influencing patterns of residential burglary, in Tehran. Since Tehran has been selected as a place where the fieldwork would be conducted, providing some information about the built environment, the housing type, and the life-style of people living in different areas of Tehran may be essential, to prepare a platform that facilitates
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explanation of burglary patterns in Tehran (which is explained in chapter 6). This is assumed to be especially useful to those who may not be adequately familiar with Tehran, or have little information about its social and cultural implications.

This chapter is intended, first to present briefly some information about the geographical and demographic features of this city (section 4.2). It will also examine the recent influential changes that have occurred in the urban environment and in the types of housing in Tehran, during the last few decades (section 4.3). The social and cultural implications of such changes influencing patterns of residential burglary in Tehran, will be addressed in section 4.4. In doing so, the characteristics of various areas in Tehran will be examined. These will show how variables such as growth of population, changes in the structure of the family, unemployment rate, immigration and its socio-economic impact on the lives of immigrants, and modernisation will influence areal characteristics, and how they are likely to produce areas with high concentration of both offenders and offences. In other words, this section will examine how economic and social changes occurred within the last few decades have shaped the life-style, as well as the crime patterns in the present Tehran.

This chapter is based upon data gathered from various sources. The information for demonstration of the built environment has been gathered from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Planning. This information, however, was very limited and had to be supplemented by information obtained through interviews made with architects and engineers about recent changes made to the housing types, street systems and town planning. Accurate and systematic information on Tehran’s social and cultural patterns was also difficult to obtain. Thus, attempts have been made to cite evidence and give references on information of social, ideological, and cultural issues, as well as the types of housing and built environment. Where necessary, due to lack of references, I have relied on my own knowledge and experience, as a person who has grown up, studied, and has witnessed several historical events, and has shared cultural and social values with people living in Tehran.
4.2 Geographical and Demographical Features of Tehran

Iran (used to be called Persia) is a country in the Middle East, surrounded from the north by Russia; from the west by Iraq and Turkey, from the east by Afghanistan, and Pakistan; and from the south by the Persian-Gulf Arab Countries. Iran is located on the southern slopes of the superb Mount of Damavand. Iran, according to the statistical census in 1992, has an area of 1,648,195 km² and the population, according to the latest census, carried out in 1996, is 60 million (population growth rate: 2.5%) (National Atlas of Iran, 1996, Vol. 1 on population). A map of Iran is provided in figure 1, in Appendix II.

Tehran is the capital and the largest city of Iran. Tehran, as the capital has attracted the highest concentration of political, economic, commercial, and social activities for its historical background. Its geographical location is in the central north of Iran and it has spread to the southern part of the Alborz Mountain, which incidentally has had a major influence on its natural well being therefore its selection as a capital. This has also had an effect on the way various districts have developed, and on the way it has accommodated different social class divisions into its areas.

Tehran, is used to refer to two terms: 1) the Province of Tehran, which consists of 10 cities and towns of Ray, Damavand, Varamin, Karaj, Shemiranat, Islamshahr, city of Tehran, Savojbalagh, Shahryar, and Ghazvin (see figure 2, Appendix II); and 2) the city of Tehran, which is the central city of the province of Tehran and the capital city of Iran. The term 'Tehran', which is discussed in this chapter, refers to metropolitan Tehran, unless stated otherwise.

The city of Tehran, with the population of 6,794,348 is the central city and the most concentrated city in the province of Tehran. The contemporary Tehran is divided by the municipality into 20 metropolitan districts (Figure 3, Appendix II). Each of these 20 areas is divided into sub-districts, of which there are 118 in total. These divisions have
been developed following the general development and areal expansion of Tehran since it became the capital, two hundred years ago.

4.3. The Built Environment and Types of Housing in Tehran and their Socio-economic Implications

4.3.1 The Urban Structure of Tehran and its Socio-economic Implications

The geographical location of Tehran and its natural characteristics has had a major influence on the way its built environment was constructed, the way its various districts have been developed, and on the way it has accommodated different social class divisions into its areas. The urban structure and the built environment are developed in south-north direction, which has had profound socio-economic implications for living in Tehran. The main and the most visible feature of life in Tehran is the way the population is distributed in various locations, which clearly shows that the southern parts of Tehran have accommodated the poor and the lower-income class division whilst the northern parts have been dominated by the wealthy and the affluent division of the society. In other words, the movement from south to north is clearly demonstrated with the increase in wealth and in facilities, better climate, better built environment and better living conditions. This has its roots in history and the way the city of Tehran developed from south to north. The city expanded towards the north as these areas attracted the attention of the kings and the rich. It has a superior climate compared with southern areas.

Tehran is situated on the southern slopes of the Alborz mountain, being 1800 m above the sea-level, at the northernmost, and 1160 m at its south-eastern border, a difference of more than 640m between the two furthest points of the city (Figure 5, Appendix II). This dramatic difference in height has created considerable difference in temperature, as it becomes cooler the further we go to the north. This has also had significant impact on the characteristics of the urban environment in Tehran. Many of the buildings were constructed in the north-south direction to adapt to climate conditions, which is
generally hot and dry— the annual average temperature of 17°C. The extreme temperature can reach to a maximum of 44°C in summer and a minimum of -14°C in winter (Madanipour, 1998: 106). Also the street system in Tehran has been constructed according to the north-south divide where the slope and the mountains in the north provide visibility and a sense of direction. The north has the natural advantage of a better supply of water, a visual dominance over the south, the countryside, and a better climate.

The use of land in Tehran, that is the distribution of commercial and industrial activities has also had an impact on the present structure of the urban environment and on the distribution of residential areas. Industrial activities (estates) are mainly located in west and southwest, often outside the residential boundaries of Tehran. The rapid growth of population has led to the expansion of the city towards the west, thereby lessening the distance between industrial estates and residential areas.

Commercial activities were initiated and have traditionally been concentrated in the traditional place, bazaar, located in the Central part of the old city. This was also the core of the old city and contained most offices and governmental buildings (Figure 6, Appendix II). With the growth of population and the expansion of activities, however, the central bazaar could not respond to the expanding needs of the public, therefore, such activities were pushed into surrounding residential areas. The new and modern street system also encouraged street-based business, locating major businesses in the centre of the city, and less major ones elsewhere. Small firms and shopping centres are now scattered around the less dense residential areas, providing local access for residents. However, the major commercial activities are still concentrated in central parts, resulting in over-population of this part of the city and surrounding areas during the day. On the other hand, these areas observe a dramatic decrease in the population during the night.

Changes in the population and commercial activities also changed the residential settings of the city. Later developments tended to shift residential areas as far as possible from the centre of commerce. In old Tehran, the main part of Tehran contained only the
present southern parts, which were used partially for business and trades, whilst the other major parts were used for residential purposes. Gradually throughout the development of Tehran, the residential areas, previously located in central bazaar were mainly demolished, preventing further development of residential areas in districts where it originally is designated for business purposes, therefore, there appeared a tendency to shift the residential areas to the northern parts, which later became part of the development of the more northern areas. This was the basis for the establishment of a classification that allocated wealthy people in the north, where there is a moderate climate, and maintained the residence of less wealthy people in the south. This produced a distinct division of the north-south, divide which developed later, and still is a major social issue in the contemporary Tehran. Despite this division, there were some southern and central parts of Tehran, which accommodated wealthy businessmen, who preferred to reside in houses close to their trading place, Bazaar. Figure 6 (in Appendix II) illustrates the land use in the contemporary Tehran. Figure 7 (in Appendix II) illustrates the pattern of the urban structure of the contemporary Tehran.

The growth of population, the expansion of commercial activities, and residential settings produced a pattern that had significant social and economic implications. Although residential areas are extended from north, south, east and west, the way they have attracted social class divisions into their areas are clearly different: such developments encouraged those wealthier inhabitants to reside further from the centre of the city, to privileged northern areas (where most palaces were built by the rulers and kings for their summer residences). Accordingly it made those less wealthy move to western and eastern areas, and further pushed the most deprived group to reside in areas further south, where the living conditions were poor and disadvantaged.

4.3.2 The Housing System and its Socio-economic Implications

In Tehran the old houses were traditionally built in circular introverted form, around a courtyard with no windows to the street, its external face was formed of a blank high
wall and a gate. It contained two distinctive sections called 'andarooni' and 'birooni', with large courtyards in the middle intending to reserve the cool fresh air that may be deposited during the night of hot summers (see Figure 4, Appendix II). Walls were built high to enhance this cooling process (Fathi, 1986; Tavassoli, 1982), also to maintain privacy and safety. The more recent urban environment consisted of houses with an absence of central courtyards with windows opening on to the street (Figure 8, Appendix II). High walls are still used in most residential buildings as responding to the needs for security and privacy. The new house patterns are built to take advantage of two major factors, of the wind direction and of the sun. These factors have changed the buildings along the north-south axis, to improve the circulation of fresh air. Therefore, in the 1930s, the basic pattern was set for housing and street development, which restricted the construction of the main building to the northern part of the land\(^1\) (placing the courtyard in the southern part), and to expose buildings to the winter sun. By introducing this building regulation new houses were of two types: the northern type, where the external door leads to a front yard, garden or parking space then leading to the internal door which enters the house; and the southern type, where the external door leads directly into inside of the house (more detailed explanation in chapter 6). In the latter type the courtyard is located at the back of the house, often having a shared wall leading to the courtyard of the house which is located in an adjacent street.

These different types of houses produce differences in the selection of targets by offenders in residential burglary. These will be discussed in detail in chapter 6. Changes in the housing types, from the old to the new forms have altered aspects of privacy and security, as well as the relationship of its occupants with the environment. They have also improved communication with other people, as these houses are modern with

---

\(^1\) Another determining factor goes back to the historical Islamic background of the inhabitants. Tehran as one of the cities accommodating inhabitants who are 98% Muslim, it has taken an urban form to conform to Islamic rules of living. Muslim people are required to practice daily prayer, standing in the direction of Qibla (the house of Kaaba in the holy city of Mecca). This is towards the south-west of Tehran. Therefore, the urban form has traditionally been so laid out to face Qibla, which is the general orientation towards the south-west and the south of Tehran. This has been a requirement of urban planning in both the old and new layout of the city.
windows, and shared spaces with other occupants, i.e. parking spaces and corridors.\textsuperscript{2}

However, nowadays all areas of Tehran contain houses which are built either in southern or northern style. Some people prefer the northern types as they produce a more beautiful view of the house, while others prefer the southern type as these produce more effective safety and are less attractive to burglars.

This revolutionary change in the housing type has been a significant factor in changing the life-style of the middle and upper classes. The use of modern materials especially in northern areas have improved the structure as well as the shape and appearance of residential buildings, and made them more attractive. The residents of such areas have used the notion of modernity to show their wealth. Fundamental changes in the housing type have also changed the levels of security in these houses, for example the new houses have replaced the small rectangular windows with larger ones, and solid high external doors with decorative ones, the latter produce more visibility to passers-by who can now see into the garden, parking space, and internal doors. These changes have implications for the patterns of burglary in Tehran (see chapter 6).

4.4 The Social, Economic, and Cultural Implications of Living in Tehran

The social, economic and cultural characteristics of the city and the life-style of people living in the contemporary Tehran are influenced by a number of interrelating factors, which has dramatically changed the face of the city during the last few decades. These factors are expected to play a major role in explaining patterns of residential burglary in Tehran (discussed in chapter 6):

\textsuperscript{2} The modernisation of housing system and their impact on the social relationships and the way it has changed the attitudes and behaviour of people living in different areas of Tehran, also its effect on
1. Centralisation of political, social and commercial activities in the capital city,
2. Rapid growth of population,
3. Changes in the structure of family,
4. Modernisation leading to increasing living standards and rising expectations,
5. Immigration of people from other cities and villages, and movement of the lower class into the south and periphery of the city, which leads to suburbanisation,
6. Unemployment of especially the lower-income young people.

These factors determine the quality of life of inhabitants living in Tehran, producing profound effects on their personal and social relationships. The life in Tehran is deeply influenced by the following factors, all inter-related and one leading to another. The concentration of political, social and commercial activities in the capital city attract a large number of people immigrating from different towns and villages, and lead to a rapid growth of population in the capital city, creating a tremendous influence on the housing, employment rate, and other aspects of life. Also changes in the family structure and independence of the young couples from their parents result in a higher demand for housing. Modernisation is another factor that influences people’s attitudes towards living standards, leading to changes in the life-style and rise of life expectations. All these factors, in an over-crowded city, determine the living standard of those who can afford a better life, and the larger section of society who cannot, by pushing them into the edges of the city, creating several problems including crime and offending.

4.4.1 Centralisation of Political, Social and Commercial Activities in the Capital City

It was the common tendency of all the kings, and all the governing systems ruling over the country that they centralised the major political, commercial, architectural, cultural, and residential activities in the cities that they had selected as their capital. Prior to Tehran, most of the large and famous cities of contemporary Iran such as Shiraz,
Isfahan, Tabriz, and Mashhad have all been the capital city for a period of time, and they all have witnessed superiority over other cities in their time of being the capital city. There was a concentration of power by allocation of the military, the courts and government offices in Tehran; the concentration of wealth and resources by the allocation of almost all factories, industrial enterprises, businesses in Bazaar and other street-based trading in Tehran. Also the building of several educational establishments including special high-schools and enormous universities and technology colleges in the capital city, all resulted in attracting people from various towns and villages that had fewer facilities and provided less opportunities for study and work. These led to a disproportionate growth of population in Tehran.

It was also the tradition of the kings and the ruling systems that while paying special attention to the capital, they ignored other cities and towns, especially the enormous number of villages located in the surrounding areas. In addition, since Tehran remained the capital city for a considerable length of time (200 years), the long-term effects and consequences of such a tradition became gradually significant. They resulted in the problems encountered by the government and people living in capital city, as well as the problems encountered by people living in smaller towns and villages. A continued policy of centralisation of major activities in the capital led to several problems, including over-population.

4.4.2 Rapid Growth of Population in the Capital City

Since the selection of Tehran as a capital city, 200 years ago, this city has encountered a continued growth of population. With the rapid flow of population from around the country to Tehran, according to the census in the period between 1867 and 1991, the population has grown more than 40 times (Markaz-e Motale’at, 1994: 19). The growth of population and the annual growth rate of the city of Tehran, between 1956 and 1986 are demonstrated in the table below:
Table 4.1: The growth of population and the annual growth rate, city of Tehran, 1956-1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
<td>2.9 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>5.4 m</td>
<td>6.0 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual growth rate</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Abadi, Ministry of Housing and Urban Development*

It can be seen from the table that the annual population rate has rapidly increased between 1956 and 1966; a slower increase is evident between 1966 and 1986. However, it has to be noted that the expansion of some areas of Tehran has been disproportionately lower, especially in the north and south of the city. The areal expansion and the limited facilities available in Tehran do not respond to the needs of the people living in Tehran. This creates an even bigger problem where such facilities are not spread equally throughout various areas of Tehran, as the wealthy and better-off areas benefit from a higher concentration of facilities whilst the poorer areas attain a much lower proportion.

In 1991, the city of Tehran had a population of 6,475,527 ((Markaz-e Motale’at, 1994:2), accounting for more than a fifth of the country’s urban population. This figure refers only to the 20 districts within the official boundaries of the city, and does not include the counties with close ties with Tehran (Figure 9, Appendix II). The population of Tehran City with the other six counties of Ray, Karaj, Savojbalagh, Shahryar, Shemiranat, and Varamin all together, according to the same source of information, was 9,140,239, in 1991. At the same time, the population of the province of Tehran, including the city with all its counties reached 9.98 million. This figure increased to 11.1 million in 1996, with an annual growth rate of 2%. This growth is slightly above the national population rate, shown in the period of 1986-96, which is 1.81 (Ettela’at, 13 January 1997 and 29 May 1997).

The disproportionate growth of population had many consequences and dramatically
changed the quality of life for most its inhabitants. The growth of population, first of all, increasingly intensified demands for housing. A large number of houses were built during the last few decades, to respond to the need for accommodation of the over-populated city. The city of Tehran has expanded from west, east, and to a lesser extent from north and south. The high demand for housing was also met by the horizontal growth of buildings (apartments and high-rise buildings) enabling residency of a much larger number of people in a particular area, which previously housed one or two families (see Figure 8). It also enabled housing large number of families more economically sharing public facilities such as courtyard and car parking space.

The increased housing led to a considerable decrease in the size of the dwellings. The smaller size houses mainly accommodated the new married couples who tended to live independently of their parents, and the less wealthy and immigrants who could not afford larger houses. The table below shows the number of houses, and the average number of people living in each dwelling, in Tehran, between 1966 and 1986:

Table 4.2: The number of dwellings and the average number of individuals living in each dwelling, in Tehran, 1966-1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of houses</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>1,163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of people/per house</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical Census, Tehran, 1988

The table shows the large increase in the number of houses between 1966 and 1986, in Tehran. The number of houses in the province of Tehran, according to the same source of information is 2,300,000 for the population of about 12 million, in 1997, an average of 5.2 people living in each house. The concentration of people and houses in various areas of Tehran is shown to be varied, with a higher concentration in southern areas compared to the north. The table below shows the number of individuals living in each
house, the number of people living in each room (depending on the number of rooms located in each household) and the average number of rooms per house, in various districts of Tehran. In this table district 1 and 2 have been selected as typical districts are representing northern areas, a large district of 9 representing west, district 13 and 14 for east, and districts 19 and 20 are representing southern areas.

Table 4.3: The number of individuals living in each house, the number of people living in each room, and the average number of rooms per house, in various districts of Tehran, in 1986.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Persons per house</th>
<th>Persons per room</th>
<th>No. of rooms per house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table that although the size of the houses located in southern areas are considerably smaller than those in northern areas, and are relatively smaller than those located in west and east, the number of people living in each house is higher, and the average number of rooms in each house is lower. This is an indication of the higher concentration of the population as they go from north to south, as well as showing the more disadvantaged living circumstances in southern districts. Similar sources show that only 5.8% of the total number of houses within the city of Tehran are built in northern areas, while 34% of them are built in southern areas. It also shows that 9.2% of the total houses are built in central areas, 22.6% in the west and 29% were built in eastern areas. Again, these statistics strongly suggest the much greater concentration of population and number of houses from the south to north.

High demands on housing respectively affected the price of land, and price of built dwellings in Tehran (see Figure 10, Appendix II). During the last few decades, these
prices have increased dramatically. For example, the price of land in Tehran is 2.3 times higher than other large cities. However, land prices in throughout Tehran differ depending on location. In 1995, the lowest residential land price was in district 20 of Tehran, the southern most part of the city, valued at IR 185,000 per square metre, while the highest land price was found in district 1, the northern most part of Tehran, valued at IR 3,205,000 per square metre, 17 times higher (Ettela’at international, 14 June 1996 in Madanipour, 1998: 186). Price differentiation comes from differences in the physical conditions and the quality of life in those areas. This is also an indication of a profound economic gap and social polarisation in the city.

With increased inflation and an increase in the price of land, the old single-storey courtyard houses are let for renting and used as multi-occupancy. This is especially the case in areas around the central bazaar (southern and central districts), where the majority of old houses have been turned into businesses or warehouses, or to multi-occupancy for immigrant workers. In other residential areas (i.e. western and eastern districts) the old patterns of dwellings were mainly demolished and multi-storey flats erected. These were mainly let for rent or sale. In the 1980s these types of constructions were dominant, and old buildings were demolished and replaced with new multi-storey buildings, advertised for sale to obtain enormous profit for construction companies, or private constructors. Multi-storey flats were also built by the middle and lower-class families, to provide independent residency for offspring, or to live in one flat themselves and let other flats for rent, as a source of income. The newer houses, if not demolished, and if they had the strength to take additional floors, were also used for offspring, or for rent or sale, as a source of income for the family.

In more well-off areas (mainly northern districts), and less dense residential areas, larger apartments were built to cater for the middle and upper class families. The northern half of the city, which accommodates the middle and upper class, is distinguished by a wide range of social and physical privileges. The north has tree-lined streets, with larger
houses, lower densities, higher land prices, smaller household, a higher concentration of modern facilities, and more green space. It also has visual superiority over the south, enjoys a better climate and suffers less from pollution. These privileges of the north to the south cause a wide social and physical gap.

The inflation and the incontrollable rises in the price of land seem to have had and continue to favour the wealthy (the middle and upper class) and the private sector. They created opportunities for this section of the society to invest and to construct large-scale, modern, European types of dwellings, in northern areas. By selling or letting these properties to those who could afford such prices, they constantly increased their wealth. On the other hand, the rapid rise in the price of land was a heavy burden on the shoulders of the lower-income groups, (i.e. wage earners and unemployed) who had to rely on the transformation of the family assets, aid from relatives, small loans from informal charitable resources, or larger loans from private bodies with a very high rate of interest, in the 1980s and 1990s. It has to be noted that the contribution of the government in an attempt to provide more affordable housing for the lower class division has not been considerable during the last two decades, the government, between 1990 and 1995, has promoted its share of investment into housing production from 2% in 1991 to 8% in 1994 (Abadi, No.13, 1994: 56-8), a share which is considerably insufficient in responding to the housing needs of these groups in Tehran.

4.4.3 Changes in the Structure of the Family

A major factor effecting the high demand on housing is the change in the family structure, from extended families of the 19th Century to the nuclear families of the 20th Century, which means a higher number of houses for the same number of people. In the

---

3 This situation may have similarities and may be supported by 'radical theories' derived from the conflict and Marxist theories, which emphasise on the role of inequality (relate to the distribution of wealth and power in society) in generating crime.
19th Century, married offspring used to live in the same house with their parents. Changes in the family structure, and tendency of offspring to live independent meant the need for a larger number of houses in a certain area. Changes in the family structure also changed the number of households per dwelling, reduced the number of persons per room (see tables 4.2 & 4.3 in the previous section). In 1976 about 30% of all the dwellings in the city had multi-occupancy, which were reduced to 14% in 1986 (Rafiei, 1989: 6).

The tendency for independent life by young couples who could not afford to purchase or own a house in their early married life, increased the demand for rented houses, which has resulted in a considerable increase in the price of monthly rent of, especially of small houses and apartments. The constant rise in the price of houses, which was due to inadequate space to respond to the high demand for accommodation of large numbers of households, resulted in decrease in the rate of ownership. For example, in 1883, about 90% of dwellings were owned by their households, while this is reduced to only a half in the 1950s and 1960s (Madanipour, 1998: 141). A similar reason also led to rises in the rate of the rent.

Changes in the structure of the family, inflation, and the high cost of living led to many problems, especially for those young people who had lower income or did not receive financial support from their parents. In traditional families where a man brought his wife to live with his parents, often the expenses were shared and families provided each other support when facing financial, emotional, and psychological hardships. There was less pressure felt on individuals living under the same roof. The newly wedded son did not have to work as hard, as he did not have to pay rent or buy an independent house/apartment. These families had a lower rate of unemployment as they often carried on with the family business.

---

4 As a traditional custom, man was responsible for the provision of accommodation for his wife; therefore, the bride was usually taken to the man's parent's house.
The financial difficulties faced by young people, who had the tendency for an independent life but could not afford it, delayed the age of marriage. Psychological and emotional problems of unmarried young people, in a society where extra-marital socialisation between boys and girls is prohibited, can lead to rebellion against the authorities. On the other hand, those married couples who cannot compete with increasing costs, especially high rent, may intentionally or unintentionally get involved in illegal activities to increase their budget. Similarly, as a result of financial problems many marriages end up in divorce (an average of 1 in 8 in 1994 for the province of Tehran against 1 in 14 for the whole country) (Markaz-e Amar, 1996a: 48), which subsequently lead to a larger number of children being brought up by lone-parents.

4.4.4 Modernisation Leading to Different Life-style

The process of modernisation and prevalence of a European life-style, which has taken place during the last few decades, has significantly enhanced the living standards of Tehranian inhabitants (see photograph 1 in appendix III). Residents of, especially middle and upper classes, have shown a tendency to inhabit modern luxury houses.

It was seen earlier that the natural privileges associated with living in northern parts of Tehran have attracted the wealthy citizens to reside there. During the last few decades, the beautification of the external appearance of residential premises and the use of highly expensive materials and decorative designs have become fashionable amongst the well-off, and are regarded as an expression of wealth and economic affluence. The exterior appearance of the residential buildings in the northern, recently renovated dwellings, and its tremendous differentiation with exterior appearance of southern dwellings demonstrates the severity of this social gap between the two.

---

5 Several previous Western studies, including BCS have confirmed the association between offending and living in economically deprived areas with high proportion of lone parents households.

6 There is evidence in the past social science research that societies undergoing rapid socio-economic changes, i.e. growth of population, industrialisation, modernisation, and urbanisation, provide more room
The life-style (traditional or modern) is usually consistent with the physical fabric of the residential area. However, it has to be noted that not all wealthy people live in modernised types of housing which are recently built in northern areas. There are some traditional middle and upper class residents who often avoid living in areas where there are westernised groups of people, as they do not desire to lead a westernised life-style. Therefore, some areas in the old city, which had accommodated the traditional middle-classes, continue to function in such a manner. On the other hand, not all northern parts of the city are modern, and there exist some specific areas, such as Gholhac, and many of the Shemiranat areas, i.e. Rostam-abad, Ekhtyarieh, Gheytarieh, Darrous and so on, which have a traditional character, and are known as middle-class traditional residential areas. These, nevertheless, constitute only a small number of wealthy people living in traditional areas and are not representative of the overall pattern, which suggests that movement from south to north is associated with the growth of wealth and affluence.

Conformity to modernisation in affluent areas and the increased wealth of a large number of inhabitants living in such areas have changed the life-style of these people. It has encouraged them to spend on building luxurious houses with luxurious facilities such as private swimming pools, Jacuzzis and saunas; and stunning external features such as decorative carved poles and marble effects. The introduction of modern local shopping centres and a concentration of major entertainment facilities such as restaurants, parks, cinemas, leisure centres, etc. in such areas have eliminated the needs of these people to travel to other parts of the city and to central shopping centres such as the Bazaar. This in turn has resulted in a greater segregation of the wealthy and the poor living in the more dense and deprived southern areas. Modernisation has not been restricted to the structure of the houses and the appearance of localities, which has made a clear and distinctive differentiation between the north and south, but has been extended for deviation. The work carried out by Durkeim formulated a theory of Anomie, which suggested that major social and economic changes in societies, if occur so quickly, the society would not have adequate time to develop appropriate regulations to govern social interaction. This in fact occurs in society where traditional norms no longer seem applicable but new norms have not fully evolved. Such a condition in a
to penetrate into many other aspects of their life-style, i.e. the use of modern forms of transport, label-designer and foreign clothing, etc.

Conformity to a luxurious life-style and modernisation was not a problem for those who could easily afford the costs associated with it, but created profound financial as well as psychological and behavioural problems for those who desired a luxurious life-style but were far from affording it. This resulted in a large economic and social gap between the life-style, the habits, and the way fortunate people were distinguished in the society from the less fortunate. The inability of certain groups to afford the least comfortable life, on the other hand, existence of groups of people who were loaded with wealth and luxury, living not too far from the deprived and the unfortunate, created hatred and frustration in the latter. This, although in itself may not result in crime, in association with many other factors such as unemployment, lack of basic social welfare provision, feelings of inadequacy and frustration, etc. may encourage and justify criminal activities of the poor against the rich.

4.4.5 Immigration and the Process of Suburbanisation

Centralisation of political, social and commercial activities, as well as the higher availability of job opportunities in Tehran attracted many people from several towns and villages into Tehran. A higher numbers of households demanding accommodation in a limited space, following the changes in the family structure, resulted in an increased density in central and southern areas. A lack of adequate attention by the government to small towns and villages, the growth of population of those towns, the lack of job opportunities to respond to the needs of residents of those towns, especially for the younger generation, has resulted in a tendency for immigration into Tehran. Immigration as well as the contribution of other factors such as density of population in central Tehran, plus a significant rise in living costs and inflation, has led to a process of suburbanization.

---

society lead to confusion about social norms, of which a rise in the crime rate is one result.
Suburbanisation has created considerable changes in population movement. People are moved from the inner city to peripheral areas, a movement which has led to over-populating the surrounding rural areas. Similarly, following the deterioration of private and family business in the villages, the lack of job opportunities in smaller town, and the rise of living standard and high expectations of young people, the majority of immigrants come to Tehran hoping to be absorbed into the job market (mainly labour work) to finance their family, or to start a new family.

In addition to immigration from other towns and cities to Tehran, a large number of people reside in the province of Tehran come from other countries. For example, following the Iran-Iraq war, and the crisis in Afghanistan, in the period of 1986-1991, about one million (7 per cent of the whole population), immigrated to the province of Tehran. This number constituted of 13% of all immigrants living throughout the country (ibid: 89). The majority of immigrants, about 80%, in 1986-1991, ranged from 6 to 36 years old, with the largest proportion of young males, aged between 20 to 24 years old. In 1991, 55.5% of immigrants were men (Markaz-e Motalea’at, 1994: 154-5).

The structure of the constituent population of those areas is mainly young which is a reflection of the high birth rate among recent immigrants living in rural areas. Although the population of Tehran itself is young with half of its inhabitants younger than 22.3 years (in 1991), the youngest population live in district 19 of Tehran. These consist of poor people, with half of the inhabitants younger than 16.7 years, compared to the central and northern areas where the average rate of age is over 30 years (Markaz-e Motale’at, 1994: 33-4, 83).

The minority groups living in deprived and disadvantaged areas are split from the rest of society for economic and financial problems associated with an over-populated city and limited resources not being equally divided between various social divisions. Suburban areas of Tehran which accommodate mainly immigrants from other cities and counties, and the spatial movement of the lower-classes and labour into those areas has also
produced a decline of the quality of life in inner as well as outer areas, alongside a mixture of ethnic origins especially in district 20 of Tehran such as Islamshahr. The buildings in these areas have poor conditions and suffer from the lack of the most basic facilities such as natural light, electricity, water, and waste disposal. This has created special patterns of life and culture in those areas, including problems of drugs and crime. They also suffer from unemployment and debt.

4.4.6 Unemployment of especially Lower-class Young People

The rapid and disproportionate growth of population, the disproportionate division of sources and facilities within various districts of the city, substantial increases in the housing and living costs, etc. led to unemployment of a large number of young people, especially those with lower access to economic resources. There is no statistic to indicate the rate of unemployment in specific areas of Tehran, but overall, in 1991, Tehran had an unemployment rate of 6.6% (Markaz-e Motale'at, 1995: 55). With the 6.5 million population living in Tehran in 1991, only 38% of people in the age group of 10-64 were economically active, i.e. employed or seeking employment (the 10-14 year olds are counted despite the fact that only 2% of this group were economically active in 1991). This rate when is seen in the context of the whole population shows that there is only one in four in employment.

Women’s unemployment rate is even higher of that in general (12.2%), this rate is more than twice that of men (5.8%). According to statistics in 1991 only 9.8% of women are indicated as economically active (ibid.: 61). Other patterns of employment include a high rate of youth unemployment and a not inconsiderable rate of activity for men over 65. The highest rate of unemployment (20%) is among the 15-19 age group (in 1976 the

7 Studies carried out by the Chicago school of criminology, and the findings by Shaw and Mckay (1942) seem to lend some support to the influence of immigration on the production of criminal behaviour. They explained delinquency behaviour in the neighbourhoods in transition-referred to 'social disorganisation'. The social disorganisation was produced by the invasion of such neighbourhoods by newly arrived immigrants, a group which did not have the resources to live in better areas of the city, also had to face the
rate of unemployment was 12.9% for this age group), as compared to the lowest (2.2%) in the 40-44 age group (ibid.). In the same year, there was a 38.8% rate of activity for men over 65, of whom 83.1% were in employment (ibid.: 64). This, according to Madanipour, indicates an absence of pensions and support mechanisms to allow this age group to retire, as well as the existence of employment opportunities for this group. The high employment rate for this age group is also influenced by the high inflation rate, which forces this group to carry on working either to support themselves or to support their young children with lower income.

These patterns of employment show that middle-age men are the main breadwinners, supporting a young population in growing households. The economy has found it difficult to provide opportunities for the young. The elderly have to be supported by their children or have to work to support themselves. In the absence of the adequate social welfare provisions, it is the household which is the main support structure to cope with these shortcomings. The household remains the basic unit of the economy and the main coping mechanism for confronting economic difficulty. Therefore, if the family or the main breadwinner become unemployed or is in low paid job there will be no financial support to counter the shortcomings and the whole family will suffer the consequences.

The unemployment rate has affected the current social tendencies for the young to engage in higher education. A high inflation rate and the lack of job prospects, also the inability of the young to meet the requirements of establishing an independent life (buying/renting a house, getting married and providing for the family) have encouraged almost all young people, who complete high-school, to study for further education (an extremely challenging and competitive procedure), assuming that the degree and higher qualification would extent their ability to obtain better paid jobs. This is especially the case for those young people who lack the financial support to start an investment in a business. The children of wealthy families feel less pressure for obtaining higher qualifications and often prefer to spend their time in business earning good money and
increasing their experience at the same time, rather than spending a few years in the university where not only no financial gain is involved but also spending large sums of money is expected; as most universities have been established privately to respond to the extremely high demand for higher education. Therefore, lower class families tend to save money to be able to pay the expenses for their children’s higher education, hoping that higher qualification would achieve their children a better future (i.e. better paid jobs, social respect, and probably self-confidence). With the constantly increasing number of graduates every year a surplus of the number of young people who are ready for employment has been created against the number of jobs available. It seems that involvement in higher education has had little effect in increasing young people’s employability but in fact has only delayed their unemployment i.e. four years.

At present there exist a large number of graduates who are still unemployed or have been unable to obtain the types of jobs that meet their expectations, as they lack the experience. The current situation appears to be that young people either do not get a university place, as a result of extremely high demand for higher education, or that they graduate from university but still have little success in obtaining employment. A situation which in many cases has led young people to get involved in false types of jobs such as intermediary, or sometimes in illegal types of jobs such as foreign exchange (a trade which is reasonably profitable but illegal for those not having a licence for it), etc. Unemployment or having to engage in these sort of jobs have created large groups of young people that have lost their hope for a bright future, they are disappointed in their ability to build up an independent life, and are frustrated and strained as a result. This situation is familiar to many young people, of whom the wealthy is more likely to receive family and financial support in building a future for themselves, but the less fortunate who lack this support is highly likely to engage in illegal activities, where the motivation may be created by the social and economic deficiencies and when and where the time and place is right.

* A similar scenario has been proposed by Merton’s strain theory (1938), followed by the Cloward and Ohlin opportunity theory (1959), which suggests that crime is the response to the strains imposed by the
4.5 Summary and Conclusion

The gradual changes made in the city of Tehran, which was due to the continuous changes in the ruling government and the kingdom, have significantly changed the face of the city and the allocation of different classes to different parts of Tehran. Similar factors created broad changes in the built environment and the allocation of the commercial, industrial, and residential areas. The rise in population density, inflation, and increased living standards gradually polarised the city, and unintentionally pushed certain groups of people to live in different parts of the city. It is obvious that significant differences in the economic and social characteristics of those areas were derived from the process of polarisation, and contained considerable influence in determining the impact these characteristics had on the quality of life in different areas.

Changes in the built environment and types of housing, with their social and cultural implications, especially the living circumstances on the edges of the city and in the peripheries, was made worse by the rise in unemployment, high living costs, and lack of adequate facilities in adjacent towns. This resulted in attracting a high number of people into these areas and intensified their problems. The intensified problem of class differences is expected to have major effects on the nature and volume of crime in those and in other areas. The extent to which the built environment, types of housing, as well as the economic and social implication of deprived areas may effect the crime rate and crime pattern of residential burglary, will be demonstrated in chapter six, where the results from the data collected from Tehran, will be discussed. It is also expected that the social and cultural implications of various areas of Tehran, explained in this chapter, will assist in explaining the crime results discussed in chapter six.

society. According to these theories individuals desire to achieve their goal (which according to Merton is mainly material gain) by legitimate and institutionalised rules, but where legitimate opportunities are unavailable to them (either closed or blocked), they tend to gain satisfaction and success by illegitimate means including crime.
CHAPTER FIVE
RESIDENTIAL BURGLARY IN TEHRAN- CRIME STATISTICS, LEGAL ASPECTS, AND POLICE CRIME RECORDING PROCEDURE

Aim 3: To determine residential burglary in Tehran in terms of its legal aspects, crime statistics and police recording procedure

Sub-aims are:

a) To look at the existing literature on residential burglary, in Tehran;

b) To determine the legal aspects, that is to examine at the definition of burglary and its punishment in Iran; Also to demonstrate how it compares with its definition in some Western societies, particularly in UK and US;

c) To look at crime statistics held by the police and other authorities;

d) To examine the police crime recording procedure, that is the way in which burglary is reported by victims and recorded by the police, to establish an estimate as to what extent crime statistics are representative of the actual crime level, and to outline limitations with crime statistics produced by the police.

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended to examine residential burglary in Tehran in terms of legal aspects, crime statistics, and police recording procedure. It will first, look at the limited existing literature on residential burglary, in Tehran (Section 5.2). It will then, address the legal aspects related to burglary with reliance to Iranian law, and will tend to demonstrate how the legal definition of burglary compares with that in particular
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Western countries such as United Kingdom and the United States. It will also look at the impact of the law and its potential in reducing/preventing burglary in Tehran (section 5.3). The remaining section of the chapter will examine the crime figures produced by the police and other related authorities (Section 5.4). Then, the police crime recording procedure will be addressed to determine how reliable crime figures may be in portraying the actual crime situations (Section 5.5).

5.2 Iranian Literature on Residential Burglary

Unlike the Western literature, the Iranian literature on residential burglary is rare. Much of the literature has explained burglary in its legal context. They have mainly discussed burglary by referring to the penal code and have tended to illuminate the legal meaning of codes by justifying what is meant by the constitutional authorities, and how they may be used in various situations to punish offenders. They have neither made an effort to provide criminological and sociological analysis of burglary nor they are based on empirical work. Exceptionally, a few studies have been carried out by research centres, to which permission to access was granted by producing a letter from the authorities. The results from these studies were produced in the form of a report and short articles, and since they were carried out to serve certain purposes, were less reliable in terms of data collection and data analysis. The main sources of data for such studies were police officers, court administrators, and generally those who in one way or another become involved with crime and criminals as a consequence of the nature of their jobs.

In the search for Iranian literature on burglary, only one extensive study was found useful for our purposes, being based on empirical work. The book was published in 1992, and was then discontinued. This work, by Ghorban-Hosseini, although wide and broad in its arguments, has provided sociological and criminological analysis of burglary. He has mainly looked at social factors contributing to theft and burglary; he has also looked at a wide range of different types of theft including theft from commercial premises, residential burglary, pick-pocketing, bag-snatching, car crime, etc.
The work has also tended to extend its boundaries to cover the entire country, including all major provinces, which have led to the production of general, less precise results. A questionnaire has been used as the main method for data collection, questionnaires have been sent to various prisons and have been filled in by convicted burglars, the information has been statistically analysed. This study, although is very broad and has its limitations, is unique, considering the difficulties of accessing statistical figures and sources of information in Iran. The findings from this study will be discussed throughout this chapter, wherever necessary.

Apart from this study, research on theft and burglary, was carried out by Shefiee, Saleh, and Foroud (1997), funded by the Research Centre of Prisons Organisation. This study attempted to identify the target-selection procedure employed by residential burglars in Tehran, with regards to time and place. This study showed that temporal patterns are largely influenced by 'occupancy', and evidenced that 27% of the total residential burglaries committed in 1982 took place the 'New Year' time, when houses are more likely to be left unoccupied. They also found that burglary is mainly a night-time activity. By the use of structured interviews with 150 convicted burglars, this study found that only 25% of their burglars carried out their burglaries during the day, while 75% were mainly night burglars (Shefiee, Saleh, and Foroud, 1997: 41). Investigation on selection of targets with reference to the housing type made evident that 70% of offenders preferred houses and bungalows, 23% chose apartment (two to four stories), and only 7% were willing to burgle houses located in high-rise buildings. Regarding to areal location, they demonstrated that preference was in most cases given to more affluent areas of the city, where 69% of offenders selected northern parts, 5% central, 5% southern, and 21% targeted suburban areas (ibid.: 49). They also showed that 81% of their offenders selected northern types of housing, 19% selected southern types, and that 55% preferred houses located in narrower valleys with less visibility, and 45% preferred houses in main streets, for providing easier escape (ibid.: 60).
The typology of residential burglars was studied by a number of officers within the police force. Their study showed that most residential burglars tend to work with accomplices, usually in a group of two to four, mainly because co-offenders facilitate burglary by obtaining information about the target. They also provide assistance to their co-offenders by watching the house and by informing them of any risk, or even distracting people or the police by attracting their attention to prolong the time for their co-offenders either to escape or to accomplish their task. A similar study also found that offenders working as a group seek opportunities everywhere and do not restrict themselves to specific areas. They argued that residential burglars are often professionals, and that skill plays a key role in conducting residential crime. They demonstrated that on average about 85% of residential burglars are aged over 25, who have gradually progressed from other less serious types of theft and burglary to residential burglary that requires courage, skill, and is associated with high risk. Most burglars in this study were highly concerned with characteristics of their selected targets, they selected unoccupied houses, gathered a wide range of information about their target, and selected houses with less surveillance from adjacent premises, and houses that provided an easy escape.

Burglary from flats and apartments is found by a similar study to be more opportunistic, i.e. stealing items of little value in a spur of the moment when a door or window is left open. Drug-addicts or less professional burglars were classified as opportunistic, and was carried out by those using readily available opportunities in various neighbourhoods. The escape route is often the first thing that a burglar searches for after entering the house, s/he often leave the door or a window open to facilitate his/her escape. They often avoid becoming physically involved with occupiers, but if they do, they are prepared to use force and inflict harm to avoid getting apprehended. The type of properties selected by burglars is dependent on their transport, and means of disposal, that is whether they have a ready buyer for them. The less professional burglars often dispose of stolen properties by selling them direct to consumers or to second-hand shops, the more professional have their own reliable buyers. An important issue revealed by
this study argued that many professional burglars conduct their offences in their own typical and individualistic manner, however, targets being burgled by such offenders are recognisable by experienced officers who are familiar with the patterns of each well-known offender. This is a skilful clue leading to the perpetrator.

Moreover, a few articles on burglary were found from the Research Centre of Judicial Ministry, carried out in 1998, kept in the archive of the centre. These reports were produced in response to the rapid increase in the level of burglary during the last few years, and were mainly aimed at establishing policies to prevent burglary through identification of the economic, personal and social factors contributing to burglary. These reports are mainly based upon the police crime statistics and court files, interviews with burglars, victims, judges, and criminologists. They have labelled burglary as the "mother of crimes", for its prevalence, yet, they have not included any crime statistics to indicate the current level of burglary or to the extent it has increased during the last few years. The argument on causes of burglary is, too, based on general assumptions made by the researchers or personal opinion of contributors, without presenting any concrete evidence, i.e. statistical figures or empirical works.

These reports suggest that most burglaries in Tehran are committed by clever and intelligent offenders, who largely commit their crime by planning their burglaries, and by gathering information on potential or selected crime sites. They describe the procedure by which individuals become involved in criminal activities by making an assumption that personal and social factors, which they called 'primary factors' such as family and parental problems, lack of appropriate education, lack of adaptation with societal values and behavioural principles, economic deprivation, etc. effect individuals and triggers them towards criminal behaviour. However, environmental circumstances, which they called 'secondary factors', will provide opportunities for such individuals to engage in criminal activities. While primary factors generate the basic motivations in individuals and make them prone to criminal activities, secondary factors assist with providing circumstances in which a crime may be facilitated or encouraged.
These studies also draw the authorities attention to factors such as addiction to drugs, alcoholism, or even sexual deprivation by indicating that these factors may accelerate the procedure of engaging in criminal activities. They also recognise the recent war imposed by Iraq, as having significant effects in creating several economic problems such as inflation and increasing the level of unemployment that has certainly played a significant part in increasing property crime, including residential burglary. The increased level of burglary, they argued, is also heightened by the false luxurial needs among the less affluent groups, through the large gap between the more deprived and the highly affluent division, and has probably triggered them against this unfair division of wealth, income, and social facilities. They continue to explain that once a young offender experiences the easy life, and considerable comfort and pleasure sustained through burglary, will not be prepared to go back to a legitimate source of income that leads to a less comfortable life provided by more hard work. This will reinforce his/her criminal career and the young offender continues to burgle unless factors such as conviction and a hard life created by imprisonment break the circle. It is, nevertheless, noted that discontinuance of criminal activities is rarely achieved after a conviction. Unless a reasonable living is established by legitimate work, it is most likely that criminal activities and possibly circles of ‘re-conviction-release-re-offending’ will be continued and will constitute the offender’s main life-style.

Factors contributing to crime led this study to suggest that crime may be prevented through four types of intervention:

1) Social intervention such as improving education, heightening religious believes, establishment of job agencies for young people and training courses easily accessible to them, providing awareness to younger people of deviating factors and the way these factors work in attracting them to crime, etc.

2) Economic provisions such as providing the basic needs of people, controlling inflation, providing employment, assisting policies aiming at fair distribution of wealth and income, etc.
3) Disciplinary and legal crime prevention, focusing on police work and increasing their effectiveness in dealing with crime and burglary, establishing specialised court branches to deal with specific types of crimes. They also favoured more severe punishment in order to prevent offenders from re-offending. They have justified their recommendations by arguing that burglary is a serious crime that, to a large extent, endangers the safety of society, therefore, severe punishments must be imposed on offenders to make them realise they can not get off easily by committing burglary. Increasing the severity of punishment, they argued, would increase the risks associated with crime, therefore, reduce crime.

4) Other provisions, i.e. dealing with drug problems, policies aimed at reducing the population, control of immigration, focusing on young people's needs and filling in their additional hours by constructive means, i.e. sports, science, social activities, increasing the public awareness on crime issues and security measures through the media, eliminating or diminishing opportunities for crime by increasing street lighting, attending to security of houses, encouraging the use of burglar alarms and target-hardening techniques by householders, strengthening the relationship between the police and people in combating crime by encouraging people to report crime and suspicious behaviour, etc.

As it can be seen, such provisions have only been suggested in a theoretical form and the study has made no attempt to suggest how these provisions may be best practiced to reduce crime levels. Finally, an article was found, which was mainly based on the use of foreign material, attempting to attract the attention of authorities to the role of the victims in the prevention of burglary. This article, by Barani (1998), confirmed the Western finding and advised that victims by producing opportunities facilitate crime. He supported 'opportunity theory', and emphasized that crimes are occurring for the potential opportunities produced in the environment (by victims), and that precautions and security measures taken by victims can make burglary more difficult for opportunity offenders, therefore, resulting in reducing crime. However, his study is limited in
presenting any evidence as to what extent burglaries are operated in an opportunistic manner, and to what extent opportunity reduction may result in crime reduction.

Furthermore, Barani has argued that situational measures and environmental manipulation are more economically advantageous and are more effective in combating burglary than concentrating merely on police resources in dealing with crime. He refers to policies such as the use of advanced locks, burglar alarms, use of banks and post offices’ safe-keeping services as replacement to keeping valuables at home, legal access control of guns and firearms, natural surveillance in the neighbourhoods, keeping an eye on neighbours houses while they are away, informing a trustable neighbour of their absence and its period, etc. as effective means of dealing with burglary. He has advocated ‘rational theory’, claiming that policies aimed at reducing the gains and increasing the risks associated with burglary will prevent and decrease the level of crime. He, however, has ignored the importance of place and time in crime occurrence.

From the limited literature on residential burglary in Tehran, it may be concluded that studies have apparent limitations in containing information based on reliable evidence such as accurate crime figures, statistical analysis, and empirical research. Among the existing literature the majority are law-text based material, the remaining are mainly dealing with factors causing burglary, therefore, policies suggested by such studies are based on an improvement of social issues and are less concerned with situational and environmental measures dealing with crime. In addition, most of the Iranian literature has discussed various types of theft under a general topic of ‘theft’, and no attempt has been made to focus on investigating patterns for specific forms of burglary that enable them to obtain policies aimed at prevention of specific forms of theft.
5.3 The Iranian Criminal Law and their Legal Implications

5.3.1 Fundamental Changes in the Law

The 1979 revolution in Iran, and the conversion of a previous governing system to the current Islamic system, resulted in substantial changes in the law, especially in the criminal law, which led to the inclusion of some acts as crimes, which were not considered as crimes in the previous system, i.e. selling, buying and consumption of alcoholic drinks in public, or establishment of brothels. While the previous criminal law was mainly relied upon the criminal code of France, the present Iranian law including the criminal code is based largely on Islamic principles. The concept of crime and its definition in Islamic law (shari’a) is based upon sources in which Islamic principles are rooted. The new criminal code was approved by the judicial commission of the Islamic parliament and took effect from 1991.

5.3.2 Legal Definition of Theft, Its Classification, Types of Punishment, and Its Legal Implications

5.3.2.1 Legal Definition of Theft

Theft (serghat), according to the penal code in Iran, is a general term used for stealing, grabbing and snatching. Theft, in Iran, like in Western countries such as in the UK and in the US is defined under the classification of crimes against property. According to Article 197 of Iranian Criminal Law (ICL), theft is defined as “stealing somebody’s property, surreptitiously”. Theft, according to ICL has been defined to include all types of acts of stealing including burglary from dwellings, burglary from non-residential premises, pick-pocketing, bag-snatching, etc.

In Western countries such as UK burglary against domestic premises has been distinguished from other types of theft. Burglary was originally defined as ‘breaking and entering’, thus, in order to commit a burglary one had to physically break in. This was changed in England and Wales following the 1968 Theft Act, which defined burglary as
'illegal entry to premises followed by theft or with the intent to commit an offence' (The 1968 Theft Act, section 9(i)). Aggravated burglary (as defined in section 10) is where the offender commits the burglary while in possession of a firearm, explosive or other weapon (Mawby, 2001: 4-5). According to this definition of burglary all illegal entries, irrespective of the use of force or causing damage, are classified as burglaries. Therefore, the elementary factor in a burglary taking place is the intention of the burglar to commit an offence and illegal trespassing to the home.

In Iran there is no separate legal definition for burglary from dwelling. However, according to Iranian Criminal Law (ICL), the punishment set for theft is applicable to all types of theft including residential burglary. Theft, as it was defined earlier, includes all acts involving stealing of properties, therefore, stealing of persons such as kidnapping is not qualified for theft. It is important to note that while the law in Iran does not make a distinction between theft and burglary, the police classify crimes by different types of theft, of which residential burglary is one category. Other categories include motor-vehicle crime, theft from shops and commercial/industrial settings, theft from private/governmental buildings, theft from inside the vehicle, bag-snatching, pickpocketing, theft of parcels, theft from cashiers, and theft from Holy places such as mosques.

5.3.2.2 Classification of Burglary

In UK, generally, attempting a crime is classified under the heading of the crime itself, though in certain cases, including burglary, it comes under a separate heading (Tarling, 1993: 187). Burglary in UK has been classified into ‘attempted burglary’ (covered by the 1981 Criminal Attempts Act), which refers to incidents that the offender tried to enter the dwelling as a trespasser but failed; and ‘burglary with entry’, which refers to incidents in which the offender entered the dwelling as a trespasser with the intention of committing theft, rape, grievous bodily harm or unlawful damage. For the latter, to be classified as burglary with entry the offender must have entered the property but need not to have carried out their intention.
According to the law in Iran, 'attempting' a crime is often classified under a separate heading, and 'attempts' are referred to situations where the criminal act has been commenced by the offender but has remained uncompleted, either because of the circumstances outside the offender's control, or because the offender has changed his/her mind and intended to stop the criminal activity. Attempts often receive a milder punishment. The uncompleted criminal activity in Iranian law seems to be similar to criminal attempts in Western countries. However, the consequences of such 'attempts' may be different with accordance to the law in Iran and in UK. In Iran, an attempt refers to any unaccomplished intention, therefore, if an offender enters a residential premise with the intention of stealing a property, but for any reason the act does not result in theft of property the act will be classified as an attempt, while this according to the law in UK, is not classified as an attempt but as 'burglary with entry', even if it has not resulted in stealing of property from the dwelling.

In US household burglary has been defined as 'unlawful or forcible entry or attempted entry of a residence' (US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics). In US, alike in UK, theft has been distinguished from burglary, and similarly in US a burglary may occur without involving a theft. Burglary in such countries also does not always involve forcing entry or breaking-ins, but illegal entry into a dwelling, i.e. through an unlocked door or an open window is similarly defined a burglary.

It has also been noted that in Western countries such as UK, the definition of 'burglary with entry' implies that for a burglary with entry to occur, a burglar must have entered a residential building, however, his intention for entry does not have to be stealing property, but it may be committing an illegal act against persons such as rape, or bodily harm. According to ICL, since burglary from dwellings is covered by the definition of theft, it is restricted only to acts with the intention of stealing property; therefore, entering a residence with the intention of i.e. rape or bodily harm will not be classified as burglary.
5.3.2.3 Types of Punishment

Theft (also applicable to acts of residential burglary), according to ICL, is punishable in two ways. Theft, including residential burglary, if it meets the specific conditions set by the law, qualifies for 'Hodud' types of punishment. Hodud types of punishment consist of penalties fixed by law, with no judicial discretion as to the extent and degree of punishment (Article 13). This type of punishment applies to more serious types of theft, as well as crimes such as adultery, homosexuality, establishment of a brothel, false accusation of adultery, use of firearms creating public fear, and robbery. In terms of theft, there are several conditions to be met for it being punishable by Hodud, which are mainly related to offenders' circumstances and the property. Hodud does not permit punishment for example, for stealing carried out by an offender who is in financial desperation. Or for theft to be punishable by Hodud the value of the stolen property must exceed a certain amount. Also the property must have been stolen from a place which is suitable for the protection of that type of property (called as 'Herz'). Theft that is legally not qualified for Hodud punishment is punishable by 'Tazir' types. Tazir types of punishment refer to penalties which their type and extent is not set by the law but left to the judge and the court (Article 16). Tazir types of punishment are milder in nature and are for less serious types of crimes including theft and burglary. In Tazir crimes, imprisonment (for a shorter time period) and fines have been used as the main types of punishment.

Differences in definition of theft, and burglary between Iranian and Western legal system may result in differences in punishments in terms of type and degree. For example an act of burglary that does not result in stealing property which is classified as an attempt, according to Iranian criminal law, therefore, it would receive a punishment set for 'attempted burglary'. A similar act in the UK is classified, as 'burglary with entry' would be dealt with by the criminal justice system. In both legal systems (in Iran and in UK) where an offender commits a burglary while in possession of firearms or other weapons, the burglary is perceived as more serious and will be punished more severely.
5.3.2.4 Legal Implications and their Preventive Potential

It seems that although differences in legal definitions of theft and burglary may produce differences in the way they are dealt with, burglary from residential premises in Iran as well as in UK and in US, is similarly perceived as a serious crime; and its seriousness is heightened where the consequences of the act are more serious, i.e. where the burglary results in higher financial loss, where the burglary is aggravated by the possession or use of a weapon, or where the effects on victims are more intense.

In Iran, the legal definition of theft (burglary as one type) is used by courts in dealing with various acts of theft. Theft is perceived by the Iranian Islamic law as a serious crime, as it involves the breach of the rights of ownership. Residential burglary is considered even more serious (compared with other types of theft such as shoplifting and car crime) for it involves intrusion in the space and privacy of others. However, contemporary courts in dealing with burglary restrict themselves to the physical elements defined by the law, i.e. whether the suspect has entered the house with the intention of stealing a property, whether an entry to the house has occurred, or whether property has been stolen. Contemporary law and the criminal justice agencies in dealing with burglary seem to be less concerned with victims of crime and the emotional and psychological effects burglary may produce. They similarly pay little attention to the socio-economic reasons which have encouraged the offenders to offend, therefore, ignoring factors that may result in any re-offending once the offenders are released into the society.

Burglary in Iranian courts is mainly punished by imprisonment and/or by returning the stolen goods, or by compensating the victim. Imprisonment is often imposed where the act conforms to the conditions set by the law. This is especially the case where the burglary has resulted in theft of high value properties, where the burglar is unable to return the stolen goods or its equivalent value, and for repeat offenders or those committing burglary in the possession of firearms. The positive effect of the use of imprisonment is that it incapacitates offenders for the time period that they are kept in prison. This effect, however, is limited as it may last only for the incarceration period
and offenders will eventually be released into the society having to make a decision whether to re-offend or stop offending. Fines may be imposed on first-time offenders or burglaries involving low value loss of properties. This is also expected to have a limited preventive effect, as most burglars are poor, therefore, likely to be unable to pay any fines. In addition, burglars tend quickly to dispose of their stolen goods. Most offenders when arrested are able to pay only a small part of the value of what they have stolen and have no alternative but to go to prison for their debt.

5.4 Statistics on Residential Burglary in Tehran

5.4.1 Sources of Data

Crime statistics, collected and held by the police, play a critical role in indicating the extent of crime being committed in every society. In Western countries crime statistics are used to measure offending by relying on the number of known offenders to the police (police cautioning and conviction in England and Wales, police arrest in US, Tarling, 1993). The limitations associated with official crime statistics in demonstrating the true picture of criminality may be supplemented by victimisation surveys and self-report studies. These sources of information are published and used by several researchers that attempt to interpret criminal behaviour and explain crime situation in such countries. In Iran, however, the situation is entirely different. Crime statistics held by the police, and those held by the Prisons Organisation (PO) (demonstrating the number of imprisoned, both convicted and accused) are ‘classified’ information and are treated as ‘confidential’, they are not publicly accessible. The only source available to the public, is the ‘census book’, which is published by the Statistical Centre of Iran, annually, and in addition to statistical information on population, gender, age, health, etc., includes the number of cases being dealt with by courts, for each type of crime (produced by the Ministry of Justice). It portrays the number of cases being processed by criminal and civil courts and does not distinguish between those resulting in convictions and those being acquitted. In exceptional circumstances, a selective part of this information is disclosed to some research-based institutions (i.e. research centres) upon request.
In order to access statistics from the police on residential burglary, to form the basis for portraying the shape and the size of the problem in Tehran, the current research made enormous attempts to approach the authorities in charge, several institutions and key authorities were repeatedly consulted within a period of six months, as a result access to main District Police Stations (DPS), of which there are five in the city of Tehran was granted. However, the figures held by the DPS were based on daily reports of all different types of crimes, each district received monthly information from about 12-13 local police stations, data sheets were hand-written, extremely scattered and disorganised, therefore, utterly useless for our purposes. Though, the Head of each DPS participated in an informal interview and shared their experience with the researcher, which produced valuable information on burglary situations in Tehran. Enquiries were also made to the PO through its research centre, which resulted in receiving limited information on the number of prisoners held for theft. Again, this information found to be inadequate in demonstrating the situation for residential burglary, as no distinguish is made between residential burglary and other types of theft, and in prison all offenders kept for different types of theft including residential burglary are classified by the general classification of ‘theft’. Despite the extremely time-consuming effort made by the researcher to collect as much information as possible, it became evident, only after putting all the information together, that the information received is very limited, and is insufficient to permit statistical inferences. The following section will look at available crime statistics held by the police, prisons organisation, other sources and previous studies on burglary. It will also examine crime figures in terms of age, gender, and drugs. The findings from this section will be useful in the assessment of the validity and reliability of the results found by the current study through interviews made with residential burglars, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
5.4.2. Crime Statistics

In Tehran, crime rates i.e. as crimes recorded by the police were unavailable/inaccessible from the Head Office. Therefore, the researcher had to provide an estimate on the rate of burglary in Tehran using figures that she had collected from the DPS. In order to do that the number of burglaries recorded by the police (for the period of six months) at each five DPS, covering the whole city of Tehran, were aggregated for all residential burglary, for each year between 1996 and 1998. The gaps in the information provided made the establishment of a precise calculation impossible; therefore, the numbers given represent estimates only. In 1996 a total number of 98,312 of thefts (of various types) was recorded by the police, of which 292 have been for armed robberies and 98,020 (99.7%) for ordinary (unarmed) theft. For these crimes 3,716 suspects have been arrested, and 11,756 crimes have been cleared up (about 12%). The rate of theft (number of thefts for every 100,000 of population) according to police crime records was 56 in 1971; this increased to 109 in 1981 (Ghorban-Hosseini, 1993: 36). In 1984, 24% of arrestees and 12% of offenders were convicted for theft (ibid: 37). The rate for residential burglary, based on the number of burglaries recorded by the police in 1996, is 46 in Tehran. There was a slight decrease to 40 in 1997 and a slight increase to 51 in 1998. The total number of residential burglaries was 3,454, in 1996; of these 2,440 (over two thirds) occurred at night with 1,014 (less than one third) occurring during the day. In Iran, theft of different types accounted for 11.3% in 1994, 14.4% in 1995, and 13% in 1996 of all crimes. In 1996, a large proportion of 53% of the young offenders in rehabilitation centres were charged with stealing.

Similar sources suggest that residential burglary constitutes a considerable proportion of theft (7%) in 1971, compared to 2.6% for commercial theft, in the same year. This rate has increased to 10% in 1976, and to 18% in 1981, compared to 6.2% for commercial theft, and 12% for shoplifting in the same year. The metropolitan of Tehran with a population of 7.5 million, in 1998, has attracted about one third of all burglaries within
the whole country. The table below demonstrates the number and the proportion of the main types of theft that occurred in Tehran, between 1996 and 1998.

Table 5.1 The number of the main types of theft and burglary recorded by the police, Tehran, 1996-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/Year</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential burglary</td>
<td>N. 3454</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>3780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total number of theft</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial burglary</td>
<td>N. 1148</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total number of theft</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-theft</td>
<td>N. 3386</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>3188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total number of theft</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick-pocketing</td>
<td>N. 2000</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total number of theft</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag-snatching</td>
<td>N. 2510</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the total number of theft</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table demonstrates that for example in 1996 residential burglary and auto-theft occur at higher rate than other types of theft, constituting 13.8% and 13.6% of all types of theft, respectively. Other types of theft include theft from inside vehicle (11.4%), theft of motor-cycle (10.1%), theft from private buildings (7.5%), robbery (4.9%), theft from governmental buildings (4.8%), theft of parcels (2.9%), theft from cashiers (2.4%), theft of bicycles (1.8%), and other types of theft which are considered by the police less serious in nature, and are classified as 'other', which account for the remaining amount of theft (4%). The number of residential burglary has slightly fallen in 1997 but has risen in 1998. The table shows that the prevalence of residential burglary is higher than other types of theft. Of the total 3,454 residential burglaries that occurred in 1996, 1300 has been claimed to have been cleared-up, about 38%. This rate has increased to 44% (1,338 burglaries) in 1997, but has decreased to 12% (454 burglaries) in 1998. There is no clear evidence to suggest the reasons for the high clear-up rate in 1996, its increase in 1997, or the sharp drop in 1998. It is evident that residential burglary is creating more acute problems for the society than other types of theft; therefore, more attention ought to be paid to its control.
According to the annual statistics, based on figures provided by the judiciary, theft of various types is the second most prevalent, with assaults and wounding being the most prevalent cases being brought to criminal courts. It was found that theft of different types constituted about one fourth of all crimes dealt with in criminal courts in 1986 (25.6%), this figure rose to 27.3% in 1990, and fell to 23.4% in 1995. There is no explanation or analysis to suggest whether these changes are resulted from the actual changes in the number of burglaries being carried out or from the changes in the police or court practices.

Statistics from PO were only useful in suggesting that the number of entries to prisons, that is the number of offenders convicted, or awaiting trial for theft has increased, an increase of 3% in 1994, and 10.9% in 1995. Again, these statistics do not suggest whether an actual increase has occurred or the increase is an indication of the courts increased tendency to imprison offenders committing burglary. The prisons organisation has treated all different types of burglary under one general classification, and is unable to demonstrate the increased rate for various types of burglary.

Crime statistics exhibiting the crime rate in various provinces of Iran, showed a much higher rate of burglary committed in the province of Tehran compared to other provinces, performing that about one third (30.6%) of all burglaries are carried out in Tehran. This explicitly point to the fact that crime is mainly concentrated in the capital city and in towns surrounded by it. The higher rate of offending was subsequently observed for provinces characterised by a higher population and higher density, i.e. 18.8% for Khorasan, and 8.6% for Fars provinces. Based on this finding, Ghorban-Hosseini (1991: 41) suggested that the larger, denser, and more urbanised cities provide environments facilitating crime. It was similarly found that in 1984, 94% of burglaries were conducted in cities and major towns and only 6% have been reported in villages.

It has also been suggested that within large cities including Tehran some areas and districts show a higher rate of offending than other areas. For example, in general, in
large cities more crime activities are observed in places such as business districts, poorer areas and some affluent residential districts, coach terminals and train stations, and entertainment centres. Ghorban-Hosseini investigated how distribution of burglary may vary in different districts of Tehran. He showed that 2% and 1.6% of all types of burglaries occur in district 1 and 2 (the most northern part of Tehran, as well as the most affluent part), respectively, 4.5% occur in northern central parts, 6% in Western parts (this is a section with newly built Western-type and multi-family housing, where people with mixed social background live), and 9% in the central and business district (Ghorban-Hosseini, 1991: 41). Ghorban-Hosseini have used the higher rate of burglary occurring in the western and southern parts as an evidence to suggest that a higher rate of burglary is occurring in the more populated areas, and in business districts.

Distribution of 'residential' burglary in various districts of Tehran showed to produce a different pattern. Based upon crime reports that the researcher received from the Head Office, (data sent by the five DPS), in Tehran, it became apparent that of the 600 residential burglaries recorded within two months of December 1998 and January 1999, 316 (53%) of burglaries had occurred in northern district, 70 (11%) in the east, 88 (15%) in the west, and 126 (21%) in the south and central districts, confirming that northern better-off areas were more frequently targeted by residential offenders. The difference between the rate of crime recorded in northern district and other districts is sufficiently large to rule out the possibility of being due to higher reports made by residents for higher loss from each burglary in those areas.

For residential burglary, it was found that the value of stolen property, especially in northern parts, considerably exceeds the value of stolen property in southern and central parts of Tehran. For example, Ghorban-Hosseini found that the value of stolen property lost in two burglaries in the south of Tehran was less than IR10 Million (about £1,000), while the value of the property stolen from a single house in Niavaran (in the Shemiran district, north of Tehran) was estimated to be IR150 million (about £15,000).
Crime statistics held by the police, as well as all other sources of information consistently suggest that in Tehran residential burglary is largely a night-time activity. The police crime statistics showed that night-time residential burglaries constituted the majority of residential burglaries, about two times higher than burglaries occurring during the day, in 1996. The rate of night burglaries outnumbered day burglaries, even at a higher rate in 1998, which indicates that, in that year, night burglaries occurred five times higher than day burglaries. Whether this increase is an indication of increased seriousness of night burglaries, therefore, these incidents are reported to the police more frequently, or that demonstrates a higher tendency of burglars to carry out their burglaries during the night, is not known by evidence. The following table demonstrates the variation in the rate of burglaries carried out at night or during the day:

Table 5.2 The number of day/night burglary between 1983 and 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per cent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar findings were shown for burglaries carried out by the use of firearms. The following table demonstrate the figures for armed and unarmed burglaries:

Table 5.3 The number of armed and unarmed residential burglary recorded by the police, Tehran, 1996-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential burglary</th>
<th>Armed</th>
<th>Unarmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day</td>
<td>Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime statistics from the police showed that, in 1996, while residential burglary by carrying firearms constituted only about 1.1% of all residential burglaries (0.9% in 1997, 1.2% in 1998), night-time armed burglaries has occurred 8 times more than those carried out during the day, and night-time unarmed residential burglaries were about 2.2 times higher than those carried out during the day (2.4 times higher in 1997, 4 times higher in 1998). It was similarly shown that in 1996, only 0.04% of day burglaries were armed, this rose to 1% in 1997 and to 2.5% in 1998. Of the total amount of night burglaries, 1.4% was armed; this rate slightly fell to 0.9% and 0.8%, for 1997 and 1998 respectively. It can be seen that whereas, in general, no significant changes have occurred in the use of firearms, within the total amount of burglaries occurred between 1996 and 1998, statistics indicate slight decline in the use of firearm at nights but slight increase in the use of firearms for conducting day burglaries.

### 5.4.3 Burglary and Age of Offending

The theft and burglary rate recorded by the police shows variations in offending for various age groups, portraying higher rate for certain age groups. It can be seen from table 5.4 that about half of burglaries in 1976 have been committed by offenders aged 19-30, this rate has increased to 55% in 1981 and to 53% in 1986. In 1976, 25% of burglaries have been conducted by young offenders of under 18, this rate has declined to 19% in 1981, while in 1986, 21% of burglary offences were committed by this age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Age</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>19-30</th>
<th>31-60</th>
<th>60 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no indication to suggest the pattern of offending and the nature of burglaries carried out by different age groups. However, crime figures may be used as an indication to suggest that lower rate of offending belongs to younger offenders. The highest rate shown for offenders aged 19-30 may be due to the possibility that potential offenders start their criminal activities at higher age, or that similar offenders increase the volume of their criminal activities as they get older. Crime figures similarly suggest that the rate of offending is declined by 31 and older age groups, and show significant decrease for offenders over 60 years of age. However, it seems that the 31-60 age group is too wide to indicate roughly at what age offenders tend to reduce their engagement in criminal activities.

Criminal statistics also propose that about 85% of residential burglars are aged over 25. The age distribution of residential burglars studied by Ghorban-Hosseini similarly showed that the most active group aged over 25, he found that 11% of offenders were aged under 18 years, 26% aged between 19-25, 32% between the age of 26-30, 25% were between 31-40; and 6% were 41 and over (Ghorban-Hosseini, 1992: 149). This has been argued by Ghorban-Hosseini as an indication that residential burglary is an offence that requires experience and skills. The majority of residential burglars studied by Ghorban-Hosseini stated that they had not started their criminality by breaking into houses but by petty theft such as stealing low-value items from shops. Most offenders expressed that burgling a house, and the actual thought of going inside some one's private life, requires a great deal of courage, and offenders do not often start their criminal activity with residential burglary, unless involved and encouraged by a more experienced offender, or a group of professional burglars.

5.4.4 Burglary and Gender

There is a common belief that the number of women engaging in criminal activities is substantially lower than of men, depending on its type. The table below demonstrates the participation of women, in three main types of theft, in Iran, compared to men.
Table 5.5 The proportion of offending for men and women, for three main types of theft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Crime</th>
<th>Residential burglary</th>
<th>Auto-theft</th>
<th>Theft from business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>99.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>99.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from table 5.5 women have significantly lower presence in the scene of criminality (theft), than men, with lowest participation in auto-theft crimes, less than 1%. Residential burglary is carried out only by about 5 women, compared to 95 men. Theft from business, which includes theft from private business and shoplifting, demonstrate greater presence of women, about 9 women for every 91 men. The greater engagement of women in shoplifting is expected to be observed in more populated, large chain-stores and supermarkets, as smaller shop units are often supervised by shop assistants, which reduces the opportunities and increases the surveillance, therefore, reducing the level of possible shoplifting. The overwhelmingly increasingly proportion of men over women in residential burglary is supported by the research carried out by Shafiee, Saleh, and Foroud, (1997: 26). They showed that burglary is carried out mainly by men, and that women are to some extent involved in shoplifting but less with residential burglary.

5.4.5 Burglary and Drugs

Interviews with the head of the DPS, as well as data from the police and findings from previous studies confirm a positive relationship between burglary and drug. Fifty eight per cent of offenders studied by Ghorban-Hosseini (1992: 181) were drug-addicted, whereas 42% were non-addicted. Among drug-addicted 75% earned their money to inhabit their drug problem mainly from burglary, and 13% from selling drugs, only 12% obtained the money needed for drugs through legitimate jobs (ibid.: 184). It was shown by a similar study that 24% of drug addicts had committed their first burglary in order to buy drugs, and in 28% of cases, drugs have been declared by burglars to be the main
reason for offending (ibid.: 258). Interviews made with police authorities evidenced that addicted burglars are highly likely to steal from their own members of family, i.e. their parents, wives (to less extent husbands), brother and sisters, or friends and relatives.

5.5 Police Crime Recording Procedure

Police recording procedure is an important indicator reflecting the final picture of official statistics produced by the police. However, different recording procedures employed by different districts, counties, and more importantly in different countries would significantly change the crime rate and the outcome may entirely change the picture of criminality in different places. This section intends to investigate how in Tehran crimes are reported to the police, and are recorded by the police. It will also look at factors that may influence the reporting and recording procedure, therefore, the reflection of crimes in the final figures; in other words, it is intended to investigate the validity of crimes recorded by the police in portraying the accurate picture of criminality. This is especially important in places such as Tehran as no other sources of statistics such as victimisation surveys and other crime surveys are available. Since no document was available to be used by the police as a guideline for recording crimes, the researcher had to rely on her own observation of police practices. Hence, the main source of information used in the following section derives from the times the researcher spent in the various District Police Stations, with officers in charge of filing reports and recording crime incidents.

5.5.1 Reporting and Recording of Crimes

In Britain crimes must be reported to the police if they are to appear on the crime statistics. Crimes may come to the attention of the police in different ways: they may be reported by the victim or by someone other than the victim such as a neighbour or a passer-by; or they may be observed and discovered by the police. Crimes are often reported to the police by the victim, the officer may make further enquiries, i.e. by
questioning the victim or someone else to ensure a crime has occurred. Once an investigating officer is satisfied that a crime has been committed s/he would record the crime (National Crime Recording Standard, 2002, sections 3.2-3.4, Home Office).

In Iran (and in Tehran), alike other countries such as UK and US, most crimes are reported by the victim. However, not all crimes are reported by the victim and crimes may come to the attention of the police by a party other than the victim. The police will register these reports as 'crime related incidents', irrespective of who reports them-they are listed on a 'crime-reporting sheet' in Britain and Iran. The main difference between the registration of incidents in Tehran and UK is that the Home Office in UK have to register all incidents reported to them, whether they are crimes or not. In Tehran they only have to register crimes.

However, not all crimes registered by the police are recorded, and (in UK) are notified to the Home office', unless they amount to a 'notifiable' offence. In order for a crime incident to be recorded as a crime, in UK and in Tehran, the circumstances as reported should amount to a crime defined by law. In both instances this will be decided by the police based on their knowledge of the law. To determine whether to record a crime related incident or not, the Home Office has used the test of the balance of probabilities, that is to say that the incident is more likely than not to have occurred. In UK as well as in Tehran, it is often sufficient for the victim to claim a crime has been committed to justify recording it. This however is not always the case.

For example there are circumstances in which a registered crime incident will not be recorded. Where it is suspected that a crime has occurred, the crime incident will not be recorded if: a) the alleged victim (or a person reasonably assumed to be acting on behalf of the victim) declines to confirm that a crime has been committed; b) the victim cannot be traced; c) the incident is reported by a party other than the victim. In all such cases in

---

1 From April 2002, in the UK, police in making a decision as to whether record a registered crime or not must comply with the National Crime Recording Standard.
addition to the above-mentioned conditions there must not be evidence to suggest on the balance of probabilities that the crime has occurred (Home Office counting rules for recorded crime, 2002, section A). Similarly, in Iran, where the crime is reported by a party other than the victim, for the crime to be recorded it must be confirmed by the victim. An exception to this rule is the circumstances under which a party other than the victim informs the police of a crime taken place at the time of the burglary, and it results in an arrest of the offender whilst in the act. In such circumstances, where the police are certain that a crime has occurred, confirmation on behalf of the victim is not needed for recording. Of course further information provided by the victim may be useful for detection purposes.

In cases where a crime related incident come to the attention of the police but is not confirmed by the victim, it should be registered, and the police would be expected, in UK as well as in Iran, to carry out reasonable enquiries to confirm whether a crime has, in fact, been committed. In Tehran however, this ruling is not always practiced, probably because of the high police caseloads. In UK, according to the rules prescribed by the Home Office, where the occurrence of a crime cannot be confirmed, the crime related incident should be endorsed, alongside the enquiries made, and the reasons given for not recording that crime. Therefore, the main criterion for determining whether a crime should be recorded or not is that the investigator officer is satisfied that it is more likely than not that a crime has been committed.

Crimes recorded by the police, in UK, are counted and classified by the rules issued by the Home Office. Most crimes are counted as 'one crime per victim', however, there might be some situations where more than one offence has taken place, may be on several occasions over a period of time, or where there is more than one offender or victim. If the sequence of crimes in an incident contains more than one type of crime, then the most serious crime is counted. For example the most serious violent crime should generally take precedence over the most serious property crime. If it is not

---

2 All offences that are notified to the Home Office, and are known as 'recorded crime'.
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possible to do this, regard should be taken of the maximum sentence or, where equal sentences are prescribed, the maximum sentence likely to be imposed on an offender (Home Office counting rules for recorded crime, 2002: section F). In Iran, similarly, recorded crimes are often counted as one crime per victim. In cases where more than one crime type is committed by an offender or a group of offenders, it is counted according to the initial intention of the offender. For example, if an offender or a group of co-offenders intend to commit a burglary, and also commit another crime such as rape or assault, the crime will be recorded and counted as burglary. Also a burglary committed by a group of burglars who co-offend is recorded and counted as one crime. For the police to record a crime, it should be reported (or confirmed) by the victim reasonably soon after the incident, unless there is a reason for delay, i.e. the victim was away from home during and/or after the incident but reported it as soon as possible thereafter. Since different categories of theft, including residential burglary, have not been separately defined by the law in Iran, they are recorded with accordance to the classification made by the police. The theft category will be decided upon by the recording officer based on the victim’s description of the crime.

Burglaries are recorded by the offence type and are classified, in terms of its seriousness, into two major categories: ‘armed burglary’, carried out while carrying or using a weapon, and ‘unarmed burglary’, which refers to burglaries committed without carrying or using a weapon. It is clear that this classification regards the former type more serious, therefore, armed burglars are more likely to be sent to court, and are more likely to obtain more severe punishment and lengthier sentences. Unarmed burglary is regarded less serious, and will be dealt with according to its merit, usually based on previous crime records of offenders, as well as the method used for burglary and the value of stolen property. Residential burglaries, one type among several other types, such as burglary from commercial and industrial premises, auto-theft, bag-snatching, pickpocketing, etc., in terms of times at which they have been carried out, are classified into

---

3 In case of residential burglary the victim is not an individual owner but the household.
two major categories: ‘night burglaries’ and ‘day burglaries’. Classification of burglaries into day and night burglaries were considered important by the police, as they believed that night burglaries were performed in different patterns from day burglaries. It was also claimed that such a classification would assist and speed up detection of crime incidents by the police.

5.5.2 Validity of Crime Statistics in Tehran

The validity of crime statistics is determined by two prominent factors: 1) the extent to which crimes are reported by victims; and 2) the procedure by which reported crime is recorded by the police. Crime statistics are most valid when are representative of the true level of criminality. In the previous section the reporting and recording of crimes were examined, in terms of the rules and regulations in this regard. This procedure, in practice however, may be influenced by several factors, resulting in producing a different picture of criminality.

Reporting of crimes, in Tehran, like any other country, is the first constituent element of crime statistics. Several factors may contribute as to whether a crime (a burglary in particular) is reported or not. For example, the victim, who reports the incident, may not consider the incident sufficiently serious to report it. Similarly a burglary may not get reported because the victim may not have sufficient trust and confidence in the police to find the perpetrator, return the goods, or help in any other way. Some crimes are reported merely for insurance claims; therefore, those not covered by insurance policies may have little cause for reporting the crime to the police. In Tehran, since insurance policy is not commonly used for residential premises, it is less effective in determining whether a crime is reported or not. Also, the circumstances under which the crime has occurred may have some effect on whether a burglary is reported or not. For example it may be reasonably assumed that burglaries involving higher financial loss, or those involving violence and/or threat are more likely to be reported. Interviews with recording officers in DPS in Tehran suggested that most burglaries, especially those resulting in loss, do
get reported, because burglary is considered as serious and often has a profound impact on victims.

In Tehran, there is no easy or convenient way of finding out to what extent crimes are reported to the police, or to what extent the disparity between the final number of crimes appeared in crime statistic and the actual number of crimes occurred is due to reporting shortages. However, even if it can be assumed that most crimes are reported to the police, nonetheless some crimes may be reported but not recorded. There are some general rules and regulations guiding the police as to whether and when to record crimes reported to them. However, these regulations do not cover all likely events leaving the police with the power to make discretionary decisions. Clearly this is likely to create inconsistencies. Increases or decreases in a specific type of crime may not therefore be valid, and may be due to variations in recording practices leading to inaccurate assumptions and interpretations about the prevalence of different crime types in different areas. To promote consistency among different police forces, it seems necessary to establish standards and detailed guidelines for recording practices.

Recording crimes by the police, or reporting crimes by victims, may be influenced by several factors. In Tehran, some of the recording inconsistencies are related to the legal definition of theft, where different types of theft are not clearly defined by the law. This leads to differences which are determined by the knowledge and the interpretation of those incidents by the police. An officer may record a similar incident albeit in different locations as a different type of crime. This is especially so in more complicated situations where more than one type of crime is committed by the offender. Another limitation observed by the researcher, which again derived from the legal definition of the crime was that according to the law burglaries that have not resulted in property loss ought to be recorded as ‘attempts’. The police did not record burglaries which did not result in a loss of property, or where the value of that lost property was particularly low. As a result the numbers of crimes were artificially decreased or clear up rates inflated.
Since no victimisation survey have been carried out in Tehran there is no systematic way of demonstrating to what extent crimes including burglaries remain unreported. It is also difficult to determine to what extent changes in the crime rate may be the result of either the changes in the reporting or recording trends, or variations in recording practices among police forces in different locations. Result from this study of burglary in Tehran revealed that wealthy areas are more at risk of burglary than others, and that the majority of burglaries occur in houses located in better-off areas (see chapter six for full results). These differences may be a result of differences in reporting rather than true differences. However, as will be shown later there is evidence to suggest that high crime rates are a true reflection of crimes committed whether in wealthy areas or not. That is to say all victims, wealthy or poor report offences largely because to them the high value of the property stolen is important, and all hope for the possibility of retrieving their valuables if the offender were detained. A burglary of a house in a poor area may involve a considerably lower level of financial loss, but this nonetheless is important to him.

Support for this can be found in evidence from a study of the social and cultural implications of specific areas in which the crimes occur. First of all, it has to be noted that reports made to the police are not always based on the level of financial loss, but in many stances are a response to the emotional and physiological effects of crime. Victims may find that reporting the incident to the police have a calming effect on them, for example by believing that they did the right thing; or by talking to the police, or even by hoping that they may get some useful advice from the police to prevent them from being burgled in the future. They may even believe that reporting the crime is a natural way of responding to being burgled.

Secondly and more importantly, despite the fact that the financial loss involved in burglaries occurs in better-off areas are often much higher than those occurred in poorer areas, the actual amounts stolen and the possibility of replacing the lost goods remains proportionately the same. Therefore, a victim losing a small amount of valuables in a poorer area may need to put in the same effort as a victim losing more in a wealthier
area. This means that although the level of financial loss is different for the two victims, the nature and the consequences of that victimisation may be the same. In addition, in Tehran as mentioned earlier, insurance policies are not yet commonly used for residential premises, (although may be more commonly used by commercial and industrial premises), therefore, removing the possibility of the likelihood that higher reporting tendency for insurance purposes for certain occupants, i.e. wealthier ones.

5.6 Summary and Conclusion

The search for the literature made evident that very little work have been conducted on residential burglary, and the majority of what is available, is descriptive and theoretical, also their reliability is restricted by lacking empirical-based evidence. Similar limitations are encountered by the recorded crime statistics, they were found to be inaccessible, and when accessed, are extremely inconclusive in creating a clear picture of burglary, for lacking accurate, advanced, and systematic methods for recording crimes.

In order to improve the quality of the literature, the researcher suggests that crime studies must be encouraged, first by providing funding, second by facilitating access to sources of information such as statistical figures recorded by the police and criminal courts, third by establishing training courses on appropriate research methods and making them available to researchers and academic bodies. Also, it is essential that the criminal justice agencies, crime prevention agencies, and the academics establish a close relationship and arrange meetings, conferences, and seminars, to be given the opportunity to share their knowledge and experience to attain the most suitable ways of dealing with crime and public order issues. Moreover, proposals have to be made to research centres to extend the volume of their research and focus on prioritising types of research topics (crimes) that are creating more tangible problems and their social effects are greater for the society. This thesis is hoping to contribute to knowledge on residential burglary in Tehran, and produce the grounds and motivations for future research and participate in future policy-making.
CHAPTER SIX
Aim 4: To determine patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. That is to examine the manner in which residential burglary is conducted (when, where, and how residential burglaries takes place).

Sub-aims are:

a) To determine the socio-economic features of the interviewed offenders, and to demonstrate their distribution in terms of gender, age, marital status, education, employment, income, etc.

b) To determine the factors that have motivated offenders to become engaged in criminal activities, especially in residential burglary;

c) To determine the times at which the occurrence of burglary is more prevalent; it includes the seasons, the times of the year or special occasions in which offenders are not prepared to commit any crime, or on the contrary, are more likely to commit crimes; the days of the week, and the times of day or night when offenders prefer to commit their burglaries;

d) To determine the spatial patterns of residential burglary, that is 'where' crimes occur. This section is focusing on areas more at risk of burglary and attempts to explain the socio-economic characteristics of such areas. It is also concerned with the types of housings (i.e. bungalows, houses, apartment, high-rise buildings) more at risk of being burgled, and intends to determine whether the location of houses within specific areas determine their selection as being targets of crime;
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e) To determine the influence of factors such as occupancy, areal density and community relationship, surveillance, accessibility, on the selection of targets by offenders, and to determine the target selection procedure, that is the availability of opportunities, or the amount of planning involved in the selection of specific targets for burglary. It will also determine the influence of preventive measures and security devices, i.e. burglar alarms, and target hardening techniques, i.e. use of proper or advanced locks and bolts on burglary;

f) To determine 'how' burglaries occur, including the techniques which are often used by residential burglars to enter residential properties, and identification of the routes often used for escape; to examine and monitor the searching places and types of valuables targeted by residential offenders; as well as the trading techniques employed by offenders to market their stolen properties.

6.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended to analyse the results from interviews with residential burglars. It is concerned with formulating the patterns of residential burglary in Tehran, that is to say to examine the manner in which residential burglary is conducted, and to determine when, where, and how residential burglary takes place. The main body of data, comes from semi-formal interviews with convicted residential burglars living in custodial institutions, in Tehran. Interviews and questions asked from offenders covered all four sections. The first section sought general information and was intended to produce an insight into the offender's socio-economic background. This type of information included offender's age, place of birth, place of residence, education, marital status and familial information, occupational status and level of income prior to conviction. This section is intended to show the social and economic background that interviewed offenders have come from. This information is presented under the heading of 'Socio-Demographic Variables of Offenders' (section 6.2).
The second section was designed to establish an awareness about the offender’s criminal career, and sought information about the age that offenders started their criminal activities, the types of crimes they have committed, the frequency of their criminal activities, and their previous criminal convictions. This information has been produced under the heading of ‘Crime-Related Information from Offenders’ (section 6.3).

The third section focuses on the main factors that motivated offenders in their engagement with criminal activities. While this study was not ultimately concerned with probing the offender’s motivations, it was considered that some information showing why offenders commit crimes and how they began being engaged in criminal activities would produce an insight into offender’s attitudes towards criminality. This information is discussed under the heading of ‘Motivational Factors’ (section 6.4).

The analysis of the data discussed in these three sections are believed to assist with an explanation of how patterns of residential burglary are formed. The information discussed in the first three sections, was also used to ensure the validity and reliability of the data produced by offenders, that is to ensure offenders were also consistent with the information they shared with the researcher. In some parts of these sections basic statistical methods have been used to illustrate the proportion and frequency of values among offenders, also in limited instances attempts have been made to demonstrate the statistical relationship between these variables (depending on whether the variable was ordinal or nominal). In most cases it was found that such techniques could not be used to create meaningful analysis, as they ended up containing cells with very small frequencies. Also, the difficulties with the sampling of interviewed offenders, which resulted in a non-random selection of the sample, prevent the research from engaging in detailed statistical analysis. In addition, the data presented in the first three sections were meant to assist with a better understanding of when, where, and how burglaries occur, and in themselves, have little value in explaining burglary patterns, and for that reason qualitative data was preferred.
The fourth section, which contains the main focus of the interviews, is concerned with an analysis of patterns of residential burglary in Tehran (section 6.5). This section, which contains the main analysis, consists of three sub-sections. The first sub-section is concerned with the times at which the highest volume of crime is conducted, referred to as 'when' residential burglary is taking place, and comes under the heading of 'Temporal Patterns' (section 6.5.1). The second sub-section is concerned with spatial patterns, that is the places and areas where most burglaries occur, as well as factors contributing to the selection of such targets, referred to as 'where' burglary is occurring. This sub-section with its major focus on various aspects of a procedure which is used by offenders regarding areas, locations and types of housing selected for burglary, is discussed under the main heading of 'Spatial Patterns' (section 6.5.2) and contains several sub-headings.

Finally, the third sub-section, is concerned with the manner by which residential burglary is committed, referred to as 'how' burglary is conducted. This is discussed under the heading of 'The Burglary Event' (section 6.5.3). This sub-section also contains several sub-headings discussing various procedures by which an offender carries out his/her burglary including entry techniques, the search inside the house, the valuables targeted by offenders, trading of stolen property and termination of criminal activities. In each section attempts have been made to, briefly outline the results from interviews; and, discuss and analyse the reasons indicated by the interview findings.

6.2 Socio-Demographic Variables

6.2.1 Age and Sex Variables

6.2.1.1 Age Variable

The researcher decided to include only adult offenders for interviews, if only to obtain more precise data on adult offending. All offenders were selected from the adult custodial institutions, which usually held inmates of 18 years and over. Data on the age of offenders in summarised below:
Table 6.1 Descriptive of interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewed offenders' age ranged between 14 and 47. The average (mean) age of offenders was shown to be 29.7, with the majority of offenders being located near the mean (about 60% aged between 26 and 35), with a standard deviation of 8.03.

Since the interviewed offenders were selected from the adult institution, all offenders were expected to be over 18. During the interview, however, an inmate was brought for interview, who was aged 14. Initial questioning showed that despite his age, he was very experienced and held a vast amount of information on residential burglary, therefore, he was included in the interview. He was imprisoned in an adult institution for persistent offending, and was assumed to have a bad influence on other juveniles. The table below shows the distribution of age-groups of interviewed offenders:

Table 6.2 Distribution of age of interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the majority of interviewed offenders (about 50%) were aged between 26 and 35, with a lower proportion (about 27%) aged under 25, and about 23% aged over 36. The age distribution of interviewed offenders is consistent with the findings from
other studies such as Ghorban-Hosseini (1992), and data from police statistics from
Tehran (see Table 5.4, p. 177). This age distribution, however, for convicted offenders
and there is no evidence to show how they compare with non convicted burglars.

6.2.1.2 Sex Variable

The majority of interviewed offenders, as was expected, were male. Only five females,
were classified as burglars and convicted for burglary offences, of which only 2 admitted
to be involved in residential burglary and consented to being interviewed.

Table 6.3 Distribution of sex among interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small number of women engaging in residential burglary may reflect their lower rate
of offending. In respect to residential burglary, which explicitly means intruding into the
most personal aspects of people's lives, the lower participation of women may be
explained by their perception of residential burglary as being too risky, or too intrusive.
The role women played in burglary activities were also different to their male
counterparts; they seldom played an active role, mainly assisting male burglars. It is
often the case that women are used as informers or accompany men during burglary to
raise less suspicion when observed by the public or by the police.

6.2.2 Distribution of Offenders in Place

The research sought information on where these offenders were born, and where they
were permanently resident. This information illustrates the offender's socio-economic
background, and determines their original localities. The following table shows the
proportion of interviewed offenders who are born in the capital city of Tehran and those who are born outside Tehran.

Table 6.4 Distribution of place of birth of offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Tehran</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Tehran</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, the majority of offenders were born in Tehran. A relatively smaller number of offenders were born outside Tehran, mainly in small towns and villages. Among the 16 offenders who were born outside Tehran, 4 came from a border city of Kermanshah (with a significant drug-traffic problem), 4 from the villages of the city of Tabriz (a large industrial city located within the Azarbayejan Province in the northwest of Iran), the remaining 8 came from small, mainly disadvantaged villages. Investigation into the areas and localities of those who were born in Tehran showed that all except two were born and spent most of their childhood in disadvantaged and poorer areas of the city. The socio-economic implication of such localities will be addressed later in this chapter.

Of the 16 offenders who were born outside Tehran 6 moved and resided in Tehran, mainly in lower-income, poorer areas and peripheries. In all cases the reason for coming to Tehran was to seek employment and search for a source of income (see chapter 4). Two offenders were born outside Tehran and have lived there all their lives. They sold their stolen goods in Tehran, and were arrested and imprisoned in Tehran. The remaining 8 who were born outside Tehran, had an unstable life-style, had no accommodation in Tehran and often travelled to Tehran to commit their crimes; of these 2 were truck-drivers and regularly came to Tehran transporting goods, 2 stayed with relatives, the remaining were doing labouring work and spent the nights in their work places. None of the offenders who were born in Tehran migrated to other cities or towns. Table 6.5 illustrates the permanent place of residence:
Table 6.5 Distribution of offenders by their permanent place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Tehran</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Tehran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen from the table above the majority of offenders lived permanently in Tehran (75%), about 5% permanently resided outside Tehran, and 8 cases (about 20%) had no stable home and constantly moved from one area to another, or from Tehran to other cities and towns, either to commit more crimes or to keep away from the area of their last crime to reduce the risk of apprehension.

6.2.3 Educational level of Offenders

It is generally assumed that criminals have low levels of education. This is often explained by the assumption that criminals come from lower class families with a lower educational background, and families with a large number of siblings, living in small size houses, which produce little space and opportunity for proper education. The educational level of offenders in this study supported that general assumption. The table below illustrates the proportion and level of education among these offenders.

Table 6.6 The educational level of interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading and writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed primary school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of education was classified into 7 categories. Those who never had any formal or informal education were classified as illiterate, 4 offenders (9.8%) were included in this category. The second group contained offenders who were able to read and write, they had learned reading and writing either by attending one or two years in primary education, or had been taught in prison by the educational committee (called ‘Nehzat’)\footnote{‘Nehzat’ was established after the Islamic Revolution and provided educational facilities for adults living in less advantaged areas within large cities, smaller towns and villages.} responsible for the education of adult illiterate offenders. A large proportion of offenders (26.8%) had completed primary school, about a similar proportion (24.4%) had left school while in secondary school, and 9 offenders (22%) stated that they had left school while in high school. A smaller number (5 offenders, 12.2%) had completed high school and obtained their National Diploma\footnote{The educational system in Iran comprises of 12 years of compulsory education, 5 years elementary (primary), 3 years secondary, and four years of high-school education. This level of education is made compulsory for the whole nation and the government is responsible for the expenses and fees. Successful completion of this cycle would obtain the ‘National Diploma’ for pupils. Volunteers for further education have to sit in an exam to be admitted to higher education.} (equivalent to ‘A’ level). Only one of the offenders had gone onto higher education, he was a third year university student studying ‘Information Technology’.

The general low levels of education among offenders may be explained by several factors such as having uneducated parents who do not consider education of their children to be important. It might be due to having large families living in small houses, where children spend most of their spare time outside the home. Since the majority of interviewed offenders came from economically deprived areas their low levels of education might be explained by their financial problems where children have to take up casual jobs to contribute to the family income, or at least provide their own pocket money and not to be a burden on the family (this is, for cultural reasons, more evident for boys than girls). This finding is supported by the National Statistics which suggest that the rate of literacy and the level of education is lower in southern poorer areas of Tehran, compared to more well-off areas (the literacy rate is higher than 90% in northern areas but lower than 80% in southern areas) (Markaz-e Motale’at, 1994 in Madanipour, 1998: 86).
6.2.4 Marital Status of Offenders

It is generally believed in Iran, that marriage and family responsibility can protect a man from deviation. It is assumed that a married man having the responsibility of providing for his family is encouraged to work harder leaving him little time to waste or associate with peers. The findings from the current research show, however, that this is not always so, and marriage for a man who is already involved in crime may have little effect on his criminality. The table below demonstrates the rate of marriage among these offenders:

Table 6.7 The marital status of interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid single, never married</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married, currently living together</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorce following a conviction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widowed, partner deceased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study 18 (44%) of the offenders were unmarried, and 23 (56%) were married. Of the 23 married offenders 12 (about 52% of married offenders) were still married at the time of interview, one offender’s husband was deceased, and 10 (about 43%) were divorced. Of the 10 divorced offenders all marriages had broken down as a result of their conviction and imprisonment. It is not known whether these offenders started their criminal activities prior to or after getting married, it is also difficult to establish whether conviction has been the main reason for the family breakdown, or that conviction has been used to break-up the problematic marriage. In order to examine the relationship between conviction and divorce, the researcher decided to run a cross-tabulation of ‘marital status’ and ‘number of conviction’. The following contingency table is unable to establish a meaningful pattern, as the numbers and frequencies are small, however, it shows that 9 out of 10 (90%) of divorced offenders had previous conviction compared to 9 out of 12 (75%) of those still married. This may be used to indicate that offenders whose marriage had broken down had higher conviction rate than those still in marriage.
Table 6.8 Cross-tabulation of marital status and number of previous convictions

Despite the fact that the above table cannot be used to suggest that family breakdown has occurred as a result of conviction, offenders themselves believed that their wives had divorced them because of their conviction.

In all divorce cases the wives had petitioned for a divorce while the husband was in prison, and had been granted a divorce, or were in the process of obtaining one. Offenders whose wives petition for a divorce are usually required to attend the court session, and if the court agrees with the divorce claim on behalf of the woman, the man has to sign the divorce papers. Criminal conviction is one factor in an Islamic society where a woman can petition for and be granted divorce without the husband's consent and in his absence. The other one is drug-addiction, which often affects the financial provision of the man for his family.

The number of children born into families of married offenders was generally low. The small number of children born into the married families of offenders may be explained by the regular visits of repeated offenders to prison and the unstable life-style of such offenders. Among our unmarried offenders, there was no evidence of the existence of a child being born illegitimately (from an extra-marital relationship).
6.2.5 Occupational Status and Income of Offenders

Employment is important not only in generating a source of income to respond to individual’s financial needs, but it keeps potential offenders occupied and leaves them little time to engage in criminal activities. On the other hand, it is generally assumed that unemployment or those types of occupation producing a low-level income are among the main factors contributing to criminality. Therefore, it was asked whether offenders held a consistent job prior to their arrest, and what the level of their income was. Table 6.9 demonstrates the frequency of employment amongst offenders:

Table 6.9 Distribution of employment among interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, it was found that the majority (about 80%) of offenders held a legal form of employment prior to their arrest. When asked what type, their response was varied. This diversity encouraged the researcher to classify employment as shown in the table below:

Table 6.10 Types of employment (categories) of interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>8 19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-employed</td>
<td>8 19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee</td>
<td>25 61.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight (19.5%) offenders have never had any legitimate job; the income from burglary constituted their main income. Included there was one female; a mother of two whose financial needs were met by her husband, mainly from burglary and drug-dealing. The remainder were all single males, who burgled houses for different reasons, and their lifestyle depended on income from crime. The ‘employee’ category, (those employed and
paid by someone, regardless of the type of work) contained the highest proportion of offenders. The 25 (61%) offenders included in this category, were engaged in various types of mainly low class and low paid work including manual labour work, i.e. brick-laying, bakery, shoe-making, dress-making, mechanics, factory labouring, driving. Some were engaged in a better-paid type of work such as flower-arrangement, one was a sculptor, one was an architect designer, and another worked in a software company. The income earned by such offenders was as diverse as their work.

Eight (19.5%) offenders were categorised as ‘self-employed’ (those who worked independently), 2 had electrical shops, one was a painter, another was a Taxi-driver, one had a sports shop, one was a farmer, one was involved in buying and selling cars, household equipment, etc. and a female offender who lived abroad for 20 years said she was an interpreter. It is believed in Iran that self-employed types of jobs generally produce higher income than jobs where people are getting paid by an employee. The table below demonstrate the level of income of the 33 offenders holding a job prior to their arrest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no, less than sufficient</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, sufficient/good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of income in the table above has been categorised according to the offender’s financial needs. There were two reasons for doing this. First, difficulties associated with the rate of exchange (which differed extensively in recent years for economic reasons) from Rial (IR) to Pound, made the accurate exchange impossible, as it produced different amounts depending on different rates. Second, the fluctuations in the value of money in different periods, when offenders were working, resulted in the inability of the research worker to compare the offender’s level of income, as the value of money
changed over years. Instead, the researcher decided to base her evaluation of the economic situation of offenders upon their own perception of their economic level.

This study showed that a large number of employed offenders (29 of 33, 88%) earned income from their legitimate jobs thought to be insufficient to their financial needs. Only 4 claimed that their income was sufficient. It has to be noted that certain amounts of money that was considered sufficient to respond to the needs of some offenders was regarded as insufficient to respond to the needs of others, possibly depending on their marital status, the number of dependents, their drug status, or their materialistic expectations.

6.2.6 Criminality in the Family

It is similarly assumed that criminal parents will produce criminal children. Criminality of parents may not be a determinant factor in the criminality of children but it can reasonably be assumed to increase the chance of criminality among children, i.e. if crime becomes an acceptable type of behaviour. However, in cases where the offender is the only member involved in criminal activities in his/her family, s/he may be influenced by several other social, psychological, and economic factors contributing to offending. The table below illustrates the situation in our study:

Table 6.12 Distribution of crime in the family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study found that while the majority (34 offenders) had no member of their family engaging in criminal activities, 7 offenders had one or more members of their immediate family (parents, brothers and sisters, spouse) doing so. The table below shows the
number of members in the family involved in criminal activities for this group.

Table 6.13 Number of family members involved in criminal activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>one member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wife-husband co-offending</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 5 offenders had one or more members of their family involved in criminal activities. One offender had his father and three of his brothers engaged in regular criminal activities, he also had started crime in a very early age. He believed that the tendency to commit crime was in his genes. In addition, 2 offenders co-offended with their spouses, including one female who had become involved in criminal activities with her husband from her second marriage. She stated that she was pressurised into co-offending by her partner. The other was a male offender who carried out his burglaries by employing women who accompanied him. He had married one of the women who was working for him and they had become criminal partners ever since.

6.3 Crime-Related Information from Offenders

This section is intended to provide information on the offender’s background. Offenders were asked about the age they became involved in criminal activity, the approximate number of residential burglaries they have committed, their past criminal records and convictions, the most prevalent type of crime they have been engaged with, and their drug consumption.
6.3.1 Personal Criminal Record

In this section, offenders were asked at what age they had committed their first crime. The responses are shown in the following table:

Table 6.14 The age categories offenders started their criminal activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to this question revealed an interesting finding. Unlike the general assumption, which suggests that criminality often begins in the early teen-age years, this study showed that the majority of 28 (68%) first became engaged in criminal activities when aged 18 and higher. It was shown that the largest proportion of offenders (46.3%) started their criminal activities between 18-25. Furthermore, a proportion of others started over 25 years. Only about one third (31.7%) of these offenders had committed their first crime under the age of 18.

Offenders were then asked about the main type of crime committed. It was expected that burglary would be the crime offenders were engaged in, regularly. The answers to this question confirmed that all except 2 offenders committed burglary as their main criminal activity (types of theft including auto-theft and residential burglary), the remaining 2 claimed to be highly skilled pick-pocketers, but had also committed large number of residential burglaries. In the next question they were asked about other types of crimes committed during their criminal career (if any), apart from burglary. Results showed that 25 offenders had carried out theft and burglaries, 8 were involved in street-fighting and public order offences, 2 in selling drugs, 2 in fraud, 2 in bribery, 1 in firearms dealing, and one in kidnapping. This information reassured the researcher that their answer provided further evidence of validity.

The next question was to investigate the number of burglaries offenders had committed,
and how often they committed them. The table below shows the number of burglaries offenders claimed to have committed prior to their conviction. These have been put into three categories:

Table 6.15 The number of burglaries (categories) carried out by offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid one</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1, &lt;5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and more</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of burglaries carried out by offenders ranged between 'one' and 'unlimited', therefore, for the purpose of interpretation they had to be classified into three categories. The first group contained offenders who claimed to have carried out only one burglary, the one that they have been arrested and convicted for. There were 5 offenders who had committed more than one but less than five burglaries (12.2%). Offenders with more than 5 burglaries were more experienced, and relatively older, 24 out of 30 offenders included in this group were aged over 25. As was shown earlier, the age these offenders started their criminal activities was generally higher than 18, this would suggest that the criminal career of offenders is reinforced, as they grow older.

In order to examine the effects of drugs on the number of burglaries committed by offenders, cross-tabulation of 'drug-use' and 'number of burglaries' was conducted. It was shown that of the 16 drug addicts participating in the interview, a considerable number 13 (81%) had committed more than 5 burglaries (Table 6.16).
Table 6.16 The number of burglaries committed by offender’s drug-use

However, a strong relationship between the drug use and number of burglaries could not be established, as the same table shows that 67% of non-drug-users had committed more than 5 burglaries. Also, there is nothing to suggest that drug addiction has encouraged offenders to increase the extent of their criminal activities, or that their addiction followed extensive involvement with criminal activities and association with criminal peers. This is an issue that deserves more attention than can be given here.

Offenders were then asked how often they committed a burglary. This question was also used to validate the data presented by offenders in previous questions, i.e. the number of burglaries they had committed, and the extent of their involvement with burglary. Also, this information was used to check the consistency of the data when, at a later stage, offenders would be asked about their burglary experiences. The table below demonstrate the frequency of burglaries carried out by interviewed offenders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of burglaries in groups</th>
<th>how often do you use drugs</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
<th>habitual</th>
<th>occasional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within number of burglaries in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within how often do you use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within number of burglaries in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within how often do you use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within number of burglaries in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within how often do you use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within number of burglaries in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within how often do you use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.17 The frequency of burglary committed by interviewed offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Burglary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid once</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once or twice in a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every day/night</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenever I need money</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesised that these offenders would have committed a larger number of burglaries- at least- if they were honest about the information they gave. It can be seen from table 6.18 that those offenders, who had committed the larger number of burglaries, were also more often involved in burglary activities. For example, those occasional offenders, who admitted to having carried out ‘more than one but less than five burglaries’, committed burglary less frequently, and usually only as a result of financial hardship situations, but the more persistent offenders, who had committed ‘more than five burglaries’ (third category), admitted to having committed burglary between one per night to one a month. The vast majority of offenders located in this category (26 out of 30, 87%) claimed to have committed an unlimited number of burglaries, and had committed burglary once a week, every night/day, or whenever they needed money.

---

**Table 6.18 The frequency of burglary by the number of burglaries committed by offenders**

---
It is interesting to state that those burglars, who were engaged in frequent burglary activities, did not have much higher drug-use than those less frequently involved in criminal activities. It was shown that 75% (15 out of 20) of the active burglars were drug-users compared to 62% (13 to 21) of less active offenders who were non-drug-users.

Also attempts were made to establish a correlation between the frequency of burglary and the frequency of drug-consumption of offenders. A weak relationship was found between the two, confirming that that the frequency of burglary activities has weak association with drug addiction ($r = 0.240$). Finally, offenders were asked whether they had a previous criminal records, and if they did how many previous convictions. The answers to these questions showed there was a wide variation between the offender's criminal records ranging between none to 16. Accordingly, it was decided to classify them to three groups: offenders who had no previous convictions and were imprisoned for the first time, offenders who had 1 to 5 previous convictions, and offenders who had several convictions (more than five). The tables below summarise the answers:

Table 6.19 The number of interviewed offenders with previous convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen, more than two thirds (29.3%) of offenders had previous convictions. It would appear that the length of sentence received depended on this as well as several other factors including the nature of crime (armed or unarmed), its consequences, the value of stolen property, etc.
Table 6.20 The number of previous criminal records of offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Criminal Records</th>
<th>No. of Offenders</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large proportion (43.9%) had 1-5 previous convictions, and 26.8% of offenders had more than five previous convictions (table 6.20). A correlation between the number of previous convictions and age does not suggest a strong positive relationship between the two ($r = 0.283$), therefore, there is nothing to suggest that those with higher number of convictions are older.

In order to examine whether the number of criminal conviction was related to the number of burglaries committed by these offenders, cross-tabulation and correlation analysis were used.

Table 6.21 Cross-tabulation of the number of burglaries and the number of conviction of interviewed offenders
It is evident from table 6.21 that while 10% of those who had committed ‘5 and more burglaries’ had no previous conviction, 90% did. Of the latter group, 53% had less than 5 convictions and 37% had more than five convictions.

A clear positive relationship between the number of burglaries and the number of convictions committed by offenders interviewed in this study was evident ($r = 0.659$), showing that the higher the number of burglaries the higher will be the chance of arrest and conviction.

### 6.3.2 Burglary and Drugs

Drug-use was expected to have a large influence on the level and pattern of burglary; therefore, special care was taken when asking offenders about their drug-use. In this study these offenders were asked whether they used any drugs prior to their conviction. And if they did, whether they used them regularly or occasionally. It seemed that most offenders had no problem answering this question. In addition, in most cases the offender’s drug-use was fairly apparent at least from their physical appearance and their way of speech. It seemed that offenders themselves were aware that one would easily sense this fact, therefore, in most cases, they readily confessed to drug-addiction. The answers to the questions on drug-use are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the table that the majority (51%) claimed not to have used drugs before being arrested. In this group there were many offenders who claimed to be against drug use, and did not want to take drugs. However, 4 (9.8%) admitted to occasional use of drugs (table 6.23). They said drug gave them ‘pleasure’ when mixing with friends.
who were regular drug users. They have also insisted that they could give up drug-use any time they wanted to, and that they were not dependent on drugs in order to perform their work.

Table 6.23 The frequency of drug-use of offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid habitual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third group, the so-called drug-addicts constituted 39% of offenders (80% of those using drugs). These were regular drug-users and spent a large amount of the profits gained from burglary on feeding their habit. Earlier the relationship between drug-use and burglary was examined and the results confirmed a weak relationship between the two. This suggests that about half of these offenders carried out burglaries for reasons other than feeding the drug-habit. More detailed analysis on the influence of drugs on the level and pattern of residential burglary will be presented in the next section.

6.4 Motivational Factors

This section is intended to look at the factors that have motivated offenders to become engaged in criminal activities, especially in residential burglary (sub-aim b, aim 4). In order to do so, offenders were asked what factors have motivated and encouraged them towards criminality. This research is not particularly concerned with causal factors, that is why offenders commit crimes, but is intended to investigate the offender’s perception of their own criminality and examine their attitudes towards their activities. It is believed that answers to this question will assist in producing a clearer picture about factors which may determine the extent to which an offender becomes involved in crime, and the patterns which may be influenced by these factors.
In addition, this question gave offenders the opportunity to express their feelings about their own offending and tell their story as they wished. It also was a turning point from formality to informality, for it seemed that once they told their side of a story they felt more comfortable with the researcher. That was what the interviewer needed before getting into more critical and specific questions that formed the main subject on patterns of residential burglary. The answers to this question were often long and contained information that could be used to check the validity of their subsequent answers, as well as explaining their behaviour when they committed burglaries.

Every burglar may have a justifiable answer to what had contributed to the start of his or her criminality. The reasons for criminality may remain the same or may change after a few offences. Some may have started burglary because they were in desperate financial need, but it does not necessarily mean that offenders would stop criminality when they obtained a fair amount of money that meet their financial needs. This is especially so for offenders who get involved in drug-use following criminality.

In this section offenders were asked, what was the main reason for their offending. The table below summarises the reasons presented by offenders themselves:

Table 6.24 The main reasons for offending, expressed by offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>No of Offenders*</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>need for money</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug-habit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading a luxurious life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence of friends, spouse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excitement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since many offenders expressed more than one factor to have motivated them into criminality, the cumulative number exceeds the total number of offenders in the sample.

Interviews with residential burglars revealed that the majority of offenders became
involved in burglary activities for financial needs. However, in order to look more closely at the impact of drugs on burglary, the study attempted to analyse offender's motivation by dividing them into two major groups:

1) Offenders who were drug-addicted, and
2) Offenders who were not on drugs, or consumed drugs occasionally.

The first group, were further divided into two categories:

- Offenders who were drug-addicted prior to criminality, and became involved in criminal activities mainly to feed their drug addiction, and
- Offenders who started criminality for other reason(s) but became addicted at some stage after being involved in crime, and currently committed their crime mainly to satisfy their habit.

The factors motivating offenders to become involved in crime were varied. The study shows that 39% of offenders were encouraged to offend by their financial needs. However, it was necessary to distinguish between those who needed money to spend on non-drug-related needs, i.e. house rent, paying debts, supporting parents, social interactions, etc., and those who needed money to feed their drug habit. The study shows that 9 (21%) of our offender's criminal activities were initiated by their drug habits. It was shown earlier (table 6.22 & 6.23) that about 40% of our offenders were drug-addicts before getting arrested; therefore, the remainder must have become addicted following involvement in criminal activities. The procedure by which drug-addiction may initiate criminal activities or may lead to criminal career is demonstrated below in figure 6.1.

According to this diagram, drug-use can influence crime levels in two ways: (1) it may initiate a crime occurrence; or (2) it may become the main reason for continuing with crime. Drug-use may be the main reason for getting involved in criminal activities for some offenders. The high cost of drugs encourages potential offenders to offend (drug is
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Figure 6.1 Drug feeds back into crime
an initiative) to obtain the finance for their drugs. It seems that drug use of these offenders, who come mainly from lower economic class, often intensifies following obtaining higher income form criminal activities. This will result in intensification of criminal activities to feed the increased use of drugs, turning them into career offenders. For these offenders there is no way out of crime unless the drug habit is terminated.

There are other offenders who become involved in criminal activities for other non-drug-related reasons, i.e. financial needs, excitement, supporting their parents, etc., but become addicted following offending, i.e. for association with drug-addict co-offenders. These offenders are often forced to continue to offend, even after their initial needs are met, as the cost of drug is not met by other means but offending. Therefore, in such situations although involvement in criminal activities is not initiated by drug-use, continuance with criminal activities is reinstated by meeting the costs of drug habit.

In fact, drug-use and crime are constantly leading to each other, reinforcing a criminal career for offenders who in some way, preceding or following criminal activities, become in touch with drug habit, unless the drug habit is broken.

However, the findings from this study showed that 25 (61%) of interviewed offenders were not in drug use (51%), or used drugs occasionally (10%), mainly for entertainment. A detailed conversation with offenders made it clear that the majority of offenders had actually committed their first burglary as a result of their financial need. Moreover, it was also evident that the majority of offenders had not stopped criminal activities when the financial needs were met, but continued their criminality for a different reason, for example, learning the fact that the money obtained from illegitimate job was much higher than the money earned from a legitimate job, while required much less effort and time, comparing to the legitimate job.

Offenders gave different reasons for their offending. The followings are direct quotations from offenders stating their reasons for offending. One offender expressed his financial need to have motivated him towards offending as:
"I was 13 when my dad was sent to jail for selling drugs, I was the oldest and had to look after my mum and six brothers and sisters. I had to quit school and start working. I worked in a cinema, cleaning floors and windows, but the money wasn't enough to feed the family, so I started petty theft and other types of burglary..."³ (Case 8)

Some offenders claimed that their business had failed therefore they went into major debt, which could not be paid through a legitimate job. A married offender who had four children stated that the deposit money requested by the landlord (which he could not afford to pay) was the main factor for offending. Some offenders who were in desperate need for money and had criminal friends were encouraged by them to offend. Seven expressed their ambitious attitude towards life. These offenders although they did not have severe financial problems and their daily expenses were paid by the income from their legitimate job, had a strong tendency to live more comfortably and desired higher spending. A young offender expressed his ambitions to spend large amounts of money on entertainment and enjoying life as:

"I was working in my dad's shop, selling electrical goods. He was providing me with accommodation and was giving me some extra pocket money, which I think was sufficient for a boy of my age (18) to manage his clothing, and going out with friends, occasionally. But I always wanted more. I had a wealthy friend, who was living in the North (of Tehran). I used to go to his dad's shop, which had many wealthy visitors, they were all driving nice, big and expensive cars, and I always wanted to drive one of those. I had a girlfriend, who constantly asked for money, and I wanted to pretend that I could afford her requests. My two friends and I used to hire American big cars and take our girlfriends out to dinner. We took them to very posh restaurants, bought them expensive clothes. We all enjoyed that. With legal job we could not afford all that, so when my friend suggested a house which he knew was empty over a weekend, I accepted his suggestion with no hesitation, ...the money we earned from the burglary, was very good, without having to go through much trouble, but it took us only 3-4 days to spend it all."

Another 20 years old offender who always carried out his burglaries with his 23 years old cousin said:

³ Since all interviews have been conducted in Iran, in Persian language, all the "quotes" from offenders had to be translated from Farsi to English. Specific cultural phrases, which may not make sense in exact translation, have been presented to deliver the meaning in the best possible way.
“Having a good time is very expensive, having girlfriends, drinking, travelling with friends, etc., needs lots of money. My dad always gave me some money but I couldn’t ask for more all the time, the trainers and the designer clothing I wanted to wear were very expensive, you have to buy things for your girlfriends to impress them and make them happy, smoking weeds, ... are all expensive, you can’t ask your dad for money all the time.” (Case 11)

Some were born into poor families and had developed an obsessive attitude towards money and the upper class in society. One drug-addict who was born into a poor family and had 14 brothers and sisters said:

“I had a friend who always brought expensive toys to school. Whenever I asked my dad to buy me those toys he refused and said he couldn’t afford it. I started hating that boy for having things that I couldn’t have. One day I stole some money from a bus-driver and bought a toy gun which I really liked to have, then I continued stealing for buying things, after a while I was known as a thief in our village, I couldn’t stay there any longer, I came to Tehran, Tehran is so big, its much easier to steal without being recognised.” (Case 12)

Another 39 years old drug-addicted with 18 years criminal experience said:

“any legal job I tried to run a wealthy life, failed. How come so many people put much less effort into life and get everything. This is not fair, somebody has got a car for every member of his family and I after all these years can’t afford to buy one, so the best thing is to steal from those who got too many.” (Case 37)

Nine offenders claimed to have started criminality to meet their drug habit. One professional drug-addict offender said:

“When my dad found out that I had become drug-addicted he asked me to leave the house and never come back. My dad was quite wealthy but stopped supporting me for being involved in drugs, I started selling drugs until I became acquainted with a woman who was a professional burglar, she employed me as her driver first, but then she gradually involved me with her burglaries, we made a successful team.” (Case 21).

Five said they had begun their criminal activity mainly because they came from broken families, or their parents cared inadequately for what they were doing. These offenders
were all young and started criminal activities at a very young age. A 14-year-old persistent offender who was spending time in an adult prison said:

"My dad left us when I was 5, he went to Tehran and re-married. My mum was very upset; my dad never showed any affection towards me, he was so selfish. I started hanging around with wrong boys, started nicking things from shops, started drinking, but although I was the only child he never cared. Sometimes I go to Tehran to my step-mother’s house and do things to hurt her and my dad." (Case 14)

Another 27 years old offender who started his first burglary when he was 17 said:

"My mum and dad were always fighting, then my mum got divorced and my dad re-married, I didn’t like my step-mother, and always had problems with my dad, so ran away from home. I became involved in crime for going out with criminal friends, but now I don’t do it for money I just do it whenever I get bored, it excites me." (Case 27)

Nine offenders claimed to have started crime under the influence of others, mainly friends. A 20-year-old offender who had come from Tabriz to Tehran to seek employment said:

"My mum sent me to her brother’s house in Tehran to find a job. I became friend with 17-18 year old boys in the neighbourhood, I saw them often talked about different houses, and saw that they often came with loads of money in their pockets, they never worked but always enjoyed themselves and spent generously,...I thought to my self why not me, it’s an easy job with a lot of money." (Case 9)

Some claimed that they cared and valued their friendship more than they should; therefore, they mainly carried out criminal activities for the sake of their friends, even though they had no need for money:

"I didn’t have a rich family but I was working in a shoe-making shop, and I did sculpture and an inlaying job, I had a reasonable income and was happy with my life. All the burglaries I did were for friendship sake, I couldn’t say ‘no’ to them, I always helped them,...but they left me alone when I was arrested, they did not protect me, everybody did only what was good for themselves, they weren’t real friends, I was very disappointed, I did wrong." (Case 17)
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Two claimed that they carried out burglary merely as a pay back to people who had hurt them. A young offender stated that he had been arrested for stealing from his uncle’s house, he said:

“I hated my uncle, my dad trusted his brother and left all his money to my uncle before dying and asked him to look after us. He didn’t give us our money back; instead, he spent it on expanding his own business. We had no money, my 70 years old mum had to work in people’s houses (as servant) to look after us, so me and my brother decided to take our revenge, we went to his house when he went on holiday, we didn’t want to steal, we just broke things and messed up the house, but we didn’t realise that his driver was looking after the house, he had reported us, my brother was shot by the police when he tried to escape, and died a few hours later.” (Case 13)

One claimed that he had no financial need for money but carried out offending only for the excitement. This offender was also involved in major acts of kidnapping. He was 33 and started his criminal activities when he was 13; he often carried a gun when going out on a burglary:

“The more exciting the job was the more willing I was to do it. I have done houses that most burglars weren’t prepared to do. I have committed most type of crimes. I’ve done everything. It was a few years since we became involved in kidnapping and selling children, we were a huge team,... most of us were executed. I sent my wife abroad and in the first chance I get I will go too.” (Case 39)

The reasons stated by offenders and the detailed conversation with burglars suggested that although the minority said they started their criminal activities for excitement and as a result of mixing with peers, it is evident that the majority of offenders came from poor families and the ‘need for money’ was the main motivation for their offending (see table 6.24). This does not suggest that financial problems would often result in offending, however, in the case of convicted burglars interviewed in this study the financial difficulties faced by these individuals was aggravated by other factors such as family problems, lower quality of education, absence of parental support, etc., which may have encouraged them even more towards offending.
Following the question on motivational factors, offenders were asked how they spend the money obtained from offending. This question was directed at those regularly involved in criminal activities, so that, one-time offenders who were arrested immediately after crime, and had not spent the money obtained from the crime, were omitted from the analysis. The table below summarises the answers given by the remaining 35 offenders:

Table 6.25 The main ways of spending the money obtained from crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things offenders spent their money on</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daily living costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily living costs, drugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment and pleasure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment and pleasure, drugs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ways in which offenders spent their money earned from burglary were classified into four categories:

- Offenders who claimed that financial need was the only reason for their offending, and that the income of a legitimate job was insufficient to meet the needs of their families (4, 11.4%). The 4 offenders located in this category were all married with children, mainly builders with low income and major breaks of unemployment. These offenders were not drug-users.

- Offenders who claimed to spend their income from crime mainly providing for the family (7, 20%). Of course offending made a more affordable life possible. These offenders were mainly married with children. They were drug-addicts and had to spend a large amount of money on their drug habit.

- Offenders who spent their money mainly on entertainment and pleasure including alcohol, women, friends, occasional drug-use, travelling, eating in first-class hotels,
etc. (13, 37%). The majority of these offenders were single, and had no habitual drug-use.

- Offenders who spent the money obtained from crime mainly on entertainment and pleasure, but were also habitual drug-users (11, 31.4%).

The findings from the current study also showed that the factors which motivated one-time offenders were different from those motivating persistent offenders. As it was shown in previous sections the sample included 6 offenders who claimed to have carried out only one offence. One was a painter, married with one child, who admitted to wanting a sufficient income to provide a reasonable life for the family, but got involved in crime because of his drug habit. Two offenders were involved in crime against a relative, with the intention of ‘revenge’. One had taken an overdose of Diazepam tablets, and had burgled his neighbour’s house under the influence of drugs. One claimed to have committed a burglary merely to respond and satisfy a close friend’s request. The last one had started a relationship with a girl, who indirectly encouraged him towards crime.

Summary and Conclusion

The previous sections attempted to determine the socio-economic backgrounds of interviewed offenders, their criminal profile, and their motivations for offending. The main findings from these sections suggest that almost all offenders in this study came from poor families, mainly living in socially and economically deprived areas. The social and economic implications for such areas are capable of explaining other features found in offenders, that are low-level of education, divorce and family problems, financial problems, unemployment or low-paid types of occupation, association with delinquent friends, drug-use, etc.

The socio-economic background of offenders is also an indicator of offender’s motivational factors for offending. The main reasons for offending are not

---

4 An anti depressant tablet which is claimed to be taken by young people as a mild type of drug.
straightforward, as crime is not the outcome of a single factor but is a reflection of several interacting factors. This study, however, was not intended to determine the causal factors, but was more interested in factors that offenders themselves thought are influencing them in their criminal behaviour, and in their perception of their own criminality. In most cases offenders managed to provide a reason that they thought had motivated them to become involved in criminality. The reasons presented were quite diverse, however, financial needs, including feeding drug habits were of major importance. Other reasons such as family problems, influence of friends, excitement, revenge, and desire to spend more generously, were mentioned less frequently. Detailed conversations with offenders also led to the conclusion that despite the fact that the majority of offenders started their criminal activities for economic reasons, elimination of financial problems did not prevent them from re-offending. They continued to offend for different reasons.

6.5 Patterns of Residential Burglary in Tehran

This section is intended to look at temporal patterns (when most burglaries occur) (sub-aim c, aim 4), spatial patterns (where most burglaries occur) (sub-aim d, aim 4), and ways in which offenders conduct their burglaries (the burglary event) (sub-aim e, aim 4), which include a series of actions such as probing occupancy, gaining entry, search patterns inside the dwelling, and selling stolen properties. Studying patterns of residential burglary in Tehran is important for a number of reasons. First, identifying these patterns in Tehran enables comparison with such patterns as those found in Western studies (see chapter 2), therefore, the findings from this study are expected to create a platform for comparison between the current study and those carried out in some Western countries. It also enables the study to investigate burglary pattern in its theoretical context, that is to examine whether the 'opportunity theory' theory, which the current research is based upon, is capable of explaining such patterns in Tehran. Moreover, identification of such patterns is expected to form appropriate background for policies and strategies to control burglary in Tehran.
6.5.1 Temporal Patterns of Residential Burglary

This section is intended to investigate when burglaries occur. A number of questions were asked to determine the times at which most burglaries occur (sub-aim c, aim 4). That is to examine to what extent time is considered important by offenders. It also aims to determine to what extent crime patterns are influenced by this factor. In other words, whether different times (seasons, months, week-days, times of a day) produce different patterns of residential burglary. Temporal patterns are also examined with reference to some religious and cultural occasions to determine to what extent temporal patterns are affected by such events. The concept of 'time' is expected to have a major influence in patterning residential burglary in Tehran. Identification of temporal patterns can assist the police and crime prevention agencies to establish more effective strategies to control burglary.

The main finding from the current study suggest that the rate of burglary varied at certain times of the day, week, over the year, and that burglary in Tehran is typically a night time activity which is carried out disproportionately higher on weekends. The answers to the question that asked offenders whether they conducted their burglaries during the 'day' or at 'night', are summarised below:

Table 6.26 The times of day which burglars often commit their burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>No. of Offenders</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anytime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study showed that a considerably high proportion of offenders, over 60%, were 'night burglars'. Only about 25% of offenders carried out their burglaries during the 'day', but about 15% burgled houses at 'anytime' during the day or night. The time at which night burglars operated varied widely, usually between 12 at midnight and 6 in the morning, although various burglars acted at different times, some preferred the early hours of the night when the occupants have just gone to sleep, others preferred a later
time nearer the dawn. Whatever the time preference, they all believed that their chosen time was a time when the occupants are in a deep sleep, so less attention is drawn to their presence. Night burglars who burgled only unoccupied houses held the opinion that if the occupants are not back by 12 a.m. it is highly likely that they will be away from home for the whole night, therefore, they felt safe to start their activities after 12 a.m. Day burglars had a more specific time pattern, with a peak time of 8-10 a.m., when occupants are either gone to work, school, or shopping, and 1-3 p.m., when most people, if at home, are taking their afternoon nap.

The results from interviews also showed that more than half of offenders (51%) performed their burglaries on weekends or on holidays, compared to 17% who worked on weekday. A large proportion of 27% indicated no preference and acted on any day of the week (Table 6.27).

Table 6.27 The days of the week that burglars often carried out their burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Week</th>
<th>No. of Offenders</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weekdays</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weekends &amp; holidays</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any day</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't remember</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further investigation into the time pattern of offenders showed 53% of those who worked on 'anyday' of the week conducted their burglaries at nights, night burglaries seem to be a major attraction to these residential burglars.

Respondents were also asked which seasons they usually committed their burglaries, and why (if any preferences were given). The answers to this question are summarised in table 6.28:
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Table 6.28 The seasons in which burglars often committed their burglaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>No. of Offenders</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any season</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some offenders chose more than one option

As it can be seen, while the season was not an important factor for about half of these offenders, 22% particularly preferred the summer and about 25% preferred the cold seasons. Those who had no seasonal commitment were either the more experienced offenders who had specific patterns compatible with various times and days; or the drug-addicts, who committed crime whenever they needed money. Crime, for this group of offenders, was a regular activity and the money earned from crime constituted the main source of income. This does not necessarily mean that the majority, who committed their burglaries in 'any season' of the year, had no preferences; rather it meant that a change of season did not stop them from offending. However, some preferred summer burglaries to winter burglaries and some the opposite.

All offenders who had seasonal preferences shared a similar logic, which suggests that burglaries during the beginning of the Spring and Summer were preferred, mainly because during the Summer, schools were closed, most people took their holidays during the Summer school holidays, or people more frequently went out for entertainment. These events resulted in residents being left unoccupied for a long period of time, producing a desirable opportunity for burglars. It is also important to know that the beginning of the spring is the start of a New Year for Iranians, the time in which everyone goes to visit relatives and friends, or take two weeks official national holiday. Residential offenders have described this time as the best time for residential crimes. The pattern of burglary in winter differed from that in summer. This was explained fully
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by one offender:

"...Every season has its own particular pattern, a professional burglar has to think about the advantages of every season, in Summer most people leave their houses in the evenings, they go out to have dinner in a posh restaurant, the houses we do, belong to these well-off people who like to show-off their wealth by having dinner in a posh restaurant; most of the windows are open in Summer, so many people forget to fasten them up when they sleep or when they go out...but there is a disadvantage to Summer, that is most people spend their evenings in their backyards, or sleep on the roof, they look around and check every little noise coming from nearby....In Winters, days are short, it gets dark soon, after 6-7 p.m., there is nobody on the streets, and if there is, they can't see you properly, every body is cold, in a rush to get home, they don't pay attention, if you go inside a house, they are all sitting in the living room, shutting the doors to feel warmer. All the windows are shut, people don't check on their neighbours or don't hear the noises coming from outside. You just have to find the house, find an entry spot, the rest is easy..."

Temporal patterns were largely influenced by 'occupancy'. Day burglars and night burglars were both concerned with occupancy; they planned their burglaries to be carried out at a time when they thought the house was most likely to be left unoccupied. This study showed that 60% of day burglars and a similar proportion of night burglars burgled only unoccupied houses. In addition, 80% of those who burgled houses both at night and during the day entered only houses that they knew were empty\(^5\).

Temporal patterns were also influenced by the probability of being seen by others. The larger number of night burglars compared to day burglars is an indication of such concern. The main reason given for the tendency to carry out their burglaries at night was darkness. Night burglars said it gave them a better opportunity to decide when people are at home and when they are not. The lights and the curtains are the best indicators to the more experienced burglars, although they tend to ensure that nobody is at home, i.e. ringing the bell, etc.

Offenders were asked about the special times and occasions where offenders were

---

\(^5\) Factors influencing burglary patterns have been questioned repeatedly, during the interview, to increase the validity of the findings.
particularly keen to carry out burglaries. Offenders were also asked whether there is any
time or occasion that they found exclusively suitable for burglary, i.e. national holidays,
New Year, etc. The answers to these questions were straightforward. It was found that a
considerable number of offenders (31.76%) preferred to burgle houses at New Years'
holidays, as most houses are likely to be left unattended at those times, and visibility is
reduced by less crowded neighbourhoods. Two offenders stated that time made no
difference to them; they burgled when they needed money; New Year or other times
were not important. Two offenders did not respond to this question, and six offenders
(14.%) expressed their concern and respect for people’s happiness, and did not tend to
steal from houses during the New Years’ holidays. Various reasons were expressed by
these offenders, i.e. “I do not spoil people’s New Year, I do it other times”, one offender
said. Another said: “most people have spent all their money by then, nothing is left
worth stealing”. Another offender stated:

“Only the desperate and drug-addicts stole at that time, we had done our job and
collected the money we need to spend in a new year way ahead, during new
years’ holidays we hide in our rat-hole (house) celebrating with our mates
(friends)”

The next question asked offenders whether there was any time or occasion, where they
had no interest in committing crimes, i.e. holy and religious occasion. The researcher has
included this question with the intention of understanding offender’s attitudes towards
religious beliefs, which have special spiritual implications for Iranian societies, to
determine whether offenders, who are aware of such implications, were prepared to
commit any offence during those times.

Before examining the answers an explanation is presented to clarify the current situation
in Iran. Iran is an Islamic country, and its cultural orientation is bound with its Islamic
historical events. These events are commemorated to revive and maintain the values
attained by those events. Religious ceremonies are actively held, widely participated,
and highly respected by the nation. These nights are considered holy, the moral and spirits are very high and any sin (crime) is unforgivable and intolerable by both the public and the law enforcement authorities. In addition, there is a month, which is especially holy, Ramadhan, the fasting month, a month which is designated for spiritual purification and for reminding the Islamic society of the poor and needy people, by fasting during the day, for a month, and by giving some money to people in need, by the end of the month. These times are always claimed by the police and the CJS to have a calming effect, the crime rates are lowest, despite the great opportunity it produces for residential burglary, because almost everyone is participating, most of the houses are unoccupied and left unattended for most of the night. This claim, had to be investigated by the researcher.

Offender’s attitudes towards these holy events were investigated and the situation sought from the offenders, who seemed to show little respect for the intimacy and privacy of residential premises. That is to say they broke into the properties of others, violated the rights of individuals and stole properties that did not belong to them and had no right to possess them. The answers to this question were quite surprising, and results were consistent with the claims made by the police. Only four offenders (10%) were non-attentive to these times, and said they would steal if they needed money. Three of these 4 were drug-addicts. The remaining 37 offenders (90%) were not prepared to commit a crime on religious nights or during Ramadhan, 18 (43%) of those were appalled by the thought of stealing during these times. It is interesting to know that offenders who did not commit a crime during those times, when were asked why, all gave reasons of which indicated their religious belief (although mainly traditional and unreasoned) or sometimes fear of something terrible happening to them if they did anything wrong during these times. Only two mentioned the fear of being severely punished if caught by members of the public or by the police.
Summary and Conclusion

Discussions on temporal patterns revealed that burglaries are largely affected by time patterns, and almost all burglars had their own specific reason for conducting their burglaries at specific times of day, week, month, or year. The findings made clear that burglary in Tehran is mainly a night time, weekend activity. Regardless of variation in times where burglary was committed, it was found that various offenders had created a pattern that they believed was associated with less risk and higher profit. Temporal patterns are also influenced by some cultural and religious events, which may considerably increase or decrease the degree of criminal activities of residential burglars at those times.

6.5.2 Spatial Patterns of Residential Burglary

This section intends to investigate where crimes occur (sub-aim d, aim 4). It will first look at those districts and areas that are more frequently targeted by residential burglars. Then, it will examine the socio-economic characteristics of such areas to explain why these are preferred (section 6.5.2.1). It will also investigate the housing types and their locational situations within targeted areas (section 6.5.2.2 & 6.5.2.3). Next, attempts have been made to see how far from their home offenders travel to carry out their burglaries (section 6.5.2.4). Finally, the main factors influencing target selection will be outlined (section 6.6). In order to do so, the following issues have to be examined:

- Whether residential crimes are concentrated in particular places and specific localities, in other words, whether crimes are spatially dependent.
- If crimes are spatially dependent, what are the social and economic characteristics of areas with a higher crime concentration?
- If crimes are spatially dependent, what are the most prevalent housing types in areas with a higher crime concentration?
In order to examine whether crimes are spatially dependent, in other words, whether some areas show a higher crime concentration than others, offenders were asked to identify all areas where they regularly carry out their burglaries. This created a long-list, which for the purpose of analysis it was decided to be put into five major categories. Since the main purpose of this section is to identify high crime areas, and to search for socio-economic factors that have attracted or distracted crime into those areas, the study has taken the ‘socio-economic’ characteristic of areas, as the basis for its categorisation. Accordingly, Tehran was divided into five areal groups: north, south, east, west, and central Tehran. These categories were identical to the categorisation established by the Central Police for the city of Tehran.

The results show that more than half of offenders (51%) targeted areas that were located in the northern parts of Tehran, i.e. where it is more affluent. A lower proportion, but still a considerable number of offenders (14, 34%) stated that they often carried out their burglaries in the western parts of the city. A lower proportion still (12%) selected each eastern and southern part, respectively (Table 6.29).

Table 6.29 The spatial distribution of offences in various parts of Tehran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Everywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
<td>(51.2)</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
<td>(34.1)</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since some offenders selected more than one area as their regular area; therefore, the total number will exceed the actual number of interviewed offenders.

The results showed, in general, a higher tendency for selection of some parts of the city compared to some others. As the table above shows, overall, areas covered by the northern district attracted the most burglaries, however, various areas located in the northern district (each district covers several areas) were targeted by offenders, equally. In other words, burglars had no preference in targeting areas having similar amount of wealth, hence, as long as these areas produced the expected financial gain, they would be
good enough to be targeted by offenders. This suggests that burglary in Tehran is spatially dependent on the socio-economic characteristics.

Further investigation into those factors considered to be important showed that the majority of offenders tended to burgle “affluent areas”, where they believed dwellings would have something worth stealing. Variations in localities specified by various offenders led the researcher to an important conclusion; that is to say these offenders (who themselves came from various economic backgrounds) defined ‘affluent areas’ in different ways, so that the definition of ‘affluency’ was not consistent. To elaborate on this point, it was noted from offender’s statements that they defined ‘affluency’ in terms of the level of living standard that they had experienced in their own living environment. The majority of offenders who had experienced a highly disadvantaged environment and had an extremely low level of living standards, considered areas located in the central, eastern, or western parts of Tehran as ‘affluent’. Obviously, not all areas located in each category are of an equal level of affluency, but those which were not regarded by the researcher, or probably by the general public as affluent, were considered as sufficiently affluent to be targeted by such offenders. Therefore, the wide variation in areas with a higher crime concentration may be explained through what could be called “relative affluency”.

It may be concluded that some areas are preferred for burglary, and that there are some factors which contribute to the levels of risk of being burgled. The next section will investigate some of the socio-economic characteristics of an area which makes it prone to residential burglary.

6.5.2.1 The Characteristics of Targeted Areas

Findings from interviews suggested that although burglary is committed in all parts of the city, northern parts are of particular interest to most burglars. To be more precise, northern areas were identified by burglars as the most attractive, while southern and
central parts were recognised as the least attractive areas. Accordingly, western and eastern districts absorbed moderate attention from burglars, although in comparison, burglars showed more tendency to burgle some parts in the western district, the more recently built areas, than the mainly traditional parts in the eastern district.

Several questions were asked from offenders in respect to their 'target selection' techniques, including the way they select an area, in a specific dwelling, and the factors that they consider important for the selection of their targets. Since the answers to these questions were regarded as important in terms of theoretical application, a number of different interview questions were asked to obtain as much information as possible and to ensure the validity of the data.

Offenders were asked which areas they mainly burgle, and why. One experienced offender who was 20, lived in the east, and often burgled with his 23 years old cousin. He identified 'higher wealth' as his main reason for preferring northern parts. He responded:

"Where do you expect us to go, if you wanted to do an area where would you go yourself? Naturally to the north, where there is money, jewellery, valuables" (Case 11)

Another highly experienced burglar, aged 22, who came from highly disadvantaged area and had an enormous sympathy to the poor, in a philosophical way said:

"...obviously northern areas, you go to places where you come out loaded, you know that people living in this house are loaded, if you take their money, carpet, jewellery, it is replaced in no time, it doesn't disable their life if they have no jewellery, it is not like we are taking their essentials, they have more than enough to live on...; I wouldn't burgle a house in a poor southern area, they do labouring, they do hard work, they work the whole day to bring something home to their kids, it isn't fair... and what do you want to take from there?...their second-hand carpet, a small old fridge!...and I'm telling you in those areas if they trap you (get apprehended) they're tough on you, you can't get away easily" (Case 18)
Another burglar, 32, with at least 20 years of offending experience, said:

"I do houses in northern areas, like any other clever burglar, but if an area is known to be suitable for burglary, or if so many burglaries have been done by other burglars, this will alert the residents of that area to take better care of their houses, they either stay home, or ask their neighbours to watch their house while they are out, they fit a burglar alarm,... the police will also focus on those areas and send their patrols more often to watch that area more closely. I wouldn’t go to those areas, I go to areas that are wealthy but more remote, and less visited by other burglars, it is safer there" (Case 25)

A similar line of reasoning was given by another offender (case 35). He stated that since most burglars target the new and modernised houses in the north, residents and the police have become more alert and concentrate more on those areas. He often went to affluent but less modernised and physically less attractive areas, which he thought were safer. Another offender, when asked the same question, stared at me, kept silent for a few seconds, then responded:

"Are you kidding me by asking obvious questions?... who is that stupid to go to southern parts for burglary. In those houses you not only find nothing to take, but you also feel that you have to leave something for them. I burgle those who deserve to be burgled...."

And after a few seconds when he calmed down, he added:

"I remember once I went to a house in those (poor) areas, I really felt sorry for them, they had not a fridge... next day I went to a wealthy house took their fridge and took it to that house and left it there" (case 41)

Almost all offenders who carried out their burglaries in the north gave 'wealth' as the main reason for selection of such areas. Moreover, it was noted that the majority of these offenders were more experienced, and had an extensive knowledge about security and the social and cultural implications of their targeted areas. Therefore, it was found that offenders, when gaining experience, confidence, and technique were more likely to
burgle houses within the better-off areas. For the same reasons, less experienced, occasional offenders were less daring or less confident to encounter the risks associated with burglarising houses in northern areas. It is important to note, however, that whilst the houses located in northern areas make attractive targets for burglary, occupants are often able to afford modern security devices i.e. better locks, burglar alarms, and build more secure buildings with higher walls and strong gates, etc. These can easily put off the less experienced offenders. As one occasional offender, with no previous criminal record, who claimed to have committed only 5 burglaries, in southern peripheries of the city said:

“I did it only at times when I was real desperate for money. And even then I never had the guts to do it myself. I only helped my friend, we had grown up together, I would have done anything for him. The only time that I insisted on a burglary myself was this time, I desperately needed some money for my little brother’s wedding, I had to get it from somewhere. I knew that if I went to a house in northern area, I would have gained the money easily, but I couldn’t see it in my self to go there...”(Case 17).

Another offender, 27, who lived in a deprived area in the south, had similarly committed his few burglaries in the poorer southern areas, said:

“I am not a professional burglar, I worked in a company and had a very good position, I borrowed some money that I had to repay, and I was only unlucky to miscalculate my financial capabilities for repayment. On my way from home to work I only did houses where doors or windows were left open, I often took whatever was available, I stayed in the house only for a few minutes. I knew nothing about breaking into houses or opening locks, etc. I had neither the skill for burglary nor the courage...”(Case 31).

The findings show that offenders who selected the less affluent parts of the city, did so because they lacked experience and the confidence. Therefore, it was concluded that offenders tend to start their criminal activity in less affluent area and gradually move to more the affluent ones as they gain knowledge, experience and confidence. Offenders coming from extremely deprived villages outside Tehran, considered areas located in the
west and east sufficiently affluent and were more attracted to those areas. There were two exceptions (2 cases) to this general rule; both were highly experienced offenders who preferred to carry out their burglaries in more traditional areas. They thought these areas although less attractive, contained some extremely rich families. One of these offenders said:

"I never do a modern house in a modern area, they have nothing valuable inside, I look for old and traditional houses, these houses don't look attractive but there is always lots of very expensive jewellery and old valuable carpets inside. I prefer these houses..." (Case 33).

The other always carried out his burglaries with the assistance of a woman (had married to her as a result) to make his appearance in those areas more justifiable, when searching for houses and probing for occupancy. He explained his strategy as:

"When you go inside or come out of a house accompanied by a woman, nobody suspects you. They think you are a family visiting a friend or a relative. When I ring a bell to see whether there is somebody inside or not, if they open the door and see you with a woman they don't suspect you, they think you are genuinely looking for an address" (Case 6)

He explained his preference as:

"Luxurious looking houses aren't suitable for burglary. The house is expensive, the household equipment are expensive, the furniture, the carpets, everything, but I'm not looking for those, I look for money and jewellery. And nowadays these luxurious houses keep their money and jewellery in the banks, not at home, because they feel more at risk. While less attractive houses feel less at risk and behave in a more traditional way, they hide their money and jewellery in the house. I find them, I know where they hide them!" (Case 6)

The interviews made clear that northern parts of the city were preferred by most offenders. In order to understand why the wealthy northern areas are preferred over others, it is necessary to digress and explain how these areas differ from other areas, and what main characteristics in such areas help explain the higher attractiveness of northern areas over their southern counterparts. In other words, why is it that although most
offenders come from lower economic southern areas, they choose their targets among more affluent houses located in more affluent areas in the north of Tehran. Answering this question the researcher decided to look at some of the social and economic features of such areas, to determine which factors help explain the higher 'rate' of burglary in northern areas. In order to obtain more data the researcher decided to concentrate only on these two areas, the south and the north, as the other three, west, east and central areas, fell midway between. A list of differences between the north and south has been outlined in table 6.30.

It is suggested that the profound social and economic differences between the southern and northern parts of Tehran are derived from the way the city has developed. It was noted in chapter 4 that wealth and social status is considerably enhanced as we go from south to north. It is worth considering then that since the early stages of the development of the city, the northern parts, called Shemiranat, was of particular interest to the then king and the aristocrats, having a more moderate climate compared with central and southern parts which had humid and hot weather. Although the city has greatly expanded since then (about 200 years ago), and the town structure and housing patterns have changed considerably, nonetheless, the better-conditioned north is still dominated by the well-off and the poorly-conditioned south is still accommodated by the poor.

Several factors contribute to the economic and social differences between the south and the north. Table 6.30 shows that southern areas are distinguished from northern areas mainly by the population density, urban design, housing type and housing size, family size, and its distance from the city centre and the old 'Bazaar'. More specifically, southern parts, compared to northern parts, are characterised by having a considerably larger population density, they are geographically much nearer to the city centre, where major commercial activities take place (see figure 7, Appendix II), they contain considerably smaller houses built with lower quality constructional material, narrower but busier streets, and with a larger family size. Such characteristics have encouraged the
wealthy to move to less dense areas, where there is a better climate, wider streets, less traffic and less noise, larger houses, large gardens and a more extensive green surroundings. All these characteristics have produced a favourable living environment in northern parts. All these factors help explain the attraction of residential burglars to residential settings that contain wealth and value. Offenders who are looking for money and valuables are unlikely to choose their targets among residential settings containing little valuables.

6.5.2.2 Target Selection and Housing Type

The type of housing was considered important by some offenders and affected their target selection. In order to identify the types of housing most at risk of being burgled, offenders where asked about target selection. Selections of the types of housing in Tehran were examined in terms of construction, and also in terms of height. Interviews with engineers and architects, and information obtained from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, made it clear that according to the town and planning regulation, all houses in Iran, especially in Tehran, have to be built in one of two ways (various types of housing in Tehran were explained in chapter 4, in detail). The 'northern style', is a type where the residential setting (i.e. bedrooms, sitting room, guest room, kitchen, and bathroom) is built in the northern part of the land, whilst in 'southern style' the residential setting is built in the southern part of the land. In the northern type of housing the main entrance door will open to a front yard, garden or parking space, leading to another set of doors opening to the interior section (usually the hall or sitting room). In the southern type of housing the main door opens directly to the interior section (a corridor leading to the hall or sitting room). The front yard, garden or the parking space is usually located in the northern part, which is behind the main building. Photographs 2 and 3 in Appendix III show a typical southern type of housing in a wealthy northern district.
Table 6.30 The characteristics of northern and southern districts in Tehran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sub-factors</th>
<th>Northern District</th>
<th>Southern District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Physical</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Moderate/Cold</td>
<td>Hot/Humid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>High Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Less polluted areas</td>
<td>Polluted areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>Less dense built-up areas</td>
<td>Dense built-up areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance from Bazaar</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street system</td>
<td>Wide/less busy</td>
<td>Narrow/busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Wealth/affluence</td>
<td>Wealthy/Affluent</td>
<td>Poor/less affluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Family size</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>Upper/high</td>
<td>Lower/middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community relationship</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of housing</td>
<td>Modernised</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of houses</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Good/excellent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping areas</td>
<td>Modernised shopping centres</td>
<td>Traditional shop units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Modernised locks</td>
<td>Highly used</td>
<td>Lesser use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglar alarms</td>
<td>Highly used</td>
<td>Lesser use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fences and protective iron bars</td>
<td>Highly used</td>
<td>Weaker protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructed walls</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Relatively high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SIX

The answers to the question: 'which type of housing do you prefer for burglary, and why?' showed that the majority of residential burglars (24, 59%) preferred northern types. However, 10 (24%) preferred southern types, and a lower number of 7 (17%) claimed that it didn't make any difference to them, implying that they were capable of working around both styles of housings.

Preference of one housing style over the other seemed to be related to several factors. Those preferring the northern type of housing said it gave an easier means of entry. Offenders said they entered the garden often by jumping over the wall. This method of entry did not require opening the main door. It took burglars only a few seconds to jump over the wall and gain entry to the garden. It has to be pointed that in Tehran, all houses are surrounded by brick high walls (at least 1.5 to 2 meters), moreover, the height of the wall is usually extended by using protective iron bars. This is especially the case in houses located in northern areas, which contain more valuables and the occupants can afford to erect such protectors; this is less so as the houses get further towards the less affluent south. However, when this issue was put to the offenders, especially to those who tended to burgle wealthy houses, they often smiled, being proud of their cleverness, and answered "we find a way around it". They explained that there is always a small gap between the main door (which itself is usually as high as 2 or more meters) and these iron protectors, that is where they made their way through to enter the garden. Another interesting point was made by these offenders, revealing that most of these iron protectors are vertical and have decorating shapes in the middle, which appear to facilitate burglar's entry. In addition, offenders added that most houses have a gas pipe installed just about 30 cm away from the main door which makes a good ladder for the burglar (see photograph 4, appendix III).

This study also examined the relationship between type of housing and the time of the day when offenders carried out their burglaries. It was found that among the 24 offenders who preferred northern types of housings the majority of 14 (58%) were night
burglars. These offenders used the darkness of the night to prevent being seen by others. Six (25%) were day burglars, these offenders often carried out their burglaries within less busy areas, at a time, i.e. 1-3 p.m., when most residents were resting. Again, only 4 (16%) of these offenders bugled houses during the day or night, using a similar strategy as those in the other group.

There was no differences between the more experienced and the less experienced burglars, in terms of preference for housing type the difference was in the technique these offenders used for entering the house (not the garden). The more experienced offenders tended to enter the house through the main interior door, i.e. by breaking the lock, while the less experienced offenders made their entries through the window. The garden gave them some protection and they could concentrate on opening the interior door, or enter by breaking the window.

Although these offenders reduced their risk of being seen by others, by selecting their time carefully, burgling the northern types of houses, however, still contained some risk of being seen, especially by those living on the higher floors. Some of these offenders were arrested as a result of being reported by these neighbours (either for their current conviction or for previous ones). Those who were very concerned with the risks of being seen preferred southern types to northern types, southern types were preferred by those who had special skills in opening locks and doors. They were reluctant to burgle northern types because of the increased possibility of their activities being seen by neighbours. In southern types once the offender opened the door and entered the house he was safe. One highly experienced offender, age 39, who claimed to be an expert in opening doors and locks, and often burgled southern types said:

"When I choose a house, I watch it for a few days, and when I know the house is empty, I walk towards the house, I open the door within the time that the resident would open the door with its key. If somebody is standing about 10 meters away from me he wouldn’t know that I had no key to the door. Once I’m inside I’m..."
Another experienced offender, age 35, expressed the advantage of burgling southern types as:

"when you try to open the entrance door of a house which is located on the southern side, the house in front is located on the northern side, with a garden and trees blocking their (resident’s) view, it is too far to see what is going on" (Case 32)

Burglars, where they have a choice of burgling different types of houses, try to take as many points as possible into consideration to make the burglary more convenient. For example, the distance from the target to the house located in front of the target, can have a large impact on the degree of risk. If the distance is increased, the risks of being seen will be substantially reduced, i.e. in northern areas, where houses are much bigger and the streets are wider, they have reduced risks in southern areas, where the houses are smaller and the streets are narrower.

Residential burglars were also asked about their preferred height of the houses. Residential premises have been classified into three types by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Planning:

1) Bungalows, are houses with one floor, where all the facilities are located on the same floor; or houses with two floors which can accommodate only one family. Such houses contain sitting and dining facilities on the first floor and sleeping facilities on the second floor.

2) Apartments, are houses with two to four floors. Each floor may contain one, two or more units, each independent of another, each accommodating one family.

3) High-rise buildings, are buildings higher than four floors. Each floor in this type
may also contain one, two, four or even more units, each accommodating a family.

The selection of a type of housing with respect to its height was important to most offenders. The general finding suggested that the majority of offenders preferred bungalows, no one preferred high-rise buildings. More precisely, a substantial number of 29 (78%) burgled only bungalows, 7 (17%) selected bungalows and lower floors in apartments, 2 (5%) chose bungalows and upper floors in apartments, but not a single offender was prepared to burgle houses with high-rise buildings. They said the majority of such buildings, especially those located in affluent areas have security guards, who know the residents, guard the entrance and exit points, and check upon those using the parking space in the parking areas.

Also not many offenders were comfortable carrying out their burglaries in apartments, mainly because they present only one way for escape, that is by the stairs, i.e. the same way you get in. That made escape difficult if encountered by resident from a lower apartment. These were also considered risky because, especially in smaller apartments, because residents knew each other, even their relatives and friends. A stranger was recognised easily. In apartments, with a limited number of flats, residents often knew who was working and who was not, were familiar with the routine and periods when residents were coming in or going out of the house, so that noises made in a house that should supposedly be empty at that time of day raised suspicion and the possible investigation by other residents. One experienced offender, age 33, who expressed his reluctance towards apartments said:

"The risk is too high, you may be seen by neighbours, escape is so difficult, and you don’t get much out of these apartments, if they were that well off they wouldn’t stay in an apartment. When there are too many other better places why go to apartments?" (Case 39)

The upper floor of apartments was burgled when the key to the target had been given by a relative or a friend. As one offender said:
"It happens sometimes that a friend gives me a key and informs me of a certain time when residents are gone out for say, a weekend, or gone on holiday, in that case I go. Or sometimes a relative who knows a lot of money is coming into the house, give me a key and a time when the resident is not in, I go take the money, we share it 50-50" (Case 34)

It was also noted that burglars who often carried firearm entered any type of building, where they thought there might be something worth stealing. Being armed made them feel powerful and they felt protected from most risks associated with burglary.

6.5.2.3 Target Selection and Location of Houses within an Area

It was seen from the previous section that the housing type was considered important by most offenders. In this study the aim is to discover whether the location of the house within an area was also important. For example, whether a house being located in a main road, where there is more traffic, in a side-street, or in a cul-de-sac valley, or whether the house being located at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a street, made any difference to offenders. Identifying the importance of such factors in target selection can determine the extent to which different houses are at risk of being targeted.

Unlike the housing type, the housing location mattered to a relatively smaller number of offenders. The results from interviews showed that 23 (57%) of offenders paid no or little attention to such factors. Their main line of reasoning was that once an offender set his mind on a house on the basis that there is something inside worth taking the risk, and the location of the house within the area did not seem important. These offenders were mainly skilled, night-burglars, who claimed to handle such issues with no difficulty. To the remaining burglars who were concerned with the location of the house, it was important in terms of the number of people being present or the number of cars passing. None were inclined to select a house that was located in a busy main street, also none
were prepared to ‘hit’ a target located in the dead-end alley, because they presented little means of escape. On the other hand, among the 18 offenders who were concerned with the location of the house 16 (38%) mentioned houses located in side-streets/alleys as the best targets, as they are often less busy, and therefore, present lower chance of offender’s criminal activities to be seen and reported to the police. Only two offenders (5%) preferred houses within busy areas as more suitable for burglary. One of these offenders, age 47, who was a drug-addict, said:

“...the busier the better, in busy areas, women are talking, children are playing, everybody is busy with what they are doing, they pay less attention to others, it’s easier there...” (Case 41)

The level of skill and the district at which offenders often carried out their burglaries seemed to have little effect. It seemed that most offenders were less concerned with the location of houses. However, two factors were considered important, one was the presence of people/cars, second was the extent to which it made escape easier for offenders. The means of escape with reference to the location of the house often meant that the house provided either a front or a back passage to the outside, where there was an easy escape route through alleys, and adjoining streets. Therefore, the majority of offenders avoided houses located in main busy streets and often burgled houses located in less busy side streets or alleys.

Additional information provided by offenders showed that one of the main issues was selecting a house on a similar level to the adjacent residential settings. It seems that when a burglar enters a house, if anybody, especially the residents are inside, the most practical way of escape is not through the main door, but through the roof. If the roof is located at the same level as the roof of adjacent houses, escape can be considerably easier. He will then go over all other residential premises, into the main street, and make a successful escape. Since the escape is through the roof, the height of the roof should be
such as to enable the burglar to jump into the main street. This may be another reason why offenders select only bungalows or two storey houses as their targets, but not flats.

Moreover, houses that were near to where other houses were being constructed were of particular interest to residential burglars. The construction of a house made the adjacent houses particularly vulnerable, providing an easy access and easy escape route. It was also found that those burglars who worked in groups of twos or threes were less concerned with matters of location. These offenders usually had one co-offender to act as a “watch-out”. He often stayed outside and did not participate in the actual burglary. He did not enter the house but remained in a hidden location to inform his co-offenders of any incident which may interrupt the burglary including the return of the resident, or the police patrolling the neighbourhood, or any other suspicious act from neighbours, etc. He would then signal to inform his co-offenders. So the location of houses within an area appeared to have relative importance, to some offenders, but in general was of little importance to those who were determined to burgle a house and/or professionally planned their burglaries.

6.5.2.4 The Journey to Crime

The journey to crime is a study of offender’s movement. It is intended to determine whether the areas containing a high proportion of offenders are those with a high crime rate. It also determines how far from their place of residence offenders travel to commit their burglaries. It is intended to identify a pattern to explain such a journey and search for the rationale behind that pattern. In order to investigate the journey to crime the study used two pieces of information, one the place where offenders lived, the other the place where they committed their crimes. The information from the current study showed that the areas where most offenders lived were different from areas where they committed their crimes. In terms of the locations where burglars resided results showed that of the 39 offenders who lived in Tehran, 33 (85%) lived on the southern edges and peripheral
areas in the most deprived areas of the south. There were 5 (13%) who came from slightly better-off areas in the east and central areas, but closer scrutiny into the occupational, familial and economic circumstances of such offenders showed that they could be classified as coming from the lower class families living in poorer and less advantaged divisions in the area. Only one came from a wealthy family living in a well-known well-off area- Nyavaran- but had been disowned by his father for getting drug-addicted.

On the other hand, the criminal areas where offenders committed their burglaries were separate from the areas where they lived. In order to investigate the offender’s journey to crime the researcher asked offenders whether they had ever, or were prepared to commit burglaries in their neighbourhood. The results show that all offenders, except one who had only once carried out a burglary in the neighbourhood under special circumstances, responded negatively to this question. The one exception to this general rule was by an offender who had burgled his next-door neighbour under the influence of drugs, and claimed that he had not known what he was doing at the time. He explained the incident as:

“That day I had taken some Diazepam tablets, I did not know what I was doing, my next door neighbour was never at home at that time of the day, I opened the door and went inside, smoked a cigarette, watched TV for a short while, then grabbed a sewing machine and a meat-mincer and went out. After 5-6 hours, after I returned to my normal self, first I did not remember where these had come from, did some thinking and remembered what I had done, I was ashamed and panicked when I heard that my neighbour had reported the burglary to the police,...” (Case 7)

Apart from this offender, almost all offenders had a strong feeling about not committing their crimes in their neighbourhood, and most of them, professional and non-professional, responded to this question fast, and with no hesitation. Additional information was sought from the offenders themselves and suggested that although many burglars had previous convictions, and were regularly engaged in criminal activities including various types of theft and burglary, they were concerned with their and their
family’s local honour and respect. Many claimed that their worst moment in their
criminal career had been the time when their family (father, mother, wife) had found out
about their involvement in criminal activities. Most of the families became aware of
their criminality when offenders were apprehended by the police, and following their
involvement with the CJS (often led to their first conviction). Several apprehensions that
did not result in conviction were sorted out by friends and peers, and the family did not
find out. Some wives who after a while had found out about their husband’s involvement
in crime never discussed the situation with their husbands, either because they enjoyed
the comfortable life and facilities provided by illegal activities and implicitly supported
such a behaviour, or they felt they had little influence over their partners and knew that
they had little effect. They would not stop their partners from offending, but would
create a more difficult situation and tense relationship.

Once the involvement with criminal activity was revealed to the family by a conviction,
they made their best effort to keep it a secret from neighbours, relatives and friends.
Crime was viewed as something to shame the family and stain the honour. Some parents
disowned their children once they found out about the involvement of their son in
criminal activities, and were not prepared to accept their children as part of the family
anymore. Some burglars stayed away from the family themselves to prevent the family
from suffering. This is the case in most of the offender’s families, unless the crime was
created by the family or within the family, i.e. having a criminal parent or criminal
spouse. The maintenance of family honour and respect was important. An educated
offender whose father was a wealthy man living in a large beautiful house in Shemiran,
and his brother owned one of the most well-known restaurants in the north of Tehran,
said:

“When my father found out that I’ve become a drug addict and provided the
money for drugs by breaking into houses disowned me and when I went home
one night he told me to either give up drugs and offending, or take the shame
somewhere else and never come back home. Now that I’m in prison, I need only
300 grand Tomans (about £300) to give to the victim and get released, my dad
knows that, and this money is nothing to him, but he has sent me a message
saying that because this money has to be paid as part of a shameful act, he’s not
prepared to be part of it. He has told the authorities to keep me here for as long as
it is legally required” (Case 21)

Another offender with three convictions said:

“Whenever I went to see my mum, she felt ashamed and kept her head down in front of the neighbours, I decided to keep away and visit my mum as little as possible, I don’t want to see my family embarrassed because of me” (Case 6)

Another female offender, who had become involved in burglary as a result of marrying her husband, and had two children from her previous marriage, expressed her shame as:

“I didn’t want to marry this man in the first place, my father encouraged me. I have two teenagers from my deceased husband. I found out about my husband’s drug-addiction and his crimes after I had married him, there was no way out, he forced me to assist him in his burglaries, he said if I don’t go with him, he’ll make my children suffer. In order to keep my children safe, I sent them to stay with my parents. Neither my mum nor my children knew what my husband and me did, until I got arrested. I feel so ashamed, I can’t face them, I have specifically asked them not to come and visit me here. If they do, I die from shame” (Case 4)

The other more obvious reason for not offending within the neighbourhood was that as the majority of offenders came from poorer areas so they tended to carry out their burglaries where there is more wealth. They often committed their burglary with the intention of obtaining considerable financial gain, something that was unavailable in their own neighbourhood. In addition, many offenders who had experienced deprivation in their childhood, generally had a sense of sympathy towards people who were kept constantly disadvantaged and the general attitude was not to steal from the poor. On several occasions, offenders claimed to have helped people living in such areas by providing for their friends living in the neighbourhood through criminal activities. As one offender, age 47, said:

“My mentality is different from others, my brain functions in a way which is
different from the majority of people. When I see a kid running in a street with a
piece of bread in his hand, my brain starts buzzing. When I see someone in the
poorer area with no watch, I get upset. On the other hand, when I see a man
sitting in a Mercedes, with his nose up, like he owns the whole world, my brain
starts buzzing again. My brains tell me to kill the man in the Mercedes, and buy
the boy a watch, a good lunch. When I see the yellow colour of gold, I can’t
resist, I can’t control myself, I must have it. I’ve helped so many kids by giving
them things they could never afford to buy...” (Case 41).

Another offender, age 33, said:

“The money you obtain from crime is easy and would be spent easily, if I went to
a cinema I often took a bunch of kids, who could not afford to have a good time,
bought them cinema tickets, and lots of food, i.e. sandwiches, popcorn,
everything. And I gave them some pocket money too. You should see the look on
their face when I do that,...” (Case 39)

This sympathy towards the lower class was evident among many offenders. On the other
hand, the feeling of hatred and revulsion towards the upper class was also evident
amongst many, but was expressively mentioned by a few. Some offenders went to other
towns and cities for burglary. These offenders said that whenever they committed a
major burglary in Tehran, they wanted to keep a low profile for a while, or when they
were fed up and bored with burglary in Tehran, they went to other major cities i.e.
Isfahan, Shiraz, Tabriz, and carried out a few burglaries there. Two offenders claimed
that sometimes they went abroad (Turkey) and picked pockets.

Therefore, these findings lead to a clear conclusion that although the majority of
offenders live in disadvantaged and deprived areas, they are mainly attracted to more
affluent areas, where goods of higher value may be stolen, and higher gains may be
obtained. This means travelling to areas, which are more distant from their own home to
unknown areas.
6.6. The Main Factors Influencing Target Selection

In previous sections the study has looked at places which were more frequently targeted by the majority of offenders, and attempted to explain the socio-economic characteristics contributing to the selection of such places as targets. It also examined various types of housings in Tehran, identified the types more at risk of being burgled, and outlined some of the factors influencing selection of such houses within such areas. This section investigates other factors affecting offender’s target-selection procedure (sub-aim d, aim 4). Questions about the main factors influencing target selection were asked repeatedly and in different forms, to assist validity. The following factors have been discussed in order of importance, and in accordance with the information obtained from residential offenders:

6.6.1 Occupancy

Occupancy was regarded as the most important factor influencing the selection of a target for burglary. Of these offenders 28 (68%) regarded occupancy as an absolute ‘no go’ factor, whilst 7 (17%) expressed their preference for unoccupied houses. However, 6 (15%) were prepared to target an occupied house if they knew there were worthwhile valuables. Among the latter only 2 were professional, drug-addict offenders, who were often armed. They stated that on some occasions the presence of residents was essential, for example for opening a safe, or getting them to show the appropriately hidden valuables. In general terms, an occupied house was likely to discourage a residential burglar, whereas, an empty house was an ideal target, and to a great extent facilitated the burglary. Occupancy was considered important to burglars, because once they step inside the dwelling, they feel safe, if they know that the householder will be away for a few hours, or probably the whole night. They feel safe while inside. In contrast, with an occupied house, even when the residents are fast asleep in their beds, the burglar still has to be worried about being caught by residents who may be disturbed. Occupancy,
therefore, has been recognised as the most discouraging factor. These are examples of some night burglars stating their reluctance to target occupied dwellings:

“I never burgle an occupied house, it has happened before that I had gone inside a house thinking that there is nobody inside, when I have seen people sleeping, I have come out straight away” (Case 15)

“I wouldn’t dare to enter a house where women and girls may have been sleeping in an improper situation (night dress/naked). What is going to happen if the man of the family wakes up and see a stranger watching his wife or daughters. I know that if anybody did that to my family, I’d kill them” (Case 17)

“When I go inside, if I see women sleeping inside, I usually change my mind and come out” (Case 23)

“Going into occupied houses means danger, violence and sometimes killing people, it isn’t worth it” (Case 24)

It can be seen that occupancy is important to offenders because it may create a violent situation, where offenders either have to harm the residents, escape if they can without stealing anything, or stay and possibly get arrested, which in all cases means an increased risk and a non-achieving activity, i.e. no financial gain.

Residential burglars use various techniques to ensure their target is empty. The most common method, is to ring the bell, or knock on the door. If there was no response they make sure there is nobody in, if somebody answered they often ask for a wrong person, or a wrong address, and leave as quickly as possible. Some stand a short distance away from the residence, after knocking on the door, so that if somebody opens the door they would not see them. This tactic is used where the offender has the intention of coming

---

6 In Iran, and in most Muslim countries the privacy of women and girls is greatly respected, and it is the duty of the man of the family to protect the women in the family from strangers who may have improper intentions towards them.
back to the target, when the residents have left the house. Some younger offenders throw a small stone at the window and wait for a reaction; if no reaction is evident they take it as a sign of not being in.

Most offenders used a combination of techniques, in sequential order. It is important to distinguish between the techniques used by night burglars and those who often carry out their burglaries during the day. Night burglars usually look for signs of occupancy by checking the lights and curtains. The more professional of them also wait slightly longer before attempting to enter the house and carry out further investigation by watching whether lights are being turned on and off, or movement of the human body behind the curtains, or even noises heard from the TV or people talking together. The latter is more applicable in southern types of housing, where the houses are smaller, and the kitchen or bedrooms may have windows opening directly to the street. It is important to note that privacy is strongly maintained by families in Iran, and all windows, where indoor activities may be observed by outsiders or passers-by, are protected and covered by heavy curtains. The more experienced night burglars, claimed, they can often sense occupancy just by looking at a house, and use other occupancy techniques to prove to themselves or their co-offenders they are right. As one skilled night residential burglar said:

"I don't need to check the house for occupancy. When I pass a street I spot the empty houses, it's like somebody is telling me there are people in this house and there aren't people in that house,..." (Case 22)

Another said:

"Some people think they are very clever leaving the lights on at night, when they intend not to return home for the night. This isn't normal; a house with people inside is normally dark after midnight. It is so obvious" (Case 24)
For day burglars there are fewer opportunities to check occupancy apart from knocking or ringing the bell, although burglars often watch the house and do not enter unless they see the residents leaving. It is interesting that some offenders pay attention to how the residents are dressed (i.e. formal, informal, casual, etc.) and use that as an indication to determine where they are going, i.e. shopping, taking children to school, visiting friends or relatives, etc. and for how long. Of course the time occupants leave the house may provide burglars with some indication as to where they are going. It was also mentioned by some that the manner in which the residents lock the door when leaving the house is indicative, i.e. if they just shut the door behind them, this can indicate how long they will be away. For example, a housewife leaving the house after her kids have gone to school, in an ordinary dress, is often taken as an indication that she is going shopping, thereby leaving the house empty for about an hour. On the other hand, seeing a man and a woman (sometimes with kids) leaving the house in the evening, dressed up, taking the car and locking the door is taken as an indication they are going out, visiting a friend or relative, and leaving the house unoccupied for at least 3-4 hours. Some offenders are informed of the times at which the house is left unoccupied by friends, or by a 'watch out'. Or even by people regularly working for the occupants, for example servants, gardeners, etc. In such cases, these workers either share the gain from burglary, or receive a fixed amount of money in return for information provided to offenders. These workers, may leave the door or a window open for offenders to get in when occupants leave the house, or even provide them with a key. In rare cases, a relative who may have been treated badly by the occupants may produce the information or even a key to a residential burglar, with the intention of getting revenge. The offender, in this case, is provided with the information about the times when the house is left unoccupied, the stealable items and their exact locations.

The minority of offenders who were less concerned with occupancy in their selection of a target for burglary (13 cases), or those who preferred occupied houses (2 cases), carried a weapon (7 with knives, 4 with guns, 1 with both). Only one did not take any weapon to
occupied houses, he said:

"First of all, I avoid occupied house, but if I go to an occupied house I don’t take a weapon with me, if I do I have to use it, and that would make my crime more serious, I don’t want that, I go for stealing not for killing" (case 23)

The remainder were offenders who were prepared to hurt anyone who tried to stop them stealing. Of course, those carrying guns had more violent attitudes and were more easily prepared to use it against the householders, compared to those carrying a knife. The general tendency for night burglars (12 of 13) was first to escape, then threaten, hurt themselves, or lastly hurt the residents if necessary. Only one day-burglar carried a gun. He was dressed up as either a police officer, or an electricity meter reader. Sometimes he waited for the door to open quickly went inside, then threatened the residents, and asked them to show him where their money and jewellery were kept. He then took everything and left. He said “ I’d do anything if they tried anything silly (tried to stop me)".

Of course the extent to which any burglar may be prepared to behave in an aggressive manner varied greatly among these offenders. It depended on how desperate they were for money, the value of the goods they have found at home, and their attitude towards the whole act of stealing. Those who felt hatred towards the rich and wealthy often had no mercy on them and acted in the most cruel and inhuman way to get away with the burglary (2 cases). These offenders not only thought it was their right to have the goods they intended to steal, but also blamed people (residents) for interfering and not paying attention to the threats made towards them. As one drug-addicted offender, who had killed a middle-age male resident for interfering with the burglary, explained the scenario cheerfully and with no sign of remorse:

"It was his fault, I warned him to keep away from me. I told him he better let me take the jewellery and money (a lot of it) otherwise I’d kill him. He was so stupid trying to stop me from doing what I was doing, he saw the knife in my hand, he
should have known better. He didn’t listen, so I stabbed him everywhere, in the chest, in the face and head,...for as much as he deserved" (Case 12)

Another offender who was 14 and often was armed when going for burglary, said:

“If I find a very good target, I don’t waste any time by waiting for them to get out of the house, I go at night and do my best not to make any noise to wake them up, but if they do, I’m not bothered, I threaten them with my knife, in most cases they let me get away with it, but if they act stupidly, they leave me no choice but stabbing them. When I finish, I get the house keys and lock the door behind myself, when I leave” (Case 14)

Another offender who claimed to be more concerned with the rights of others said:

“I often take my knife with me when going to an occupied house. If the residents wake up I try first to escape without harming anyone, if not possible and stopped by residents I hurt myself with the knife, when they see I’m bleeding they usually get scared, I use this opportunity and escape, if not I have to hurt them and escape, to stop them from giving me up to the police. That would be the last resort” (Case 26).

Another said:

“If there is a safe in the house, you have to go at a time that the residents are at home to tell you the security number. I go and wake them up myself, holding a knife at them, I tie them up and ask them to help me to open the safe, they usually co-operate, if they don’t they get what they deserve for being so stupid” (Case 33, Similarly Case 41).

It may be concluded that although some offenders have carried out at least one burglary where the residence was occupied, almost all offenders preferred unoccupied houses for burglary.
6.6.2 The Areal Density and Community Relationship

The number of people passing by at times at which the burglary was taking place, is an important factor in the selection of a specific target. The majority of offenders (21.51%) when asked what characteristics they consider important for target selection, pointed out the population living in an area, as well as the number of people present at times of burglary were important factors. It was explained earlier that most offenders thought that areas located in the northern parts of Tehran are the most desirable targets, i.e. being the most wealthy. The population density and the community relationship, however, were considered as important.

In this section the aim is to investigate how areal description as regards to population density and community relationship may contribute to site preferences for burglary. The characteristics of areas located in the north, south, west and east play a significant role in the target selection procedure. The discussions in this section comes partially from offender's statements, but mainly from personal experiences derived from living in Tehran. It has been argued in chapter 4, that the population density in Tehran, decreases as we travel from south to north, with the southern areas and central commercial area (Bazaar) as the densest areas in the city. Moving from south to the north means that the commercial sites will be dispersed into various areas, with increases in the residential districts. The residential premises, on the other hand, as we go from south to north will be enlarged. Large bungalows built on large pieces of lands, accommodating only a small number of residents, who mainly use private cars for transportation, considerably decrease the number of those present on the streets, at any specific time of the day. For a housewife living in such an area, it takes only a few seconds to take her car out of the parking area and drive through the street to go shopping, or for any other purposes. Whilst in southern areas, for a housewife living in a considerably smaller house, occupying a smaller piece of land, or living in an apartment, where several other families live, either not being able to afford a car, or living where the street conditions do not allow a car access, will have to do her shopping on foot.
The modern way of living in northern parts, which is aided by the use of car, reduces the amount of time present on the street, therefore, it reduces the chance of being seen by neighbours living in the same street. In northern parts of the city, very little communication may be evident in the neighbourhood, as it has become a culture for these areas. The decreased communication in the neighbourhood means having less information about the times that houses are left unoccupied. Lack of knowledge about who lives where also makes it difficult to distinguish between residents or strangers approaching a house. Therefore, if an entry to a house is made by a burglar, the neighbours may not see it as an illegal intrusion. In addition, larger houses being located in better-off areas, means less noise being heard at all times by the house next door, thereby aiding burglar’s activities at night. Thus, it may be concluded that the lower population density and the decreased level of communication in northern areas are factors that residential burglars will benefit from greatly.

6.6.3 Surveillance

Surveillance (defined as being seen by others, i.e. neighbours, police, passers-by) is important to some offenders. The possibility of being recognised as a stranger in an area, being seen when entering a house, and being reported to the police by neighbours, are issues that are expected to have a large impact on target-selection strategies. The extent to which surveillance affects offender’s performance has been discussed briefly in previous sections. However, it seems necessary to discus these with reference to wider aspects. The question of surveillance and how it may affects selection of a specific target was considered important to some offenders. Surveillance in this study was defined in terms of a) neighbours, b) passers-by, c) police patrols, d) private patrols, and e) street-lighting. The degree to which these forms of surveillance affect offender’s target-selection, have been investigated throughout, but in different contexts in order to check the validity of the offenders replies.
Surveillance, in terms of passers-by seems to be of prime importance to offenders, as only 14 (34%) offenders expressed their concern about selecting targets in less busy areas. This finding also explains the offender’s tendency to carry out their burglaries at a time when fewer people can see their criminal activities. Surveillance, in terms of neighbours, was also considered important to many offenders (12, 29%). Surveillance, in this form, also involves households which are situated where they can see other households that may be selected as targets (mainly facing each other).

Moreover, surveillance by neighbours is influenced by the height of residential buildings. For example people living in bungalows and those living on ground floors have little means of overlooking buildings located at the same level of height. Thus, only those living in upper floors can view houses built on lower lands. Even in such cases the visibility is reduced where the distance to the front buildings is increased (i.e. in larger houses located in northern areas), resulting in reducing the effectiveness of surveillance. In the current study, 4 offenders had been reported to the police (resulted in their current sentence) by a neighbour living in an upper floor apartment facing the burglary site. The risk of being seen and reported by neighbours, offenders claimed, is reduced where offenders work in groups of 2-3, as they often have someone outside the target, usually sitting in a car 2-3 houses distant from the target, to watch the area, in case a neighbour got suspicious and made an approach, or to inform others if the resident returned to their home, or if police were patrolling in the area. Those working alone were concerned with neighbours only at ‘entry’ and ‘exit’ times, therefore, they acted more cautiously, but felt safe once inside.

An examination of other forms of surveillance such as being seen by the police patrolling in the neighbourhood showed more interesting results. It was a factor considered by many offenders (22, 54%). However, all offenders claimed to be capable of controlling the risk, and the risk was not regarded as being able to reduce their performance whether of criminal activities or influencing their selection of target.
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Offenders often gathered information about where the surrounding police stations were located, the times at which they sent their officers to patrol in the area, and the times they changed shifts. Obviously, the presence of police in an area was important only at times when offenders intended to enter the burglary site, or when leaving the house. The time required for entering or leaving a house was only a few seconds, but crucial that an offender was not seen. Only one of offenders interviewed in this study had been arrested by the police at the burglary site, and that had occurred because the 'watch out' who had been waiting for his co-offender had fallen asleep in the car in the middle of the night.

The presence of police in an area is also important at times at which offenders are leaving the neighbourhood, carrying the stolen goods, either travelling by car or walking down the street. This is especially the case for night burglars who carry out major burglaries and need to take a van to transfer the stolen goods. Moreover, their inappropriate appearance and presence in an area may raise suspicion and can lead to being stopped and questioned by the police. Three offenders in our study were involved in situations where they were stopped by the police when returning from the burglary site. One was lucky and got away by producing forged documents, the other two were arrested, one of whom was carrying 20 highly expensive Persian carpets.

The private patrols and house guards, who are often hired by residents in any specific neighbourhood, were not considered a risk by offenders. Private patrols who may observe criminal activity have little power to encounter and question the offender and their presence may only be effective in making noises to attract the attention of other residents. House guards, hired by residents of a specific block, are often responsible for the security of that particular residence (often high-rise buildings) and are rarely present on the street during the night. Street lighting was mentioned as important by only 2 (5%) offenders, although offenders tended to avoid houses which are located in very bright spots.
6.6.4 Accessibility

Accessibility is defined in accordance with two components, one the mean of access produced by the type of residential setting, the other by the way access is influenced (hardened) by security measures used in such premises. Types of buildings which may produce easier access to the house were preferred by offenders and have a higher rate of being targeted. On the other hand, target hardening techniques, i.e. the use of modern locks and bolts, burglar alarms, secured windows, etc. reduce the attractiveness of a target by producing additional difficulty.

The types of housing, the way each type of housing is entered, and their influence on target-selection procedure have been discussed earlier. An examination of the influence of security measures on the selection of targets revealed that although houses secured by modern burglar alarms may attract fewer offenders, target-hardening techniques have shown to have little effect on target selection. It was shown earlier that houses located in the more affluent parts of Tehran are most likely to be targeted by residential offenders. It is also the case that wealthy people who live in affluent parts of the city are aware of being more at risk and feel more vulnerable. Leading a luxurious life in such areas means having several valuable items at home which may attract burglars to those homes and make them more desirable targets. Therefore, homeowners and residents living in such localities tend to secure their homes and make the lives of intruders as difficult as they can be.

Obviously, the extent to which residents may use security measures in order to reduce the chance of being burgled may be very different depending on people's attitudes, their information about the risks and consequences, and their prior experience with crime. It is, however, accurate to say that security devices and physical barriers are generally used more widely in affluent areas of Tehran compared with less affluent areas. Security measures are maintained in such areas because, there is more wealth and affluency in
such areas, and, people living in such areas feel more vulnerable and at risk of being burgled. Also, they can afford to secure their homes with more expensive devices such as burglar alarms, higher walls, iron bars and iron gates behind their doors and windows, and have modern intercom devices equipped with screening and monitoring facilities. However, interviews with burglars revealed that employment of security measures in affluent areas, in general, have not decreased their attractiveness to residential burglars, for these areas are still the most targeted areas for burglary.

The question of accessibility was put to offenders by asking various questions. First they were asked whether access to a house was considered important in selecting their target. Only 2 responded positively. When questioned further most implied that once offenders set their minds on a target, they always manage to find a way in. However, when, at a later stage during the interview, offenders were presented with a list of security devices and were asked specifically about their preventive effects, the results showed that while fewer offenders were deterred by high walls and protective bars (4, 10%), and locks on doors and windows (2, 5%), many felt to be more at risk by burglar alarms (22, 54%) and dogs (18, 44%).

In an earlier section it was shown how offenders overcome the difficulties associated with high walls and protective iron bars. It also became evident that an enormous number of offenders in Tehran (33, 80%) were capable of opening various types of locks fitted on almost all types of external and internal doors. For the more professional burglars opening a lock took as much time as opening a door with its key. Accessing a target that was secured with a burglar alarm presented difficulties for the majority of offenders, and a large proportion of burglars were deterred by a fitted burglar alarm. However, this was offset, offenders argued, by the presence of several other suitable targets located in similar areas, that were not secured. Offenders who expressed their ability to deactivate burglar alarms, showed a greater tendency to favour houses with
burglar alarms, because they felt that unless there are valuable items hidden inside the house the resident would not have felt that they needed to secure their house in the first place. There were 4 offenders in this study who said they knew little about burglar alarms, but did not consider them a deterrent. They believed they were inefficient in protecting a target from burglary. An offender who knew about burglar alarms said:

"I don't think burglar alarms are a problem. Once I tried to break into a house that their burglar alarm went off, I ran out and hid a few houses away watching, it sounded for five minutes nobody did nothing, it stopped after a while and nothing happened, I went back, this time I used the neighbour's wall and entered through the attic and did my job" (Case 8)

In addition, these offenders said that if they found a really good target which was secured by a burglar alarm they would hire somebody to do it for them. Apart from burglar alarms, dogs were considered as deterrent, and only 6 (15%) residential burglars claimed that they knew how to treat or to get rid of a dog. Four of these offenders claimed that existence of a dog did not affect their selection of a target, and they had no problem hitting or even killing the dog. Offenders who were brought up in the most disadvantaged areas stated that stray dogs were always around, and dogs were something they could play with. An offender who claimed to have had close contact with dogs in his childhood, revealed his technique as to how he dealt with dogs:

"There was a house which had caught my eye, I was watching the house for a while and knew that nobody was there. The only problem was a large wild dog in the garden. What I did was that I bought some meat every night, I let him smell it, then I rubbed that to my body and let the dog smell me, I did this a few times then gave him the meat to eat. He was a friend of mine after a few nights, and one night I went inside when the dog was busy eating the meat. That is if you are really determined to do a house which may keep a dog for protection" (Case 18)

It has to be noted, though that having or keeping dogs, especially in residential premises, is not part of the Iranian culture, and houses tending to keep a dog at home are rarely found. There is an increased tendency to keep dogs, in affluent areas, especially amongst those that are more influenced by Western culture. Thus, it may be concluded that in
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general target-hardening techniques had little effect in deterring offenders from approaching and burgling highly secured dwellings in affluent areas. They learned the trick and upgraded themselves to compete with the level of security set in wealthy areas, where a higher gain was guaranteed.

Summary and Conclusion

The general finding from the spatial patterning of residential burglary showed that some areas in Tehran contained higher crime rates than others. Since the ultimate aim of burglary is financial gain, it was shown that residential burglars had a higher tendency to burgle more affluent areas. Other factors contributing to the selection of such areas were lower population density, fewer people, less traffic, and poor community relations.

The results from this section also showed that some types of housing, i.e. bungalows, houses, and lower ground flats in apartments, generated more suitable targets than others, i.e. upper-floor flats in apartments, and residential units located in high-rise buildings. The selection of houses within different areas were influenced by several factors such as occupancy, the extent to which they presented an easy access, location of the target within the area where it presented a lower chance of being seen and reported to the police, and the extent to which they facilitated escape, etc. This study showed that the majority of residential burglars tended to burgle unoccupied houses, and used various techniques to ensure the house was empty, i.e. ringing the bell, throwing small stones at the windows, checking the lights and curtains at nights, waiting for residents to leave the residence, etc. Residential burglars avoided occupied residents mainly to minimise their risks of apprehension. However, those who tended to burgle occupied houses were more likely to be armed.

Accessibility was found less important to the residential burglars interviewed in this study, as the majority were capable of opening most types of locks on doors and
windows. However, they were less efficient at dealing with burglar alarm, or dogs, and therefore, tended to avoid such dwellings.

A close relationship was found between selection of targets and the level of skill and experience obtained by residential offenders. The skilled and more experienced offenders targeted more difficult targets located in more affluent areas, where higher financial gain was guaranteed and higher risks were overcome by the ability to deal with tighter security. Conversely, the less skilled offender had to target dwellings within less affluent areas, where the gain is less and the risks are greater.

Finally, an examination of the movement of offenders, to determine how far from home residential burglars travel to commit their burglaries, revealed that almost all offenders travel a long way to unknown areas to carry out their burglaries, and that they are quite reluctant to burgle targets in or close to their living neighbourhood. The main reasons identified were: 1) To maintain theirs, and their family's local respect and honour; 2) Since offenders themselves often come from economically deprived areas they are well aware of the fact that in those areas there are little wealth and value worth stealing. The disadvantages associated with selection of targets in unknown areas, however, are offset by the considerable amount of time and effort spent to obtain information and knowledge about certain aspects considered important by residential offenders.

### 6.7 The Burglary Event

The aim in this section is to show how burglaries occur in Tehran (sub-aim e, aim 4). It includes an examination of a series of actions that constitute the actual offence. Target-selection procedure and gathering information about the target (which were examined in previous sections) although are prerequisite for the actual offence, are not counted as illegal, themselves. This section will look at activities that form the actual burglary, and it includes entry techniques and escape routes, the process of searching once the burglar
is inside the house, the types and value of valuables targeted by residential offenders, the trading techniques employed by offenders to market their stolen properties, and finally the termination of criminal activities by offenders. Some of the issues presented in this section have been discussed earlier in a different context, but will be referred to again where appropriate.

6.7.1 Entry Techniques

The entry techniques selected were determined by the type of housing (i.e. southern or northern style), as well as the personal skills and experience. Personal skills were often derived from personal abilities gained by past criminal activities, or previous jobs held by offenders which were relevant to the type of criminal activities conducted by them. For example, an offender who had worked in a company whose main job was assembling and repairing safes (mainly for commercial usage, but occasionally used in residential settings), utilized his expertise about safes. Another offender, who worked in a key cutting shop, was an expert in opening various locks and could unlock every type of lock in about 2-3 minutes. Another one, whose father owned an audio-video shop, often burgled those types of electrical devices and sold them to specific customers visiting their shop.

The findings from the interviews showed that offenders who were capable of unbolting locks preferred southern types of housing. This type of housing, according to offenders, provided more safety and less risk, as they felt safe as soon as they went inside. It was also the case that career burglars had gradually learned the skills about opening or picking locks. The more experienced burglars used two methods of entry: one by picking the lock, and the second by opening a lock using a small screwdriver, or by misplacing the windowpane. Side doors were generally opened by a screwdriver, other more difficult doors were opened by picking the lock.
Those less confident about opening locks preferred the northern style housing. In that case entry was often made through the wall to the garden, where s/he was less at risk of being observed, or the offender could afford to spend more time opening locks or breaking a window. The less experienced offenders jumped off the walls and broke into houses through windows (8 cases, 20%). These offenders broke the window by the use of a wet cloth, which was put on the glass surface and punched. The wet cloth was said to make the breaking noiseless. Windows in back doors, patios, and those in the roof were preferred to the windows located on the front side of the house. Only two offenders claimed that they had several sets of keys that fit numerous types of locks. The more experienced offenders contradicted this view and claimed that pre-cut keys can only be used for cars not for house locks.

6.7.2 Inside the Dwelling- Searching Patterns and Targeting Valuables

Offenders felt fairly safe once inside the house, especially when they were confident that residents would not be back for the whole or a part of the night. The searching pattern used by all offenders was similar. Of course the extent to which offenders searched various parts of the house depended on the time they intended to spend inside or how quickly they found what they came for. Offenders, who were confident that residents would be away for the whole night, took their time, they ate, smoked, watched TV, satellite and sometimes interesting videos, and even slept there. Two of these offenders were arrested following a night-time sleep, often as a consequence of drinking alcohol found inside. They also took their time searching all the hidden places they could think of, and took as many goods as possible depending on their ability to sell them safely, and depending on the type of vehicle they had brought with them. If these offenders had prior information about the type of valuables the house contained and of their hidden location, it made the job much easier and required much less time. Offenders who had less time, or panicked, often searched the house less thoroughly and only looked at places where they thought could find something.
Several questions were asked to determine the searching patterns and the way burglars targeted valuables. These questions sought to obtain information on more frequently targeted items, places searched by offenders, whether burglars made decisions on their escape route as soon as they entered the house, whether they felt anxious when going for burglary, whether they took a vehicle for burglary, and if they did, how far from the target they parked it, and how they transferred their stolen goods to the vehicle. Also how they reacted if somebody arrived while the burglars were inside, and finally how these patterns were affected by whether they carried out the burglary alone or in the company of others.

Although the items stolen by offenders were diverse, the most frequent items were those that are commonly used, easily changed to cash, mainly light and small in size, but highly valuable. Items such as cash, jewellery, finely-knitted Persian carpets, modern electrical equipment, Samsonites, foreign money, and safes were targeted by offenders, in order of importance. A considerably large number, 36 (88%) stole cash and jewellery. Among these, 16 (39%) stole cash and jewellery only, and were interested in nothing else. Carpets were stolen to a lesser extent; they were targeted by 13 (32%) offenders. Moreover, 22 (54%) stole only cash, jewellery and expensive carpets. A lower number of 11 (27%) burgled electrical equipment, mainly of modern types such as Hi-Fi, satellite, fax machine, mobile phone, video-recorder, computer, and camera. Five (12%) tended to steal antiques and collectable items, 3 (7%) stole foreign money, and one (2.4%) stole a safe.

Cash was the prime target, it enabled the offender to use it straight away. Jewellery was, however, as desirable as cash for it was light in weight and high in value. Carpets were highly desirable targets, but in demand only if small, preferably the finely-silk-knitted ones, which make them extremely light and expensive. Electrical equipment was targeted by many offenders, with preferences given to the smaller, lighter, and more valuable items, and those more easily saleable, i.e. videos, tape-recorders, cameras, mobile phones, etc. Antiques are of interest only to offenders who had a readily buyer
for them, but in general, are less in demand; for being unique and easily recognised.

Discussion of the types of items selected by residential burglars led to an interesting finding. This suggested that the tendency of the public, especially the more well-off, to keep large amount of cash, jewellery, and carpets at home has resulted in the burglars’ awareness of such availability, and has enhanced their level of expectation of each burglary. It is surprising to know that so many offenders claimed that they never touched a large expensive wide-screen TV because it was not worth the hassle, or that they never touched a wide variety of expensive decorative pieces of statues, flower pots, crystal dishes, etc. which are commonly and widely used in such houses, unless they were antiques. As one offender with 22 years of experience in various types of crimes stated:

“I only take cash and jewellery, I never take a sack or a bag with me, I only put them in my pocket and come out empty-handed. It has happened several times that I have come out of houses without taking anything. If there was equipment in the house worth millions I wouldn’t touch them, if there is not enough cash and jewellery it isn’t worth the trouble” (Case 6)

Answers to the search pattern showed that for all the 41 offenders the master bedroom was the prime target, for it almost always contained the cash and jewellery, which was often kept in cupboards. Cash and jewellery were also found in Samsonites, ladies handbags, under the bed, in pockets, or in suitcases. If they were found, by those who targeted only cash and jewellery, they left immediately. If cash and jewellery, was not found in the master bedroom, then offenders searched elsewhere, including the bathrooms, the kitchen, even in the fridge and freezer, or in the dustbin until they found what they came for. Those stealing electrical equipment went to the reception area and other bedrooms, where these items are usually kept. Offenders who were interested in expensive Persian carpets found little problem, as they were easily available. They were spread on the floor in the guest rooms in wealthy areas. Antiques were often on display in guest rooms, and were spotted immediately.
Where offenders chose to take a vehicle when going for burglary, the type of vehicle they used depended on the type of goods they intended to steal, and their perception of risk. Those who targeted only cash and jewellery and came out with nothing, or only with a small bag, acted accordingly. Some believed ‘walking’ in possession of stolen goods (even inside their pockets) was too risky; hence, they used a private car to get away from the target. Others thought that since they did not have anything to be carried by hand, it looked more natural if they just walked away on foot. The latter believed that walking away from the site raised less suspicion and less attention. Among the 16 offenders who burgled for only cash and jewellery 9 left the target on foot, the remaining 7 used a car as a getaway. Amongst offenders who targeted more than cash and jewellery, 19 offenders (76%) took a private car and fitted stolen goods in the bonnet, and 6 (24%) used a motorbike as it was claimed to be faster on the road and more manageable in narrower alleys and streets. In exceptional cases, offenders mentioned that they had either stolen or hired a van to transfer major thefts containing several larger items from the burglary site. However, they stated that since driving a van at night is highly suspicious and likely be stopped and searched by the police, they stole them at night but transported them during the day.

Burglars who intended to steal more sizeable items often parked their cars in front of the house or inside if they were confident that nobody would return while they were inside the target. Those working with co-offenders (25, 61%) often had someone sitting in the car, 2-3 houses away from the target, while their co-offender was inside collecting the items. When ready to leave s/he signalled to the driver, then s/he brought the car in front of the target, transferred everything to the car, and drove away, quickly. One female offender explained this:

"I always accompanied my husband in burglaries, I often drove the car and waited for him in the car, a bit further than the house, to watch that no body is coming. If there were so many good items, he called me inside, we collected everything, then I came outside, if it was safe, drove the car to the front of the house, we quickly put the things in the car and left " (Case 4)
It was also shown that the majority of 37 (90%) searched for a means of escape immediately after entering the target. The main response to 'what routes of escape do you choose, if somebody arrives?' was the same way they came in. If not through the backdoor, then through a window leading to the yard, or the roof, or any other way available. Four experienced offenders said they opened a window to make their escape possible. Only two stated that they had not thought of an escape route, one relied on his associates as he considered himself amateur.

Moreover, the majority of offenders felt no anxiety about the burglary. Twenty-five offenders (61%) felt quite comfortable about entering somebody else's private domain. They explained how they used to get very nervous at the beginning, but they had got used to the idea and it did not scare them anymore. However, they still got nervous about getting arrested. Among these offenders 2 (5%) thought burglary was a game; they enjoyed it and felt very excited by it. On the other hand, 6 (15%) offenders, all occasional, said they got very nervous every time they decided to burglar a house. Ten offenders (24%) expressed a slight anxiety, due to the uncertainty of the consequences and possibly related to their conscious about doing something wrong. This feeling, they added, went away once they were inside the target.

Finally, offenders were asked how they reacted if somebody arrived while they were inside. Their answers suggested that the way they reacted was largely influenced by whether or not they carried a weapon; also by the extent to which they were determined not to get arrested. It was found that those who were armed and those with previous convictions who had the experience of prison life, were extremely determined not to get apprehended. These offenders stated that they would do anything to stop being detained. The most frequently answer to this question, which came from 22 (54%) offenders, was in the order of: 'I try to runaway if possible, if not will threaten the residents with anything heavy or sharp I find around (with knife or gun, if armed), I injure myself,'
when they see blood they get scared and I run away, if not, I hit them and escape”. On the extreme side there was a group containing 7 (17%) offenders who claimed that under no circumstances were they prepared to physically hurt the residents. None of these offenders were armed, and their main reaction was: “I try to escape, if not possible I get caught”. On the other side there was a group of 12 (29%) who said that they would do anything not to get caught, even killing people if necessary. The latter were all armed and although not all in favour of harming people nonetheless saw killing as the last resort to their freedom.

6.7.3 Selling Stolen Property- Fencing

No burglar can survive without a fence, i.e. somebody who buys stolen goods from burglars. Burglars carry out their burglaries only by relying on buyers who convert their stolen goods into cash. Of course, obtaining access to somebody who is prepared to buy stolen goods, and can be trusted is not an easy task. It is also the case that most buyers work covertly and are reluctant to reveal their identity to less known offenders who may give away their name once they are arrested by the authorities. Thus, there is a mutual trust between the burglar and his buyer, a trust which is built under special circumstances and is strengthened by time.

Offenders in this study were asked what they did with their stolen goods, if they sold them, to whom and whether they believed they had received a fair price, First of all, it became clear that almost all offenders tended to dispose of their stolen goods, and only in exceptional circumstances did they tend to keep an item for their personal use, as this caused a risk. In addition, 5 stated that sometimes they stole items that were requested by friends, and gave it to them.

It was also found that the majority of offenders interviewed in this study (26, or 63%)
were consistent in dealing with specific buyers who would buy various types of goods. For example, all offenders sold their stolen jewellery to a specific buyer who had a jewellery shop; no one sold his stolen jewellery directly to consumers or to other casual buyers. An offender with 22 years of thieving experience who had his own fence, a man owning a jewellery shop, said:

"I sell my stolen jewellery only to one man who owns a jewellery shop. I have been doing business with him a long time, I trust him and he trusts me. I have never given away his name for the last three times I’ve been in jail. In return he has never refused buying any jewellery I brought to him and he pays good money for them" (Case 6)

Despite the fact that in Tehran, all jewellery shops are closely controlled by the police, and the owners of these shops, according to the law, are prohibited from buying any type of jewellery brought by customers without a receipt, (used as a ‘proof of purchase’), some of the owners buy jewellery from people whom they know, mainly because this jewellery can be quickly converted to other forms. The gold itself is changed to a model and design which is quite different from the stolen design, so it becomes unrecognisable by the owner, and the illegal act becomes unprovable by the police.

Carpets, on the contrary, were seldom sold to carpet shops, in fact, offenders mentioned that carpet shop owners were rarely prepared to buy carpets without their receipts, as this is highly likely to result in terminating their career. However, since carpets have exclusive designs, and are not convertible to any other forms, they are easily recognisable by the owner or the police. In addition, all Persian carpets have their labels attached underneath. These labels are used as carpet documentation and facilitate identification. Most of the more expensive carpets, with exclusive designs, are sold to mediators who have access to buyers taking these carpets abroad. The less exclusive ones are sold directly to unknown customers.

Stolen electrical equipment is sold in specific markets known to most offenders. These
types of goods are sold at a much lower price, often less than half to one third of the original price. Six experienced offenders said that they never steal electrical equipment without their boxes, instruction leaflets; they prefer them to have their receipts. They would sell their stolen goods to ordinary shops and expected to receive a fairer price for them.

Although the relationship between the thief and his buyer is a complicated one, and is not fully discussed in here, this study showed that most of the more experienced offenders have managed a good and trustable relationship between themselves and their consistent buyers. Burglars are often tested for their loyalty to their fence through possible arrests. A burglar, who is arrested and possibly convicted, if he did not reveal the identity of the fence to the authorities, will be trusted by his fence and will continue trading stolen goods after being released. A fence with a consistent relationship with a burglar, however, has to treat the burglar fairly, by appreciating the trouble s/he has gone through, and by paying a reasonable price for the stolen goods, to encourage the thief not to reveal his identity to the authorities, if arrested by the police. On the other hand, a burglar who has been treated fairly by a fence often protects him when arrested, hoping to maintain the trading relationship after being released.

6.7.4 Desistance from Crime and Attitudes towards Imprisonment

It was evident from interviews that conviction and imprisonment often made offenders more determined to continue with criminal activities. Repeat offending and the number of criminal convictions affects offenders in two distinctive ways: first, it affects their future job prospects; and second, it affects their psychological disposition and thereby influences their behaviour and attitudes towards life.

Offenders, at the end of interviews, were asked a few questions aimed at demonstrating the degree to which incarcerational institutions may be effective in reducing the likeliness of re-offending. This is also expected to assist the establishment of appropriate
crime prevention policies. Offenders were asked to explain their last experience with residential burglary and explain how they got arrested. This was expected to encourage them to be open about how they felt about the criminal justice system, the police, and whether they thought they have been treated fairly. They were also asked whether they thought imprisonment would be a suitable form of punishment and whether it was capable of stopping them re-offending. The final question asked offenders what will they do when released from prison: pack up criminal activities all together, change to another type of crime, or continue with a similar type of offence. The answers to these questions were, the most interesting as well as the most distressing part of the interview. It was generally found that conviction often had a negative effect on offenders, depending of course on the consequences the conviction had on their life.

The determination to continue with burglary and illegal activities was often fortified after the first conviction. It seems that a conviction and having a criminal record eliminate all possible opportunities for a legal job. An offender who initially had the opportunity to run his/her life through a legitimate job, but somehow had ended up living on crime, receiving a conviction in most cases reduced his chances of a legitimate living. Offenders often lose their self-confidence, feel different and are isolated from the rest of society; they have to face the stigma when other people, i.e. employers, colleagues, relatives or friends, find out about their involvement with crime. Conversely, they gain more confidence with illegal activities, obtain experience and information about how to perform criminal acts successfully, enjoy the high gain, often become engaged in more expensive types of entertainment, and start drinking and using drugs.

In addition, the manner by which they have been treated by the police and the court, i.e. whether they think they have been treated fairly or not, the outcome of their trial, the extent to which they feel humiliated, etc., often greatly influence the ways in which they think about justice, discipline and public order issues. Most offenders felt they had been mistreated and misjudged (if this feeling is justified or not, is a different issue), and this
would promote hatred and revenge from authorities. A female offender who was convicted for the first time, and was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment for co-offending with her husband, a professional burglar, expressed her annoyance with the criminal justice system as:

"The thought of spending time in prison was very appalling. I always wondered what life is like in prison, my worst nightmare was coming into prison, but when I came into prison, everything became normal to me, I'm used to it now, I know what its like in here, it doesn't scare me anymore, I've learned a lot from my cell-mates, people are coming and going in this place, people with all types of offences, you learn a bit from each and you become a professional yourself. I have no shame in carrying on with crime now, they should have not brought me here, they should have left me with my imagination about prison, let that scare stay in me, that may have stopped me if they did, but not anymore" (Case 4).

Another offender with two prison convictions, explained his experience as:

"I have been convicted once before for bag-snatching, it was a four months conviction. I felt that I learned a much better lesson and that punished me more effectively than this long-term (3 years) conviction, for this conviction, I lost everything, my wife, my kids, my whole life is destroyed, when I come out I have nothing to live for, so why bother, I definitely have to continue with crime, all the money I had saved up was spent on my court case with my wife demanding divorce, I returned all the goods I had stolen to its owner and I'm still here for nothing" (Case 5).

This offender believed that each time he committed a burglary, because he had worked hard, therefore, deserved the gain as a consequence. In addition, he felt that the judge had treated him unfairly for not helping him and for taking the victim's side (and not his side), despite returning all the goods to the owner. Moreover, he felt betrayed by his wife who did not remain loyal to their marriage and divorced him. He was frustrated because his children were handed over to the social services, as a consequence of their mother's request, because she saw herself financially and emotionally incapable of looking after them.

Imprisonment seemed to toughen these criminals; they seldom regretted what they had done. They often decided to continue their criminality and in a more aggravated manner;
that may even preparing themselves to use more violence, if necessary, in order to decrease the risk of apprehension and future conviction. Offenders with convictions, saw no way out of crime, they were immersed in their little world of criminals, a world which has surrounded them entirely and blocked any form of communication with the outside world. An experienced offender with 8 previous convictions expressed his feelings as:

“We are corrupted people, we are like an old thick tree who has deep roots in crime, the only way to stop us from offending is to cut the old tree down from the root. Since I remember things I have been involved in crime, no body ever taught me how to live right. If they release me from prison today, and tell me to live right and don’t do crimes again, I wouldn’t understand what it means to live right, how on earth would I do that, I haven’t a clue” (Case 18)

After a few convictions offenders often get more persistent in the job, so that everything appears to be easy, almost like an ordinary job, as case 18 added:

“Now I don’t go up the walls for money, I love the job, it excites me, when I’m up on the wall, when I come out of a target successfully, I feel like an artist who have played a film successfully and is being applauded and admired by the public, I don’t feel shame at all, so many times I have gone into a house, have watched the house, eaten, drank and have gone out without taking anything, I’ve had enough money in my pockets, I didn’t need money, its a habit, it’s the success of the job that excites me,...” (Case 18).

Thus, it may be seen that crime and convictions have eliminated the job opportunity for these offenders. Offenders said when released from prison, they had no money, no confidence, often no proper training or skill, possibly with drug problem, no support from family and friends. They were surrounded by all types of criminal opportunities, and will most likely return to offending. Offending, therefore, is a justification of the way they felt about life and how fair, they thought, it has treated them. The prison experience, the hatred towards the authorities, the annoyance with the whole society that has produced little opportunity for offenders to live like others, the hatred towards the upper class who, many offenders claimed to have kept them deprived of wealth and a
comfortable life-style, the annoyance with family whom have rejected them, and all
other feelings of disappointment and exhaustion will only leave one option open to
offenders: that is crime.

Summary and Conclusion

The previous sections were intended to demonstrate in what manner burglaries occur.
Examination of techniques which were used by offenders to enter a dwelling showed
that in general when burglars set their mind on a target, they almost always manage to
find a way in. Selection of the ways in which they provide access to a burglar differ with
the level of skill and experience. The more skilled offenders are capable of opening most
types of locks on doors, the less skilled offenders obtain access through easier points of
entry i.e. walls and windows. However, it was discovered that even the majority of the
more skilled offenders were put off by the presence of dogs and burglar alarms in the
house and that they preferred other opportunities that presented similar gain but lower
risks.

The searching patterns of offenders revealed that the most frequently targeted items,
cash and jewellery, were easily found by offenders. It seemed that they had no difficulty
in recognising the places where these items are concealed. Moreover, it was shown that
several items targeted by offenders, i.e. carpets, Hi-Fis, videos, antiques, etc. are often
on display and all the burglar needed to do was to decide which ones to take.

The fencing techniques used by offenders for converting their stolen goods to cash
suggested that most offenders in this study had successfully managed to establish a
consistent and trusted relationship with a specific buyer. In addition, it was found that
the majority of offenders preferred selling their goods to a specific buyer to using casual
buyers and consumers of goods; this resulted in lowering the likelihood of getting
captured, as well as increasing their chance of receiving a fairer price for their trade.
Finally, when seeking the offender’s view on the effectiveness of custodial institutions in terms of preventing them from re-offending it seemed that imprisonment and conviction did not discourage these offenders rather it made them more determined. It would seem then that alternative preventive measures ought to be employed.

6.8 The Target-Selection Procedure

In earlier sections of this thesis it was shown which areas were more at risk of being burgled, the factors influencing selection of an area, as well as the selection of the dwellings within an area. It is intended now to look at the procedure by which burglars follow in the selection of their targets. It is interesting that, when offenders were asked how they choose their targets, initially they were unable to give clear answers. Only later as a result of analysis of their responses has it been possible to clarify those procedures in a coherent manner.

First of all, it was found that although almost all burglars claimed to have selected their targets within relatively better-off areas- depending of course on how they defined ‘better-off’. When they were asked to be more specific and name the areas that they often carried out their burglaries, their answers made it clear that the search for a suitable target was extensive and that they selected areas that were widely spread. It was also noted that the procedure by which offenders selected their targets differed, depending on various circumstances, i.e. how desperate s/he was for money, whether s/he was on drugs or not, his/her awareness about factors contributing to a successful burglary, etc. In general, target-selection procedure is explained as follows. Each offender may not be consistent in terms of the level of search s/he accomplishes prior to a burglary, and in various circumstances, may behave with accordance to one of the followings:

1) Offender was given a specific target by a friend,
2) Offender was searching for a target to be burgled shortly,

3) Offender was searching for a target to be burgled subsequently.

Offenders who are introduced to a specific target are often presented with sufficient information, i.e. exact location, times at which the residence is left unoccupied, possibly the characteristics and the value of goods available at home, the access and entry points, or even a key. In such circumstances, offenders approach the target with some awareness, although in such cases most offenders claim that they never rely entirely on the information given by others and always carry out their own investigation. The investigation mainly includes probing occupancy by using their own techniques.

Offenders, who are searching for a suitable target with no prior information, often walk around the area, mainly in the side-streets and alleys. The extent of their search depends on several factors i.e. whether driving a car, being on a motorbike or walking on foot, whether they had consumed alcohol, drugs, etc. The initial decision made on the selection of a target is based merely on its 'appearance', to determine whether or not there is something inside worth stealing. If the offender has decided to carry out a burglary on the same night/day, s/he usually looks for signs of occupancy. When ensuring that the house is unoccupied, s/he spends some time investigating the neighbourhood, and looks for ways which provide easier access. If the situation is right, s/he often carries out his/her burglary at the same time. Offenders who carry out their burglaries in such a short time are those who desperately need money (often for drugs), and obviously are at a higher risk of being observed by neighbours, or being encountered by the residents. Residential burglars interviewed in the current study often behaved in such a manner, the major trend though is towards longer-term investigation about their selected targets, prior to the burglary.

The suitability of a target is often determined by the past experiences of offenders. If the offender finds a target which is considered suitable by reference to his/her awareness and
experience, s/he often starts his/her investigation. An investigation made by a professional burglar includes searching the surrounding area to get familiar with surrounding streets and alleys. This means investigating the distance of the target to the main road, examining the types of housing within the area, the possibility of being seen by neighbours while entering/exiting or while inside the target, the height of the walls separating the target from its adjacent dwellings, the level of the roofs of adjacent buildings located in the same row, and where they are linked to the target. It also includes assessing the frequency of patrolling of the police in the area and possibly include the time-table when they change shifts, as well as entry points i.e. types of locks, height of the front walls linked to the main external door, the location of windows, the number of people living in the target, the occupation of the residents and the times at which they regularly leave the house unoccupied, as well as the number of children and their schooling time-table. It might also include information about the residents from others living in the vicinity.

A professional offender always carries out his/her burglaries with prior preparation and adequate planning based on information s/he has gathered. Most offenders interviewed in this study claimed to have spent about one to two weeks getting familiar with the area and with the residents living in the target. However, they believed and realised that they were taking a big risk, and therefore, they expected a high gain, and for that they spent a considerable amount of time in order to increase the possibility of their success. Following the investigation, especially finding out about the time at which residents would not be at home, they decided on a night/day to carry out their burglary. They always checked occupancy before starting the burglary. The less experienced and less professional burglars may spend a shorter period investigating some of the aspects that were mentioned above. A professional drug-addicted burglar explained the procedure for conducting his burglary as:

"During the day, I go round areas in Shemiran (a popular area in the north), down the alleys where there are less people and less cars on the street, search for a suitable house located in a place where it is easily linked to other alleys for easy
escape, I wander in the area for a few days, and I watch that house closely, when I feel ready I steal a car and do that house at midnight” (Case 1)

It may be concluded that the procedure by which offenders select their target and carry out their burglaries, is a complicated one. Conducting a burglary often requires time, investigation, collection of information about the target, and planning. The occasional offenders, however, spent less time planning their burglaries, usually entering a house and stealing wherever an opportunity is presented, which is often an open window or door. In the next chapter, the findings from this study will be analysed in terms of the ‘rational choice’ and ‘routine activity’ theories to determine how the availability of crime opportunities influence the selection of targets by offenders, and also to determine whether the results from the current study are explainable by such theories.

6.9 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter looked at patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. In doing so, it first examined the procedure by which burglars select their time and place for offending; it also addressed the factors influencing temporal and spatial patterns. Then, it looked at the manner in which burglary is carried out in Tehran, it investigated burglar’s means of entry, their search patterns inside the house, items more frequently stolen by burglars, and the ways in which burglars sell their stolen properties.

The findings from the temporal and spatial patterns suggest that most residential offences are carried out at specific times, at certain places. Temporal patterns revealed that burglary in Tehran is mainly a night-time, weekend activity. It was generally found that residential offenders carry out their burglaries at times associated with low risks and high financial gain. Temporal patterns were found to be closely influenced by the ways in which a specific time enhanced the success of their burglaries. The overwhelmingly higher number of night burglaries over day burglaries suggest that the darkness of the
night, is the main reason for conducting burglaries then. Occupancy was important to residential offenders as it also reduces the risk of apprehension by avoiding confrontation with residents. Night-time burglaries are also preferred by most offenders because residential burglars are less capable of identifying occupancy during the day. They will not take the risk by guessing whether there is anybody at home, unless they personally see residents leaving the house. The night time burglaries in unoccupied houses, in addition to creating less opportunity for observation and detection, often provide more time for the burglar to search the house, which may in turn increase the value of the property the burglar can take away.

The findings from the current research suggest that burglary is not restricted to some specific geographical areas. However, those areas located in districts offering better socio-economic conditions may be selected more frequently. Since burglary is mainly intended for higher financial gain, it occurs more frequently in areas containing higher wealth. Results from this study indicate that burglary in better-off areas is carried out by more experienced and skilled offenders, whilst burglary of houses within less wealthy areas is carried out by less professional offenders, leaving the petty and opportunistic type of theft to be carried out in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and committed by the most amateur, often occasional burglars.

Districts with diverse socio-economic characteristics produce different rates and patterns of burglary. Data obtained from interviews and the information gained from the police made it clear that in areas with lower population densities, containing higher wealth, where houses are more distant from each other, and where the community relationships are reduced, the rate of burglary is increased, as are gains from each burglary. For similar reasons, burglars are less likely to be detected in such areas, therefore, the chances for a successful burglary is enhanced, especially for burglars who have acquired certain skills and abilities to overcome more difficult security measures. Conversely, more populated and denser areas, with smaller houses that contain larger number of
people are at less risk of burglary. Burglars in such areas are easily identified and discovered. In addition, the lower gain from houses located in less wealthy areas, makes such areas less attractive, except to the less experienced offenders who lack the skill to shift their activities to more affluent areas.

Selection of targets was determined by factors such as occupancy, the degree to which criminal activities may be seen and reported by neighbours and passers-by, and the ease of access to the house including the level of security employed. Regardless of the level of experience, it was discovered that the vast majority of offenders selected their targets at places and at times where and when visibility was reduced, dwellings were left unoccupied, and easy access and easy escape routes were produced. It was evident that security and strong locks are less an issue for the more professional and more determined offenders who are prepared to learn the trade for a higher gain from burglary. However, these offenders were deterred by the presence of dogs and burglar alarms.
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CHAPTER SEVEN
Aim 5: To draw out similarities and differences between the findings from Tehran and those carried out in some Western countries, to determine whether the theories underlying Western studies are capable of explaining patterns found in Tehran. The findings are hoped to assist predicting whether the situational solutions offered in Western countries are transferable and capable of reducing burglary in Tehran.

Sub-aims are:

a) To outline similarities and dissimilarities between the patterns found in both studies, that is the findings from Tehran with the findings from Western studies;

b) To determine whether ‘opportunity’ theories underlying some Western studies, including ‘rationality’ and ‘routine activity’ perspectives, could be similarly used to explain patterns of residential burglary in Tehran.

7.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section will outline similarities and differences between the findings from some Western studies discussing patterns of residential burglary (discussed in chapter 2) and those found from this empirical work carried out in Tehran (discussed in chapter 6). The results from this section will illustrate the extent to which these patterns are similar or different; or they may be similar in some aspects and different in others.
The second section is intended to examine whether theories underlying Western studies, namely 'opportunity' theory including 'rational choice' and 'routine activity' perspectives, are adequate to explain patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The results derived from this discussion are expected to assist predicting whether situational measures can effectively reduce crime levels in Tehran.

7.2 Similarities and Differences between the Findings from Two Studies

The patterns of residential burglary have been studied for some Western countries with reference to the existing literature to determine when, where, and how burglaries occur (chapter 2). Similar lines of research have been conducted by this empirical study carried out in a non-western society- Tehran (chapter 6). The main findings from chapters 2 and 6 have been used to outline similarities and differences between the two studies, which are explained in the following section (summarised in Table 7.1.).

7.2.1 Gender and Age Variables

Residential burglary, according to both Western literature and the current research, was seen to be mainly a male activity. This, however, is true only for the known offenders (Tarling, 1993), and may not be generalised to the whole population of burglars for example to those who may have been too clever, too professional, or even lucky not to become caught.

The finding from Western literature also shows that crimes including residential burglary are carried out mainly by young boys (Tarling, 1993). Reppetto's (1974) studies in Boston showed that his arrested burglars tend to be disproportionately young males. In 1994, a high proportion of convicted offenders for indictable offences in England and Wales were young offenders, with 43% being under 21 and only a very small proportion being over 30, with the majority involving theft, handling stolen goods and burglary (Croall, 1998: 118). American studies, similar to British studies found that burglars were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Western Pattern</th>
<th>Patterns from Tehran</th>
<th>Similar/different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Burglary is predominantly a male activity</td>
<td>Burglary is predominantly a male activity</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Burglary is predominantly carried out by teen-agers, often under the age of 21</td>
<td>Burglary is predominantly carried out by relatively young offenders, the average age for burglary is 25</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of burglary</td>
<td>Burglary is a time specific activity Burglary is mainly a daytime activity</td>
<td>Burglary is a time specific activity Burglary is mainly a night-time activity</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime duration</td>
<td>Crime duration is short; normally 2-5 minutes</td>
<td>Crime duration is long; normally 1-2 hours</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime frequency</td>
<td>Frequent; especially among drug-addicts and younger, inexperienced offenders</td>
<td>Less frequent</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of burglary</td>
<td>Burglary is unevenly distributed within various areas, with socially and economically deprived areas attracting most of residential crimes</td>
<td>Burglary is unevenly distributed within various areas, with wealthy areas attracting most of residential crimes</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journey to burglary</td>
<td>The journey to crime is short; offenders often live in poor areas and offend in areas close to their homes; targeted areas are socially and economically similar to offender’s living neighbourhood</td>
<td>The journey to crime is relatively long; offenders often live in poor areas but offend in areas distant from their homes; targeted areas are socially and economically different from offender’s living neighbourhood</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry techniques</td>
<td>Entry is made through more easily accessible means, i.e. less secured doors and windows; selected points of entry is largely dependent on the type of housing</td>
<td>Entry is made through more easily accessible means, i.e. less secured doors and windows; selected points of entry is largely dependent on the type of housing</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>The majority of burglars tend to target unoccupied houses</td>
<td>The majority of burglars tend to target unoccupied houses</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of stolen property</td>
<td>Cash and jewellery are the most desirable targets; electrical equipment is popular</td>
<td>Cash and jewellery are the most desirable targets; carpets are popular</td>
<td>Almost similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of stolen property</td>
<td>The value of stolen property for each burglary is often low</td>
<td>The value of stolen property for each burglary is relatively high</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug use</td>
<td>There is a strong correlation between burglary and drug use</td>
<td>There is a weak correlation between burglary and drug use</td>
<td>Almost different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat victimisation</td>
<td>There is a high risk of repeat burglary within a short period of time after the first burglary</td>
<td>The risk of repeat burglary is extremely low</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Summary of the main findings from Western studies and those found in Tehran
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largely young, with few occupational skills or educational qualifications (Decker and Wright, 1994). The average age, according to American studies is 15 for burglary. Similar studies suggest that most young offenders stop committing crime sometime around their late teens, and only a minority carry on to become professional criminal, possibly by moving into more serious types of offences with a lower risk of being caught, i.e. from burglary to organised crime. Pease (1997: 666) noted that the age at which most males start offending is 14, and the age at which most stop is 23. Pease (1997) expressed the life changes that occur at this age as the main reason for the high level of offending among young boys. This view has been criticised by Croall (1998), who suggested that teenage offenders are over-presented in the picture of criminality and that it may be due to the fact that young people are more focused upon for their often petty nature criminal activities.

The findings from the research in Tehran clearly demonstrate that the average age of residential burglars, including the age in which offenders start their engagement in residential burglary is considerably higher, 26-30, and 18-25, respectively. According to the police crime statistics the majority of burglaries in Tehran are carried out by offenders between the age of 20 and 30. The higher age of offending for burglars in Tehran may be explained by the nature of the offence requiring tremendous skill and technique, and that most offenders usually start with other less serious types of theft and move to residential burglary later when they acquire more experience and confidence.

7.2.2 Times of Burglary

Several European and American studies, such as Reppetto (1974), Scarr (1973), Maguire and Bennett (1982), and Felson (1998) have found that burglary, in these societies, is mainly a daytime activity. The patterns of daytime burglaries are compatible with other features of burglary, that is most burglars use opportunities that become available to them during the day. In addition, the crime duration is found to be short; also the
properties stolen mostly contain the easily saleable items of low to medium value properties (Felson, 1998). These features are consistent with a typical Western burglary, that is using easy opportunities presented by occupants who leave their houses, for a short period of time, to do their daily business, i.e. taking children to school, shopping, etc., and paying less attention to properly securing their residence, therefore, creating a suitable target for burglars. On the other hand, the burglars' tendency to avoid confrontation with residents, makes night-time burglaries less prevalent because most people are likely to be at home, or asleep at night, and may be awoken by the intruder, resulting in confrontation between the burglar and the occupants (Maguire and Bennett, 1982). For the same reason, on weekend nights, when more people are likely to be going out, more burglaries are carried out. This is also confirmed by a considerably lower rate of burglary during the weekend daytime, when most residences are more likely to be occupied (ibid.).

The current study showed considerable difference from Western findings. Residential burglary in Tehran is mainly a night-time activity. This finding is confirmed by the crime statistics held by the police, the findings of other studies, as well as information obtained from interviews with offenders. The less prevalent daytime burglaries, in Tehran, are also explained and supported by other features of burglary found in this research; especially the nature of burglary which tends to be less opportunistic. Also, the longer crime duration (average 1-2 hours), increased visibility in the daytime, the uncertainty of the level of gain, and tighter security, especially in better-off areas, where houses are targeted more frequently, all make daytime opportunities unattractive. In less wealthy areas the population density, the smaller size of the residential premises, the presence of people and cars, also tighter community relationships, make day burglaries largely visible, and associated with greater risk.

On the other hand, the number of night-time burglaries in Tehran may be brought about by the cover of darkness. In addition, a considerable amount of planning conducted by
the majority of offenders in the present study, enables the offender to obtain adequate knowledge to decide when is the best time, and what is the best method for entering the house without being seen by neighbours, at a time when the house is known (or seen) to be left unoccupied for a fair period of time. This enables the burglar to stay longer inside the house.

7.2.3 Spatial Patterns of Residential Burglary

The majority of Western crime studies such as Herbert (1989), Evans (1989) Davidson (1984), especially those carried out after the 1970s, found that the crime rate was unevenly distributed within areas with specific social and environmental characteristics. These studies, in particular, found that most offenders come from poorer areas, and tend to commit their crimes in areas having similar socio-economic settings, often close to their home (Brantingham and Brantingham, Evans, 1989, Baldwin and Bottoms, 1976). This spatial pattern of residential burglary is explained by the fact that offenders tend to commit their crimes in familiar areas, where the social characteristics are known to them (Wright and Decker, 1994; Poyner, 1983). The spatial patterns, according to Western literature, again show conformity with other aspects of residential burglary in such societies. Offenders who live and offend in economically and socially disadvantaged areas, where the majority of houses would be in similar socio-economic circumstances, would not find or expect a high financial gain from each burglary. Although it has been suggested by Reppetto (1974) that offenders within the poorer areas select the relatively better-off houses, this still does not substantially promote the gain. Any reduced financial gain is, therefore, compensated by increasing the frequency of burglaries to raise the total gain from burglary, whilst young offenders, may tend to burgle several houses located within one area.

The spatial patterns produced by the research carried out in Tehran, also show variation in spatial patterns. These variations, however, are more evident in the patterns and
methods by which residential burglary is conducted in Tehran, rather than its rate. The varied patterns are in themselves related to socio-economic characteristics and ways by which these areas have developed. While in Western countries the poorer areas, and to a lesser extent, the affluent areas located close to disadvantaged areas, are largely targeted by offenders, in Tehran the more affluent areas, and to a less extent, economically disadvantaged areas which are located geographically distant from the affluent areas, are mainly targeted. Wealth, which in most cases guarantees a higher gain from a single act of burglary (if successful), has been considered by almost all offenders as the main factor determining where to go for burglary. Environmental characteristics such as a means of access, surveillance, occupancy, physical barriers i.e. high walls, locks and bolts, patrolling police, etc. are all influenced by the fact that there is a higher gain in wealthy areas.

On the other hand, unlike Western burglars, those from Tehran showed a greater tendency to travel long distances to select targets and carry out their burglaries. This is justified by the financial factor (higher gain) as well as the fact that most offenders avoid conducting burglaries in their own neighbourhood in order to prevent being recognised as burglars- as they destroy the family honour (see section 6.6.4, chapter 6). Familiarity with the neighbourhood, social conformity and personal affiliation with certain types of housing and environmental design are of little importance to the Tehranian burglar. He/she is prepared to travel a long distance, and conduct his/her burglaries in an entirely unknown area. He/she spends a considerable amount of time watching the area, the house, the resident's routine activities, the frequency of police or private patrolling, and the extent to which the target has been hardened by security devices, etc. All these exhaustive efforts are made for a higher gain of a successful act of burglary, to enable the burglar to be free of trouble and enjoy greater financial gain. It may be concluded that the findings from Western studies were not supported by the general findings from this study which suggested that areas with a high proportion of offenders were quite distinctive from other high crime areas, and that almost all offenders travelled long distances to commit their burglaries.
7.2.4 Techniques of Entry

Techniques used for entering a residence are, to a large extent, similar in Western studies (i.e. Cromwell, et al., 1991; Waller and Okiihiro, 1978; Reppetto, 1974) and the study in Tehran. Thus were wide variations concerning the points of entry used by burglars, including entries made through doors, windows, backdoors, patio-doors, the roof and skylight windows. In the Western studies and in Tehran, however, it was evident that main doors and windows were more likely to be used as a form of entry. For example, 77% of burglars studied by Waller and Okiihiro (1978), and 68% of Reppetto's offenders (1974) entered through main doors; the Tehran study found that 70% also entered their targets through main doors. Differences in the types of housing in the two studies, however, showed obvious differences as to how best entry was achieved. The use of exterior metal doors, surrounded by high brick walls in Tehran, instead of half-length gates and shrubs used in some Western countries, (i.e. in the UK where the demarcation of boundaries and signs showing where private land is separated from the public, or semi-public spaces), creates some differences in the means employed by burglars to enter houses. It was generally evident that burglars from Tehran had to overcome more complicated security barriers and had to put in greater efforts and skills to get access inside the house than a Western burglar who often used unsecured points of entry (Maguire and Bennett, 1982).

Overall, as discussed in chapter 4, in Tehran, residential premises use boundaries such as high brick walls, which are compatible with their cultural and religious implications creating more privacy. The privacy is heightened by pulling the curtains at night, which has the unintended advantage of obstructing the view of outsiders and passers-by, as well as giving a false sense of occupancy. These differences in building designs and cultural trends produce some differences in the means of entry used by burglars. These differences ultimately do not alter the fact that burglars learn to overcome these obstacles and enter the house, often successfully.
7.2.5 Search Patterns, Types and Value of Stolen Property

The search pattern, that is the places that burglars look at, once inside the house, for obtaining valuables, was almost similar in both studies. Both the Western and the Tehranian burglars searched the house, particularly the bedrooms, and elsewhere thoroughly, within the time limits they could spend in the house. However, the type, and especially the value of properties targeted by residential burglars showed more diversity within the two studies. It was evident in both studies that cash had the highest priority among items stolen by burglars. It was also evident that apart from cash, jewellery was the most desired and also preferred by almost all offenders. Electrical equipment was popular and was targeted by many Western offenders (Repetto, 1974, Felson, 1998), but less targeted by burglars from Tehran. This may be explained by variations in the life-style of people living in two societies. In Western societies credit cards have nowadays almost replaced cash, and people are less likely to keep a large amount of money inside the house. Credit cards are used to lesser extent by people living in Tehran¹, yet most households often contain a large sum of money kept for emergency purposes. The availability of cash and jewellery (which are easier to spend, trade, and are lighter in weight) reduces the offender's tendency to steal electrical equipment.

Moreover, jewellery is counted as an investment by Iranian ladies. They often tend to buy and keep a considerable amount of gold (depending on the level of wealth, and social attitude). Jewellery is used by women as a symbol of wealth in social gatherings and, especially in formal ceremonies such as weddings². These jewelleries, however, are mainly kept hidden at home to be used on special occasions. These jewelleries, however, create a highly desirable target for burglars.

¹ The use of credit cards are rapidly increasing in Tehran, people and especially business men are consistently encouraged by banks, and by the police to replace credit cards with large sums of cash, but some time is required to establish people's trust and habit in credit cards.
² For example, it is a social custom that obliges the groom or his family, in addition to a wedding ring, to buy a complete set of gold, often decorated by valuable stones such as a diamond, ruby, etc. to be presented to the bride when she accepts the marriage vows.
In addition, Persian carpets are widely used by almost all groups of people, and are highly targeted by burglars. The wealthiest keep the smaller size; extremely fine crafted light (often silk-crafted) but highly expensive carpets, whilst the less wealthy keeps the larger, less delicate, and less expensive carpets. Electrical goods are targeted by lower number of burglars (27%), often by less professional burglars in less wealthy areas, where cash, highly valuable jewellery, and more expensive carpets are found less. These variations in life-style although they explain the differences between the types of properties targeted by offenders, in both Western studies and those from Tehran burglars tend to steal items from houses that maximise their gain.

Moreover, the shorter time period spent inside the house (intrusion time) by a Western burglar, compared to the amount of time spent by a burglar in Tehran, is related to the amount of damages inflicted by a Western burglar (Felson, 1998). This is much less evident in burglary patterns studied in Tehran. The burglar in Tehran selects a time and a situation, which often gives him/her sufficient time inside the house. So many offenders take their time inside the house; they eat, drink, and sometimes sleep inside the house at night (if confident that residents will be away for the whole, or a large part of the night). In almost all cases burglars did not create a mess and disturbed the house contents as little as required. Obviously daytime burglar, and those committed by the frightened, unrelaxed drug-addicted burglar in desperate need for money operate in a different manner, with less consideration for the house-owner.

7.2.6 Drugs and Burglary

A strong association was found between burglary and drug-use by Western studies such as Brantingham and Barantingham (1991), and Repetto (1974), which could have a major implication for crime prevention policies. This suggests that the prevention of burglary is strongly related to policies aiming at controlling the availability of drugs and public access. Studies carried out by Cromwell, et al. (1991), showed that 93% of his
offenders were regular drug users. The findings from the study in Tehran showed a lower association between burglary and drugs, about half of the offenders interviewed in this study were drug-addicts. About 21% of drug-users had started their criminal activities to meet the costs of their drug habit.

Drug-use is also shown in Western studies to have a major influence on the frequency and the level of rationality used by such offenders. Repetto (1974) and Cromwell, et al. (1991) revealed that most of their offenders who had become drug-users following engagement in criminal activities, had increased the number of their offences and had become increasingly dependent on burglary to meet their drug habit. It has also been suggested by Brantingham and Barantingham (1991) and Cromwell, et al. (1991) that burglaries carried out by drug-users involve little planning, are less organised, and are usually opportunistic, using readily available opportunities. In contrast, studies from Tehran showed no relationship between drug-use and the frequency of burglaries. It was also evident that 65% of these offenders had planned most of their burglaries, although did not deny the occasional engagement in opportunistic burglaries in desperation situations.

7.2.7 Repeat Victimisation

Repeat victimisation (RV), or dwellings being re-burgled after a short period of the initial burglary was often found by many Western studies, but almost non-existent in Tehran. RV has been studied by Polvi, et al. (1991), Farrell (1992), Bridgeman and Sampson (1994), Pease (1993, 1998) and Bennett and Durie. They related RV to vulnerability factors, which suggested that houses with lower surveillance (where the house view is obscured by trees and shrubs), were more at risk of being re-burgled. Similar studies suggested that the higher risk of revictimisation for previously victimised dwellings is often derived from the information passed on from offenders to their colleagues and peers, indicating the vulnerability of a house being previously hit by them. It is obvious that unless some valuables worth stealing, are left following the
initial burglary, a repeat burglary to the same house is of no use to another burglar. It may be assumed, therefore, that in order that a second burglary takes place in the same house, it is either the case that some valuables, which are of interest to one burglar, have been burgled in the first burglary, and other items of interest may be passed on to another friend or colleague, for the re-burglary offence. Or it may be assumed that a burglar who is not adequately equipped for burglary may hit a house, and by observing more valuables require the company of a friend, or a vehicle, and come back later for the rest of the valuables. A repeat offence committed by the same perpetrator is likely to occur at a time which is adequately distant from the first offence to allow for the goods to be replaced. The goods are likely to be replaced quickly if the house contents are insured, or if the householder is sufficiently wealthy to allow for quick replacement. Or the properties stolen may be essential for routine daily life, i.e. TV, fridge and freezer, or they may be items whose absence may be inconvenient to a household, e.g. camcorders, videos, cameras, etc.

Repeat victimisation, for whatever reason, was not evident in the study from Tehran. Interviews with the key authorities and the police showed that they had little concern for such an issue, and it seems that only in exceptional cases, or by chance, a house may be re-burgled after the initial burglary. Interviews with residential burglars also showed that they never thought of re-burgling a house previously burgled by themselves or by a colleague. The idea of re-burgling a stolen house seemed funny and laughable to them. Despite this, it was mentioned by a few burglars that they had accidentally entered a house, which they thought previously been burgled.

In exceptional circumstances, where a burglar who had planned his/her burglary came across exceptionally valuable properties, which s/he was not equipped to transport then the burglar may return to the same property at a later time. Again, occasionally, offenders with a selective approach towards goods, and in a house which was of interest to a close friend, may do them a favour (or may be returning a favour) and inform him/her of the availability of such a target (or had stolen it for their friend). This
however, was not a common occurrence. In Tehran housing insurance is still not as common as in Western countries, and most people do not insure their homes against loss of contents from burglaries. It seems that with widening knowledge about the beneficial advantages of insurance and the advertisement of insurance companies the use of such policies will grow. That may affect the future pattern of burglary in Tehran.

7.3 The Adequacy of Theoretical Models in Explaining Patterns of Burglary in Tehran

In the previous section it became evident that patterns of residential burglary in Tehran were similar in certain aspects to patterns found by some Western studies, the differences, however, were more extensive and more profound. This section is intended to determine whether, or to what extent the 'opportunity theory' underlying Western studies (see chapter 2), including 'rational choice' and 'routine activity' perspectives, are capable of explaining patterns found in Tehran. In other words, this section is intended to determine whether such theories can be generalised to Tehran. The findings from this analysis should enable the study to predict whether, or to what extent situational crime prevention policies, suggested by some Western studies including Home Office research studies in UK, would be appropriate for the reduction of burglaries in Tehran.

In chapter 2, theories underlying the current study, including the 'rational choice' and the 'routine activity perspectives, were described. Similarly, the patterns of residential burglary in some Western countries, especially in the UK and in the US were examined. This was followed by a discussion on the adequacy of these theories in explaining burglary patterns in Western societies. Patterns of residential burglary in Tehran were examined in chapter 6 based on data gathered from Tehran. This section intends to use the data produced by previous chapters to examine whether or not theories underlying Western studies are capable of explaining patterns of burglary in Tehran.
The first section will look at the rationality of offenders to determine the process by which a decision is made by an offender to become involved in criminal activities, to select a target, and to offend. This will enable the study to determine to what extent offenders in Tehran are rational in the selection of their targets by assessing the risks and gains associated with burglary sites (section 7.3.1). The next section will determine to what extent the 'routine activity' of offenders as well as victims influences the selection of a target within a specific area (section 7.3.2). This will lead the discussion to consider whether the 'opportunity theory', which situational crime reduction policies predominantly rely upon, is capable of explaining patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The results are expected to determine whether situational measures are suitable to prevent or reduce burglary levels in Tehran (section 7.3.3).

7.3.1 Explaining Patterns of Burglary in Tehran with reference to the 'Rational Choice' Perspective

7.3.1.1 Offenders' Use of Rationality in their Initial Involvement in Crime and in the Selection of Targets

The rational choice perspective, as seen in chapter 2, perceives offenders as rational individuals who choose to offend. Crime, in this perspective, is based on rationality, and is the outcome of reasoned decisions about the 'gains' and 'risks' involved (Cornish and Clarke, 1986). Rationality, in this study, means an attempt to explain how the minds of potential burglars work in: 1) getting engaged in a burglary activity; 2) the selection of their targets by calculating, or at least taking into account (depending on the level of rationality, which will be discussed in the next section), the gains as well as the risks which are often associated with this type of crime.

The decision to offend in terms of rationality involves the procedure by which an individual evaluates different types of actions to respond to his/her needs, i.e. financial,
emotional, and/or psychological needs, and finds himself/herself ready to commit a crime to satisfy his/her needs (Cornish and Clarke, 1986). The initial involvement in crime, therefore, means that the potential offenders evaluate different choices of actions (including legal and illegal) and finally, by calculating the ‘gains’ and the ‘costs’ associated with those choices, decide to commit crime.

The findings from Tehran showed that the initial involvement of offenders in criminal activities is less influenced by rationality and that the majority of offenders start their criminal activities with no prior planning and without devoting sufficient time and thought to consider consequences. Engagement in crime is often persuaded by peers, or is carried out to respond to financial needs of potential offender. Many of these burglaries were initially organised by friends and peers. This is especially the case for younger offenders, whose decisions are made spontaneously, and are satisfied with little gain. They are used mainly by more experienced offenders, and they, for evaluation of risks as well as for disposal of stolen goods, often rely on the more experienced members of the group/ co-offenders. It seems that the lower the age that individuals start their criminal activities the less rational will be the procedure to offend. This pattern, however, may be different for older offenders whose criminal activities are consciously chosen to respond to drugs or financial needs. Older offenders, when make informed decisions to offend, seek opportunities to maximise gains and minimise risks.

A close examination of the patterns of burglary, however, reveals that no activity is committed without a prior decision, and whatever the reason to offend, individuals, at some stage had to make a decision, which implicitly signalled their readiness to commit an illegal activity. The roots of criminality, whether for highly rational or those less rational offenders, must be sought among the factors that stimulate and motivate offenders to commit crime. Although the study from Tehran showed that financial need was the prime motivating factor for committing crime (see section 6.4 on motivational factors for offending in chapter 6), indeed not all individuals in financial need would be
prepared to engage in criminal activities. In fact, examination of other socio-demographic characteristics of interviewed offenders in Tehran showed that their social, family, and psychological backgrounds have led to their readiness to criminality as a way of responding to their needs. They, for the way they have been brought up and based on their social learning experiences, are more prone to criminality. Once they get involved in criminal activities, they will have to assess the risks involved in i.e. burglary to prevent being caught. Therefore, the findings from Tehran conclude that the decision to offend was often made, less in the form of a careful assessment of risks and gains allied with illegal activity compared to those of legal activity, but more in the form of being driven to the path of crime. Although the factors influencing the offender's decision to offend were diverse, once a decision was made offenders were aware that they are about to become involved in an activity which is illegal, and were ready to do it. They at that stage may of course be less attentive to the exact consequences of crime.

Once an offender decides to offend, s/he has to find a target. According to the rational choice perspective, offenders use their rationality to select a target for burglary. The two main elements underlying the procedure by which potential offenders select their targets are the 'risks' and 'gains' associated with burglary. Therefore, in interviews made with residential burglars in Tehran attempts were made to seek offender's perception of 'risk' and 'gain' associated with burglary sites. The results from these interviews showed that the decision made on the selection of a target was determined by the gains outweighing the risks. The perception of risk in the mind of these offenders was clearly defined as the 'chance of apprehension and arrest that resulted in conviction'. In the selection of a target, thus, offenders sought factors that ultimately decreased their chances of arrest. The risk factors associated with a target, according to these offenders, was measured through occupancy (that enhanced the risk of confrontation between the offender and house residents), level of access, visibility by neighbours and passers-by, the extent of police patrols in the area, burglar alarms and dogs (for full explanation see chapter 6). The possible gains were perceived mainly by the appearance and condition of the house,
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and its locational area. Since financial gain in Tehran, is to a large extent determined by
the economic implication of each area, the location of a target within a specific area can
give a clear indication of the level of gain expected from the target.

The Patterns of burglary in Tehran clearly indicate the high level of rationality on behalf
of offenders in the selection of targets. The level of rationality used by offenders,
however, is influenced by several factors such as the age and experience of offenders,
acting in a group or alone in performing the burglary, the drug habit, the previous
conviction, the type of areas targeted by offenders and the level of gain expected from
each burglary, etc. For the importance of such factors in determining whether rational
choice theory is adequate in explaining burglary patterns in Tehran, the level of
rationality used by offenders in Tehran and the influence of such factors on the level of
rationality used by them in the selection of targets will be discussed in more detail in the
next section.

7.3.1.2 The Level of Rationality Used by Offenders in the Selection of Targets

The previous section showed that burglars from Tehran, like burglars in Western
societies, are rational in the selection of targets. This section is intended, first, to
demonstrate to what extent burglars in Tehran are rational in conducting their burglaries
and in selecting their targets. Second, it will identify the factors that may influence the
level of rationality used by offenders in selecting their burglary targets. The level of
rationality, that is the extent to which risks and rewards associated with burglary is
assessed by offender, is measured by the amount of planning prior to the burglary. The
greater the amount of planning the more rational the offender will be. The findings from
Western studies showed that in most cases burglary is not an act involving lengthy
planning, and that most offenders only evaluate immediate risks, and are less concerned
to assess gain cues, simply by making assumptions that all residences contain something
worth stealing (Cromwell, et al., 1991; Waller and Okihiro, 1978). The procedure by
which offenders selected their targets in Tehran showed a different result. The data from
Tehran showed that the largest proportion of burglaries are carried out in better-off areas, merely for containing higher level of gain. This finding was in complete opposition with the pattern found in most western countries, which suggested that poorer areas contained the highest crime rate and were targeted by the largest proportion of burglars. In Tehran, the findings made evident that in the selection of targets offenders were more concerned with the level of gain, and only when ensured the level of gain is high (by targeting houses in wealthier areas, depending on their level of expectation) they evaluated the risks and sought ways of minimising the risks. Of course, it is unwise to assume that all houses located in northern areas would guarantee a higher gain than those located in less affluent areas, however, the extent of wealth linked to the level of risks makes it worthwhile to travel from the south to the north of Tehran. This is a finding which is again completely inconsistent with findings from most Western studies, where in the West it suggests there is a lower level of rationality on behalf of those offenders.

The level of rationality and the amount of planning used by offenders is also determined by the 'time gap between the identification of a suitable target and the actual commission of crime'. Studies such as those by Bennett and Wright (1984) and Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) have identified the majority of burglars as opportunistic offenders who used presented opportunities and acted on the vulnerable target immediately, leaving no time gap between the selection of a target and the commission of a burglary (also Maguire and Bennett, 1982, Reppetto, 1974). Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) went further and suggested that professional burglars left very little time gap between searching for a target and the actual offence. Furthermore, they found that the burglary, that is the time between the decision to offend, committing the offence and selling the stolen goods, took only 1-2 hours.

The findings from interviewed offenders in Tehran were different to the Western experience, suggesting a much higher amount of planning made by the offenders prior to the burglary. There was also a larger time gap (usually 1-2 weeks, for professional offenders) between the selection of target and the actual commission of the offence. The
process was often started by the offender getting motivated for the crime. Unlike Western offenders, most burglars in this study were less likely to become stimulated by observing a vulnerable target, more by financial need (either for drugs or other reasons). The process of searching for a target was then followed by the offender travelling to areas where s/he is convinced they contain those targets guaranteeing higher gain. These offenders said the best time for discovering a target was daytime, for both night and day burglars, as this gives the offender the chance to make better levels of observation. Night burglars must also determine occupancy. Identification of a specific area enables the offender to search for a suitable house. This is usually done by wandering round the area on a car or a motorbike. The offender may come across a suitable target the same day, or it might take some days before s/he finds one. The majority of offenders in this study, tended to commit the burglary before they become desperate for money, as this allowed them sufficient time for planning. It was also evident that since the profit gained from each burglary was usually high, they were able to keep the number of burglaries relatively low, and consequently tended to put themselves at lower risks by committing crimes less frequently. When the offender discovered a suitable target, with likely high gain, then s/he started his/her investigation, searching for risks and often making an extensive search in order to obtain as much information as possible. This included the times at which the house is left unoccupied, the number of people living in the house, their occupation and their time schedule in respect to their daily activities, as well as the possible entry points, the type of doors and locks, the extent to which surveillance is allowed by neighbours and passers-by, the times at which the area is less crowded (depending on being a night or a day burglar), and the time schedule of the police patrols in the neighbourhood, etc. In general, a considerable time was spent and a substantial amount of information gathered by the majority of burglars in order to carefully assess, and minimise the risks associated with burglary. The searching stage ranged between 1-2 days and 1-2 weeks, depending of various circumstances. Once the offender gathered all the information required, and planned his/her action, then the offender acted according to the plan. Since access to information, especially from inside the house is in most cases impossible, the offender may not always have a precise idea about how much exactly
s/he will gain from the target. However, minimising the risks will often make the burglary worthwhile.

An exceptionally low number of burglaries were observed, in the current study, that were conducted merely on the basis of presented opportunities, i.e. an open door or a window. It is apparent that opportunity-based burglaries have to be carried out straightaway, with no time gap between the identification of the target and the commission of the crime, before the opportunity is blocked or removed. It also meant that the offenders may have to enter the target while the resident is at home, or gone out for a short period of time, both of which were considered as having an extremely low chance of success. Even if successful, the gain is likely to be quite low, which is largely unacceptable for the majority of cases examined in this study, who had much higher expectations from each burglary.

Therefore, it may be concluded that the fundamental difference between the patterns generated by Western studies and those found by the current study, was not the 'rationality' of the burglars, as patterns indicate that both burglars in Tehran and those in Western societies were considered as rational in the selection of their target, as well as in conducting their burglaries. It was in respect of the 'level of rationality'. This was determined by the time gap between the decision to offend and the commission of crime, and it suggests the lower level of rationality used by Western burglars, on the other hand, yet a higher level of rationality utilised by interviewed offenders in Tehran.

Several factors may influence the 'level of rationality' (the extent to which risks and rewards associated with burglary is assessed by offender). The level of rationality is largely influenced by age and skill. Those who start their criminal activity at a younger age, under the influence of peers, often have little information about the level of risks and gains associated with a target, they rely on the group for their judgement on the suitability of the target. The study from Tehran identified a minority of offenders that had committed crime in such manner. They included mainly younger and inexperienced
offenders, or those who had immigrated from villages to Tehran and were unfamiliar with the geographical locations and their economic and social implications. The crimes committed by these offenders, at the early stages of their criminal career, involved more reliance on the decisions made by others. These offenders were often used by the group as ‘look-out’, and were less involved in the procedural stages that required more skill and experience, i.e. opening doors, identifying escape routes, or selling stolen goods. However, these offenders, if not caught, start to enjoy the easy gain, and will gradually learn about the techniques, pay more attention to environmental cues signalling a ‘good’ or ‘bad’ target, and consequently, become independent and seek targets for themselves, or become consistent partners with other residential burglars.

For the majority of offenders in this study, who started their criminal activities at a later age, and worked independently, the readiness to offend was promoted by financial needs. These offenders often actively sought a target to commit a crime, and spent a considerable amount of time assessing the risks and gains involved with that specific target, before actually committing the burglary. Such offenders, according to the data from police are those who have formerly been engaged in simpler types of theft, i.e. shoplifting, car-theft, etc., these offenders use their past experience and their common sense to select a target which they think is suitable. They, like the first group, gradually learn about factors that are considered important by more experienced burglars in the selection of a suitable target.

It was similarly found by the current study as well as Western studies (Croall, 1998; Brantingham and Brantingham, 1991; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985) that the more skilled and the more experienced offenders tend to spend more time on planning their burglaries, attending to a more extensive assessment of risks against gains. In other words, some factors such as tighter locks or burglar alarms are perceived a high risk by less skilled offenders, therefore, preventing them from selecting the more difficult targets that are perceived to have little or no risk by the skilled offenders. Thus, the more able offenders can approach targets that are associated with higher gain and profit.
However, a major difference between the Western and Tehran Study shows that whereas only a small minority of all Western residential offenders are highly skilled and planned, the majority of burglars examined in this study were shown to be as such. In general it can be said that the proportion of skilled and experienced offenders within the population of residential burglars is an important element in the patterns of burglary. It is also important on the decisions about which policies are to be implemented in order to reduce the crime rate. In an environment where the majority of targets are based upon presented opportunities, removal or blocking opportunities may be considered as the most effective method of crime control. Conversely, in an environment where the aim is to reduce risks, linked to the intention of obtaining higher gain, and where the criminal activities are involved in extensive planning to encounter risky situations, situational measures seem to be less effective.

It was similarly found by Western studies that burglaries carried out by young offenders, as well as drug-users indicate lower levels of rationality (Cromwell, Oslon and Wester, 1991; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985). These offenders spend less time planning their burglaries, attending only to immediate risks-versus-gains, and are satisfied with little gain from each burglary. Reppetto (1974) says that the younger offenders and the drug addicts were less concerned with planning. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) as well as Winchester and Jackson (1982) argued that drugs speed up the process where offender has to search for a crime site. However, the current study found that age and drug-use had little effect on the level of rationality. The differences between the findings from Western studies and findings from Tehran may be partially due to the differences in the mean age of offending (15 according to Reppetto, 1974; 25 for interviewed offenders). Also, in Tehran, no evidence was found to suggest that younger offender's activities are less involved in planning compared to older offenders. Similarly, drug-users were found to be fairly rational in selection of their targets, thorough in their assessment of gains and risks, and their activities involved sufficient

\[d^3 \text{Correlation coefficient showed weak relationship between the level of planning, age, and drug-use (see tables 6.19 and 6.22).}\]
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amount of planning for burglary.

The greater tendency to plan, in the current study, was more likely among those burglars with previous criminal record and those with prison experiences. Interviews with residential burglars in Tehran suggest that since residential burglary is considered very serious according to the law, a burglar arrested by the police is likely to be sent to court, and likely to receive a conviction (the length of the sentence will depend on previous criminal record and the nature of the crime). In addition, a burglar released from prison after serving a prison sentence will have to face great financial hardship. To compensate for his/her time spent in prison, the offender will need to plan burglaries more carefully, and target residences that guarantee a higher gain, as well as reducing the frequency of his/her burglaries to reduce the risk of further conviction.

Whether offenders continue to commit burglary offences often depends on initial level of success or failure. Successful experiences lead to an increase in the frequency of offences and reinforce the habit. The failure of past experiences leads to arrest and conviction, therefore, this results in either termination of criminal activities, or heightened determination to obtain more informative techniques of handling a burglary, or moving to another type of crime. Successful burglaries often lead to improved techniques aiming at reducing the risks and selecting targets that are associated with higher gain; in our case targeting wealthier houses located in more affluent areas.

7.3.2 Explaining patterns of Burglary in Tehran with reference to the 'Routine Activity' Perspective

The routine activity model has been used by Western studies to explain the process by which offenders select their targets. This section is intended to examine those explanations presented by Western studies. Then, it will investigate whether the 'routine activity' model is capable of explaining the patterns of burglary in Tehran. In order to determine whether the pattern found by the current study can be explained by routine
activity theory, the study has to demonstrate, first, whether the pattern for target-
selection, with reference to the time and place (temporal and spatial patterns), is similar
or different for the Western studies and the current study. If similar, the chances of being
explained by this theory is increased; however, if different, the study has to look at other
factors that contribute to such a difference, and base these on the results that determine
whether or not the ‘routine activity’ model may be adapted in explaining the patterns in
Tehran. The applicability of routine activity theory to this study will be examined in
terms of two aspects: (a) places at which crimes occur (spatial patterns), and (b) times at
which crimes occur (temporal patterns).

In terms of ‘spatial patterns’ the main findings from Western studies suggested that most
crimes are carried out by offenders living in poorer areas; and that these offenders often
target houses located within the same areas (see chapter 2). This has been explained by
the ‘routine activity’ perspective. The ‘routine activity’ model proposes that the daily
activities of house residents such as going out to work, shopping, taking children to
school, etc. result in the home remaining unoccupied and unguarded at certain times of
the day, creating a suitable opportunity for burglary (Cohen and Felson, 1979). The
routine activities of offenders within similar areas will facilitate the observation and
assessment of suitable opportunities for burglary, especially for motivated offenders
seeking opportunities for crime.

a) The routine activity theory and spatial patterns

Routine activity theory attempts to explain the search patterns by offenders. It suggests
that most burglars tend to select targets that are located in their own neighbourhood, or
where they conduct their daily routine activities, i.e. school, work, entertainment, etc.
Familiarity with such areas has been considered to be the main factor. However, within
those areas houses are being targeted that are perceived as vulnerable. It has been
discussed earlier that several Western studies such as by Reppetto (1974), Baldwin and
Bottoms (1976), Rengert and Wasilchick (1985), Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) have confirmed the explanation offered by the routine activity theory and have supported the search pattern presented by such a model.

The capacity of routine activity theory to explain the search patterns found by the current study is dubious. The differences in socio-economic features between Western countries and Tehran create fundamental differences in burglary patterns and the ways in which targets are selected. As the results were discussed in the previous chapter the burglary pattern in Tehran is different: it is characterised by travelling a long distance into geographically unknown or less familiar neighbourhoods, with the intention of identifying targets that offer higher gains. The majority of areas targeted by offenders in the current study have not been visited prior to burglary; it was even shown that burglars often tended to choose areas as far as possible from their home to avoid being recognised as an offender. However, the disadvantages of selecting houses within unfamiliar areas is offset by the time and effort taken by a burglar to become informed of the features essential for a successful burglary prior to the offence. Therefore, it seems that the spatial movement of burglars in this study is less easily explained by routine activity theory.

b) The routine activity theory and temporal patterns

Routine activity theory is based upon a number of assumptions. In order to evaluate its capability in explaining burglary patterns, it is essential to breakdown the information, and clarify the assumptions that the theory is based upon.

The routine activity theory indicates:

- Burglaries are carried out by motivated offenders using 'opportunities' produced by residences being left unoccupied at certain times of the day.
- 'Unoccupied' houses are targeted at certain times of the day.
- Targets are burgled 'during the day', when most houses are left unguarded.
The assumptions utilised by this section are:

- Occupancy (unoccupied houses) is the main reason for houses being selected as targets.
- Houses are more likely to be left empty during the day, than at night

The discussion will be based on two concepts: ‘occupancy’, and ‘time of offence’. It was suggested by Western studies such as Bennett and Wright (1984), Jackson and Winchester (1982), Waller and Okihiro (1978), and Stangeland (1998) as well as the current study that “occupancy” was considered fairly important in the selection of targets by offenders. Therefore, unoccupied residences made the most favourable targets for burglars. However, the difference between the findings from this study and those from Western studies is mainly about the ‘times’ at which most residences are burgled. Western studies showed that daytime burglaries outnumbered those being carried out at night, whereas the findings from this study suggest the opposite. It was evident that burglary in Western countries is mainly a daytime activity. It was found that 90% of burglars studied by Cromwell, et al. (1991), and 75% of those examined by Maguire and Bennett (1982) carried out their burglaries during the day. Our findings showed that only 24% of offenders examined in this study conducted their burglaries during the day, and 61% of offender’s criminal activities occurred at night. Therefore, burglary patterns in terms of the time that most burglaries occurred differed between the findings from Western studies and those found in this study.

Felson (1998) by relating the peak times and the low points for burglary to the times when residents left their houses unoccupied, showed that burglary is more prevalent during the day, because during that time most houses are left unoccupied. Similarly, he explained the lower prevalence of burglary rates at nights through the higher presence of occupiers. Therefore, he concluded that the selection of targets are determined by daily activities of residents. Similar findings are confirmed by Rengert and Wasilchick (1985) and Cromwell, et al. (1991) portraying the consistency of target-selection pattern with
the routine activity model. It is evident that these studies have expressed "occupancy" as the main reason for selection of some targets (unoccupied) over others (occupied), during the day. With this argument, if the assumption is accepted that houses are more likely to be left unoccupied during the day, then the prevalence of day burglaries over night burglaries in some Western countries will be well explained by routine activity theory.

On the other hand, in Tehran, in order to confirm that routine activity theory is capable of explaining the selection of targets, the assumption underlying this theory has to be accepted. The first assumption suggests that houses are burgled during the day more frequently because they are left unoccupied during those times. The study from Tehran revealed the higher prevalence of night burglaries over day burglaries, which is explained by lower visibility (being seen by others) and a higher chance of determining who is at home and who is not. It was also shown that target selection was largely influenced by occupancy, that 60% of night and day burglars selected only unoccupied residences as targets. However, it is important to note that although most burglars in Tehran strongly preferred unoccupied houses to occupied ones, the higher prevalence of night burglaries was not attributed to occupancy, but to other factors such as 'lower visibility' and having a 'higher chance of determining occupancy', not occupancy itself. Therefore, the first assumption suggesting that occupancy is the reason for the selection of targets at the time that burglary is more prevalent is not proved by the findings from this study.

The second assumption made by routine activity theory suggests that dwellings are more likely to be left empty during the day. The argument for this assumption was expressed in terms of the increased proportion of women participating in the job market. Also the increased activities of housewives to go shopping, taking children to school, etc., leaving residences unoccupied for a large part of the day. It is argued by this study that this assumption is proved right only when we are able to demonstrate that within the mostly targeted areas (wealthy areas) the length of time people leave their houses unoccupied
during the day is higher than the length of time people leave their houses unoccupied during the night. It is argued by the researcher that in Iran, especially in Tehran, although the number of women taking up occupations outside their homes has increased considerably, during the last few decades, (which increases the chances of leaving the house unoccupied for a large part of the day), similar reasons have enhanced the tendency of people leaving their houses unoccupied at nights, i.e. to visit relatives and friends, going to restaurants, cinemas and theatres, etc. Therefore, without further surveys it seems difficult to determine the times at which more houses are left unoccupied, and whether targets are selected based on the routine activities of residents living within targeted areas.

Therefore, the findings from Tehran seem to have difficulty to determine whether such a theory (which assumes that houses during the day are left unoccupied more frequently than at night) may be accepted or rejected until more information is obtained, based on appropriate surveys. In the case of Tehran, it is evident from the empirical work that burglars have a higher tendency to carry out their burglary activities at night. Also they consider occupancy important in determining where and when to commit their crimes, so that whether most burglars carry out their burglaries at night because houses are more likely to be left unoccupied, is not supported by the evidence from this empirical study. Alternatively, it may be more appropriate to say that burglars show a higher tendency to burgle unoccupied houses at night, not because houses are more likely to be left unoccupied, but for other reasons, i.e. darkness produce a lower chances of being seen. However, amongst several houses that may be selected as targets, burglars tend to select unoccupied houses to reduce the risks. The latter explanation seems more reasonable, as there are several houses that are left unoccupied during the day. However, residential burglars are reluctant to burgle such houses as they carry other risks, i.e. being seen by others or being confronted by residents.

The lack of support for the assumptions underlying routine activity theory, based on the findings from the study carried out in Tehran, makes this research incapable of supporting or rejecting such a model in explaining the burglary pattern found in Tehran.
7.3.3 The Adequacy of ‘Opportunity' and ‘Rational choice' Theories in Explaining Patterns of Residential Burglary in Tehran

The ultimate aim of this thesis is to determine whether theories underlying Western studies may be similarly used to explain the burglary patterns found in Tehran. In previous sections it was found that both the rationality and the routine activity models are limited and restricted in explaining various aspects discovered by the current research. The temporal and spatial patterns, as well as the methods by which the actual burglary was operated in Tehran showed fundamental differences with those explored by major Western studies. The economic, social, and cultural features evident in Tehran seem to have created patterns that are greatly varied from those observed in some Western countries. Crime patterns in the former study have to be explained within their own specific contexts.

This concluding section is intended to determine whether opportunity theory, i.e. which suggests that opportunities produced within areas dictate the level and pattern of crime, which is based on the notion of rationality derived from the classical school of criminology, may be similarly used to explain the level and patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The answer to this question will assist predicting whether the situational measures, applied through modifications made to the physical layout of areas and houses that aim at removing or blocking crime opportunities, would be suitable for the prevention or reduction of burglary in Tehran.

The patterns from Tehran as well as those studied in some Western countries, especially in UK and US, revealed major differences between the two. One of the major disparities found in patterns of burglary in Tehran and in Western countries is related to the procedure by which offenders select their targets. It was shown repeatedly in this study that the major difference between the target-selection strategies lies within the perception of ‘opportunity' and the way it manifests itself in various districts that are characterised with diverse socio-economic attributes. Opportunities were seen and meant
differently by Western offenders and those conducting their burglary in Tehran. It was shown earlier that target-selection procedure and commission of burglary is based on rationality, and that both western burglars and those from Tehran use their rationality to choose areas, and within those areas select targets, that they think are associated with higher gain and lower risk, i.e. by targeting houses that are unoccupied, present easier access, lower visibility, etc. The main difference between the target-selection procedure in Western societies and in Tehran, however, lies within the level of rationality, the concept of opportunity, and in the 'rationale' and the way they rationalise their decisions about where, when and how to carry out their burglaries. Major diversities between the two sets of studies, especially in terms of temporal and spatial patterns and the way these patterns were rationalised by offenders, clearly indicated different perceptions of crime opportunities in the minds of offenders originated from diversities in the socio-economic characteristics of locations targeted by offenders. For example Western patterns showed that the majority of western offenders (who were also young and less professional) selected poorer areas, and within those areas targeted houses that were relatively easy to burgle (presented better opportunities). The rationale behind the selection of such targets stated that offenders chose these targets because the characteristics of such areas were known to offenders (mainly through their routine activities) and that they did not stand out and were not recognised as strangers in those areas. Therefore, a typical western burglary involves a relatively lower gain paired with lower risks (indicating lower level of rationality). Such a rationale, nonetheless, for the majority of burglars in Tehran (who were often older and more skilled) was not acceptable. It seems only rational to burglars from Tehran that for burglary which its main aim is often financial gain (for burglars in Tehran), targets (areas/houses) should be selected in areas where they guarantee a higher gain, something that is often found in wealthy areas. Therefore, the rationality of the burglar in Tehran implicitly dictate to him/her to conform his/her level of skill and knowledge to the higher levels of risks associated with such targets. This rationale, respectively, may not be followed by most western burglars.

A similar situation may be raised in terms of the times at which burglaries occur
(temporal patterns). Western studies showed that daytime opportunities attracted the attention of the majority of Western offenders; this was explained by the rationale that night time burglaries are too risky, as most houses are occupied at night. This rationale presented by Western offenders, is supported by other findings showing that the crime duration in these countries is short, therefore, houses which are left empty for a short period of time during the day, is often sufficient for the burglar to carry out his/her act. The higher number of night burglaries found in Tehran is also based on offender’s use of rationality, however, is associated with a different rationale stating that day burglaries are too risky as the possibility of being seen (and reported) is high. This rationale is also supported by other findings from Tehran showing that houses left unoccupied during the day, even for a short period of time produced insufficient time to carry out their burglaries in Tehran. The daytime period provided fewer opportunities in Tehran.

Fundamental variations in the socio-economic characteristics of locations selected by the majority of Western burglars and those from Tehran also pointed to major differences between perceptions of ‘opportunity’ in the two sets of societies. The findings from Western countries showed that the majority of Western burglaries are opportunistic in nature, and described a typical opportunistic burglary as an act committed by a young offender who targets a vulnerable house located in a low socio-economic area, preferably presented with an open door/window, or an easy entry through the back door, obtaining the burglar with little gain, being carried out during the day, and within a short period of time (often in 2-5 minutes). This proved to be unattractive to the majority of burglars in Tehran. They perceived such an opportunity which promised little gain as too risky. Conversely, a typical burglary in Tehran is characterised as being carried out in wealthy area, where most houses are well-secured, where it is less busy, where community ties are weakened, and a high gain is likely. It would also be carried out at night, when the visibility is reduced and signs of occupancy more easily determined. Such an opportunity is less likely to attract the attention of the majority of Western burglars, as it is considered too risky.
Moreover, although most burglars, whether in the West or those in Tehran, considered easy access as one of the main factors for targeting a specific house within a specific area, different skills and different abilities of offenders in dealing with different types of locks, doors/windows, changes the concept of 'accessibility.' This results in changes in the concept of 'opportunity.'

Apart from analysing patterns of burglary with regards to perspectives underlying the current study, in better understanding of the extent and the pattern of burglary in Tehran, one must take into consideration the social and cultural implications of living in various districts of Tehran. The findings from interviewed offenders revealed an important fact that offenders come mainly from socially and economically deprived areas and target districts containing wealth and affluence. This, combined with other data obtained from Tehran, proves that burglars start their criminal activity mainly for economic reasons. The latter finding when discussed in the context of other social and cultural factors influencing criminal behaviour in Tehran (discussed in chapter 4) makes understanding of burglary patterns easier. It is the fact that the rapid socio-economic changes, i.e. disproportionate growth of population, inflation, lack of proportionate division of wealth, resources, and job opportunities amongst various class divisions, lack of basic welfare for the poor and unemployed, rising life-expectations derived from modernisation, lack of job prospects for the young graduates, also other cultural changes in the family institution such as independence of the young from their elders, which have occurred in Tehran during the last two decades, have had a major role in generating criminal behaviour. Indeed, those who have lower access to economic and educational resources are expected to remain far from success in competing with the ever-increasing costs associated with a relatively comfortable life-style. They, for the same reasons, are less likely to obtain better-paid and respectable types of employment. This situation is aggravated for the immigrants who have to add to their problems having to adapt to urban culture. It seems that in contemporary Tehran the speed of economic deterioration is in constant increase, a situation which inflict a tremendous pressure on certain group of people (mainly the deprived), which consequently constantly increases the gap
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between the poor and the rich.

The poor who for economic and social pressures become involved in criminal activities are more likely to become involved with the criminal justice system. As these offenders are less able to afford the costs associated with the criminal procedure, they are more likely to end up in prison, and once they are released into the society will be more likely to carry on offending, as a result. The prison experiences deprive these offenders with criminal records even more of employment opportunities. They often get discarded by their families and relatives, and often establish a sense of hatred towards the authorities whom they feel have mistreated them. Their economic welfare is often deteriorated unless endorsed by further property crime, including residential burglary. Therefore, the findings from interviews merged with the social and economic context of living in different areas of Tehran can fully explain who gets involved in criminal activities and why (though it is undeniable that not all of those who are under the economic and social pressure resort in crime). These findings can also explain the reasons for continuing with criminal activities for the majority of interviewed offenders researched by the current study.

In regards to adequacy of theories underlying the current study, therefore, the patterns show that both burglars in Tehran and in Western countries utilise their rationality by creating a balance between ‘gains’ and ‘pains’ (costs), yet most western burglars target houses that are associated with lower levels of risks (in poorer areas). Conversely most burglars from Tehran, expect a higher level of gain (by targeting better-off areas), and therefore equip themselves to overcome a higher level of risk. So, what is considered as a suitable target to the majority of Western burglars is less likely to be considered as an opportunity by most burglars in Tehran. Respectively, differences in patterns and in concepts underlying such patterns, in the West and in Tehran, would expect to produce divergence in policies regarded as adequate for the prevention/reduction of burglary. The patterns of burglary in Western countries have led policy makers to suggest the suitability of situational measures. However, variations in the level of rationality and in
the concept of opportunity used by burglars in Tehran make such measures less effective. It has to be noted, however, that situational crime prevention through alterations in the environment i.e. increasing visibility by enhancing the street lights at nights, increasing the presence of police or private guards; or target-hardening techniques such as instalment of burglars alarms (which was found to be deterrent to most offenders in Tehran); as well as community initiatives such neighbourhood watch, (especially in affluent areas where the community relation is weak) may prove to be effective. Such measures however must be redesigned to conform to meet the findings of this study (and further research) in order to respond to the socio-economic characteristics of areas that are targeted more frequently.

Moreover, it is recommended that in order to select and implement policies that are more efficient in the reduction of crime in Tehran, one must distinguish between various areas, which are shown to be different in burglary patterns and in socio-economic features. For example the fact that this study found that most burglars performing in affluent areas are highly professional and highly determined in maintaining a high gain from each burglary by increasing their skills and ability to overcome most security devices, in such areas situational measures are expected to have little effect. They are likely to lead to the displacement of crime, i.e. to another area, to another type of crime, or ultimately to increase the level of skill required, and/or by toughening themselves up, i.e. by carrying firearms, etc.

The situational measures, on the other hand, may be more effective in dealing with burglary problems in lower socio-economic areas, where younger and less professional offenders operate. These offenders may be more easily deterred by target hardening techniques, unless that is these offenders are in desperate financial needs in which case that might increase the possibility of crimes being displaced to easier types, such as shoplifting, or bag-snatching. In such areas, however, there may be some problems with using target-hardening techniques, as the majority of its residents are poor; in such stances public funding contributions may be essential. Alternatively, other initiatives
related to factors found to be associated with burglary may provide a more adequate solution. Policies aimed at the market reduction of selling stolen goods, rehabilitating offenders by mandatory drug treatments, increasing offender’s occupational skills and producing employment opportunities within the probation period and supervision thereafter, ought to taken considered.

7.4 Summary and Conclusion

In this concluding chapter the main similarities and differences between the patterns of residential burglary were identified, with reference to studies carried out in some Western countries and those carried out in Tehran. It is evident that there is more dissimilarity and divergence between the two patterns than similarities. The first section of this chapter attempted to outline the main findings from studies carried out in Western countries and those in Tehran. Furthermore, it described how variations in gender, age, level of skill and experience, and drug-use could contribute to the determination of the rate and patterns of burglary in the two societies. It also focused on variations in temporal patterns, spatial patterns, and operational methods utilized by these offenders and made evident that substantial diversities might be explained through socio-economic characteristics of such societies. Subsequently, it looked at factors that encouraged the prevalence of repeat victimisation in Western countries, an issue which was almost non-existent in burglary patterns in Tehran.

Compatibility of such patterns with the theoretical framework selected for the present research was addressed in the second section. Burglary patterns were mainly explained by the employment of ‘rationality’, and ‘routine activity’ models of crime, to lead the research to determine whether opportunities presented in the environment were capable of justifying such patterns. The wide variations found between the burglary patterns in Western societies and those from Tehran led to a conclusion suggesting that although almost all offenders utilized opportunities being presented to them by the environment, the perception of opportunity differed considerably amongst the offenders studied in the
West and those in Tehran. Differences were ultimately attributable to socio-economic variations between the areas in which most crimes occurred in the two societies, to the extent which made the expediency of opportunity theory, advocated by many Western criminologists, dubious in explaining patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The findings from the current research suggest that distinctions have to be made between patterns of residential burglary in various areas, based upon their level of affluence. Whilst the findings predict little utility of situational measures in reducing or preventing levels of burglary in the more affluent areas, they may be more useful in decreasing crime levels in the lower socio-economic districts of Tehran.
CHAPTER EIGHT
8.1 Conclusions

This project was an attempt to explore the transferability of findings from Western studies on residential burglary to non-western countries, or societies that are different in socio-economic structure- Tehran was the case study. In order to do so it looked primarily at the patterns of residential burglary in both Western countries and in Tehran, and outlined similarities and differences between the various findings. This was followed by an identification and recognition of the factors that played a major contribution in formulating and shaping patterns of residential burglary in the two societies. It was seen that almost similar factors, i.e. occupancy, surveillance, accessibility, influencing burglary patterns in Western countries produced similar effects on patterns of residential burglary in Tehran. The wide variation found between the patterns of burglary in two societies, however, was mainly derived from the profound divergence in economic, social, and cultural implications adhered to each society. Finally, similarities and disparities between the patterns in Western countries and those from Tehran were explained by looking at some theoretical assumptions underlying Western studies and their capability in explaining burglary patterns in Tehran. The results from the current research indicated to a limited extent the value of opportunity theory in explaining patterns of residential burglary in Tehran, therefore, situational measures were regarded as less useful in the prevention and reduction of burglary in Tehran.

8.1.1 Similarities and Differences between the Patterns of Burglary in Two Studies, and their Implications

Research into patterns of residential burglary clearly indicated immense differences, but
slight similarities in patterns of residential burglary between the findings from Western studies and those carried out in Tehran (see Table 7.1). Similarities and differences occurred in the times at which burglary takes place; the spatial patterns, that is the places in which crime occurs; and in operational methods by which burglary was conducted.

In both Western countries and in Tehran it was similarly found that rates of burglaries are higher at certain times in specific areas. However, there were differences in time patterns. The most important difference was that while the majority of burglaries in Western countries are committed during the day, most of burglaries in Tehran were committed at night. Several factors were found to influence the time patterns developed by burglars in these societies. Decisions made by offenders as to when to carry out their burglaries, according to Western literature, related the temporal patterns to 'vulnerability' of potential targets, and showed that most offenders tend to carry out their burglaries at times when their targets are most vulnerable, i.e. left unoccupied. It was also assumed that since the dwellings have a considerably higher chance of being left unoccupied during the day, therefore, day burglaries would outnumber night burglaries. Occupancy, or rather the absence of it, was considered the most influential factor in making houses vulnerable to burglary, and the absence of occupants during the day was considered the main factor which led to a dwelling being targeted.

The temporal patterns of burglary in Tehran show that burglaries were predominantly carried out at night, because of the cover of darkness, a factor that greatly benefited the offenders. In Tehran night burglaries are preferred, not because houses are more likely to be left unoccupied during that time, but for the lower visibility. Nonetheless, occupied houses are avoided because they lower the risks of apprehension and reduce the chances of success.

It was also found by Western studies as well as the research from Tehran that some areas showed higher rates of crime. The ways in which offences are distributed in various districts, however, were found to be different in the two societies. The major differences
in terms of the distribution of offences, in various areas, were related to socio-economic characteristics. While Western studies identified economic and social deprivation as a prime feature in the concentration of burglary activities within areas, the research in Tehran indicated lower crime being committed in economically less advantaged areas. Conversely, districts characterised with great wealth were recognised as having an increased crime rate in Tehran. In addition, it was similarly found that the built-up environment, types of housing, and allocation of certain people in the community determined where offenders committed their crimes. While in Tehran affluent northern districts, which mainly contained large modernised houses, lower population density, systematic urban construction, lower community relationship, and concentration of wealth, attracted the higher level of crime; in Western countries the opposite features were known to attract higher level of crime. In Western countries, crimes are predominantly concentrated in less deprived areas containing public buildings (high-rise buildings and council estates), a higher population density, and inappropriate urban design, which suffered a higher rate of victimisation, and produced an entirely different pattern of burglary in these countries.

Moreover, findings from Western countries and Tehran both documented the over-presentation of offenders in some areas. Most offenders lived in the low income and the economically and socially disadvantaged areas. However, the types of areas selected by these offenders were completely different to where they lived. Western burglars predominantly chose neighbourhoods that were similar socio-economically to their own neighbourhoods. However, the burglar from Tehran made an effort to carry out his/her burglaries in areas that were entirely different in terms of economic and social characteristics.

Familiarity with socio-economic characteristics and the proximity of offender’s homes were the main factors determining the location of crimes in Western countries. Consequently, and in order to maximise the rewards associated with offending the high-value properties near or close to poorer areas were more heavily victimised by Western
offenders. On the other hand, burglars in Tehran were mainly reluctant to carry out their crimes in the proximity of their homes; these being poor, had high population density, had smaller house sizes, and higher neighbourhood ties. Burglars in Tehran were also highly concerned with the possibility of being recognised and feared family dishonour by committing a crime within a neighbourhood where the risks of arrest and detection were high.

Selection of targets by offenders in Western studies was explained through the routine activities of offenders as well as the routine activity of their victims. The Western literature has related the target-selection procedure to offender’s daily activities. It shows that the majority of offenders select their targets where they legitimately spent much of their time, where they regularly gather information about available opportunities within areas and determine the suitability of their targets by evaluating the possible risks and gains associated with them. This was different for Tehran; there the burglars carried out most of their crimes in unfamiliar areas. The outcome resulted in differences in the nature, seriousness, value of stolen properties, and the level of planning involved in criminal activities of offenders in Western countries and in Tehran.

Major differences in regards to the types of areas targeted by offenders in Western countries and in Tehran, as well as differences in times at which they were selected by offenders, led to variations in operational methods. Techniques for entering a dwelling were used to conform to the type of housing, the degree of accessibility it provides, the level of security, and the personal skills of offenders in dealing with security measures. A wide range of techniques was used by burglars in both Western societies and in Tehran. The findings from Tehran, however, indicated a relatively high level of skills learned by offenders in order to overcome tighter security devices used in wealthier households, and involvement with a higher level of planning in the selection of targets that promised a higher gain.

The type and value of stolen property showed some similarities in the selection of
properties that produced the least risk of apprehension. Almost all burglars preferred cash to other property, enabling them to spend it immediately. Again, the type and value of stolen property selected by various offenders was determined by the socio-economic characteristics of areas and houses targeted by offenders. The type and value of stolen properties differed according to the life-style, social and cultural implications in the two societies. In Tehran, for example, the use of jewellery and handicraft, of expensive Persian carpets, especially in houses located in better-off areas, makes them the prime target for burglaries. Burglary in Western societies involving low status housing results in targeting lower value jewellery and electrical equipment.

The type of properties selected by offenders was also dependent on the degree to which they had access to a ready market or a fence. Having access to a trusted and ready buyer seems to have been a major influence on the selection of property in both Western countries and in Tehran. Although almost all burglars were tempted by anything of value that was available inside the target, stealing a property for which they have no ready buyers increased their risk of apprehension; therefore, most burglars avoided stealing properties without having a means of disposal. The rapid advancement in technology and the introduction of electronic devices that are more easily portable and are compatible with the modern life-style makes highly expensive electronic properties suitable targets for burglary.

8.1.2 Factors Contributing to Patterns of Burglary in Two Studies

Patterns and levels of residential burglary in both Western countries and in Tehran were shown to be influenced by specific factors, of which occupancy, surveillance, and accessibility were determined to be of prime importance. The contemporary Western studies such as Newman (1972), Poyner (1983), Baldwin and Bottoms (1976), and Brantingham and Brantingham (1991), which aimed at a reduction in the rates of residential burglary, have concentrated on environmental elements that could be manipulated to reduce opportunities for crime. In contrast, social and psychological
dynamics are difficult to alter, and are therefore, of less interest to the current Western
crime studies as they do not produce immediate and certain effects. This research on
residential burglary carried out in Tehran has examined similar factors. Results from this
study showed there were similarities, but also differences in this regard.

In Tehran, it was found that factors such as occupancy, surveillance, and accessibility
were considered important in influencing patterns of residential burglary. The order of
importance was however slightly different in Tehran. While Western studies identified
surveillance as being slightly more important in terms of the way burglars construct their
scenario (see section 2.7.1.1, Chapter 2), the studies in Tehran showed that less
conscious attention was paid to this factor by offenders. A scrutinised analysis of
burglary pattern in Tehran makes clear that because burglars in Tehran were apparently
less concerned with surveillance this does not mean they ignored it; surveillance was
effectively dealt with by offenders because they committed their burglaries at night.
Also, the spatial patterns assisted as urban design and the socio-economic context of
such areas almost guaranteed lower visibility by lower population density, larger
proximity of the targeted house to its surrounding premises, natural cover produced by
means of fences, trees, and shrubbery, high brick walls and high metal doors, and a
lower number of people present on streets.

Almost all burglars in Tehran and in Western countries, were concerned with occupancy,
and largely preferred unoccupied premises for their offence. Residential burglary is not a
crime aimed at persons but at property; therefore, the majority of offenders tended to
carry out their burglaries in houses that were vacant in order to avoid any confrontation
with house-occupiers. Avoiding confrontation also reduced the chances of being
detained, and therefore, indirectly enhanced the chance of a successful burglary.

Accessibility was considered similarly important in both Western countries (see section
2.7.1.3, Chapter 2) and in Tehran. Selection of premises that present accessible entry and
exit points, enabling the burglar to carry away the stolen property successfully, was
considered of similar importance by burglars in Western and Tehran studies. Some differences, however, were evident indicating a relatively higher level of skills attained by offenders in Tehran if they were to overcome a higher level of security in order to obtain access to residential premises. The higher proportion of planned burglaries carried out by more professional and determined offenders in Tehran, conducting their burglaries mainly in areas and houses where the level of security is generally high, have produced different patterns in Tehran regarding accessibility. The ability of many burglars to deal with tighter security in Tehran made these burglars less concerned with accessibility, since they always found a way of overcoming elements of security when they were confident that a house produced a high gain. Nonetheless, the presence of dogs and burglar alarms were regarded as a deterrent and prevented offenders from selecting such targets.

Other factors such as conducting a burglary alone or with the assistance of accomplices (see section 2.7.2.1, Chapter 2), carrying weapons and firearms, etc. were found to have influenced patterns of residential burglary to some extent. The extent to which these factors influenced patterns of burglary depended on the burglar’s skill, past experiences and their personal preferences in conducting their burglaries. Drug use had a more profound effect on the level and pattern of burglary (see section 2.7.2.2, Chapter 2). Its significance is shown in almost all Western burglary studies such as Cromwell, et al. (1991), Brantingham and Brantingham (1991), Brown and Altman (1991), Reppetto (1974), etc. Drug-use in Tehran was found to have a relatively moderate influence on rates of burglary, but had a lower influence on the way burglaries were carried out. In Western countries drug-addiction led to types of burglary that involved less planning and was more opportunistic in nature. This finding was contradicted by burglaries in Tehran, which suggested that although a high number of burglars were drug-abusers, drug use had a limited effect on their level of planning, unless that is in desperate situations, in which case they fed their drug habit not through residential burglary but through other less serious, more opportunistic types of crimes such as shoplifting, and motor vehicle crime.
8.1.3 Evaluation of the Current Situational Measures and Their Theoretical Implications

Situational measures which focus on policies that attempt to reduce the vulnerability of targets selected by a wide range of offenders, have used a theoretical perspective mainly based on 'opportunity theory' indicating the occurrence of crimes as a result of availability of crime opportunities to potential offenders. The efficiency of situational measures in reducing crime is largely dependent on assumptions underlying such policies determining how individuals become engaged in criminal activities. Situational policies, based on an opportunity model of crime, have been less concerned with social and psychological factors that have motivated offenders to become involved in criminal activities. Instead they have focused on how availability of opportunities encourages motivated offenders, and how offenders may be deterred from offending by eliminating or reducing criminal opportunities.

Situational crime prevention is aimed at reducing crime levels, i.e. residential burglary by making crime more difficult to commit, by increasing the risks perceived by offenders, and by reducing the rewards associated with acts of burglary. Situational measures are targeting policies that enhance the visibility of crimes by increasing surveillance through community crime prevention such as neighbourhood watch and citizen patrol, increasing street lighting for improving observation of criminal activities and removing the points of concealment for offenders who use darkness as a tool for hiding their criminal intentions. They also utilise alterations and manipulations in urban and environmental design to increase the risks, by separating private and public zones in order to improve the sense of territoriality and surveillance by inhabitants (Newman, 1972). These policies are also assisted by changes in building design, especially in residential premises which contain large number of people and are public in nature. Instalment of CCTV cameras in places prone to criminal activities such as lifts, corridors, and the allocation of janitors help control the people entering or leaving the buildings. Target-hardening techniques have also been considered as a major
development in diminishing criminal opportunities by making properties less vulnerable; i.e. by using better locks on doors and windows, burglar alarms, etc. Property marking is another solution to crime reduction that is assumed to make recognition of stolen property easier and trading of stolen property more difficult.

Situational policies have been favoured by crime prevention agencies as being more practical and having immediate and measurable effects in reducing crime levels. They are preferred to policies aimed at transformation social traditions, educational establishments, and behavioural re-construction of offenders, which are considered to be more difficult to implement, requiring considerable length of time, and are problematical for their effects to be observed or to be evaluated. Another main advantage of situational crime prevention strategies is reflected in their interference with crime before it occurs. The aim is to reduce the weight of the work being carried out by the CJS, and other crime controlling institutions placing them in an active position rather than waiting passively, for crime to occur.

The efficacy of situational measures is also increased by a concentration on preventive measures in high crime areas, where their implementation is beneficial in practical terms. Crime controlling agencies, in order to heighten the effectiveness of crime reduction policies, and to increase cost effectiveness, direct their policies to such areas in order to control the main factors facilitating crime. Most policies, however, have had to confront the issue of displacement, which occurs as a result of blocking or eliminating opportunities for a certain type of crime at a specific time and place. Reducing opportunities in a high crime area and controlling these factors which encourage crime makes it difficult to restrict the level of displacement, especially among those opportunistic burglars who may move their criminal activities to other areas that present better opportunities or even commit different types of crime. Crime prevention policies which are directed at high crime areas are unable to reduce the displacement effect on crimes that may move to another areas.
In addition, the effectiveness of situational measures is limited in controlling the criminal activities of offenders who are motivated by other factors rather than mere availability of opportunities. More experienced, highly motivated, or more determined offenders by reducing opportunities in an area will tend to increase their effort and are more likely to learn techniques to overcome constraints imposed by policy implications. Therefore, the efficiency of opportunity reduction policies will be reduced, especially for offenders who are financially dependent on crime, possibly by drug-addiction, previous crime record, etc. These offenders equip themselves with better tools in dealing with more difficult crime situations in order to maintain the income from crime. It has to be noted that although the number of burglaries carried out by persistent offenders are lower in proportion compared to the number of opportunistic burglaries carried out by the young and inexperienced offenders, the nature and the consequences of those burglaries carried out by older and experienced offenders are more serious, and contain a much higher financial loss. Finally, the short-lived situational measures may be currently successful in controlling the crime level at the current time, it is doubtful if it will take long for offenders to learn the alternatives to counterattack these situational measures.

8.1.4 Limitation of Theoretical Implications and Situational Measures in Dealing with Crime Patterns in Tehran

The analysis of burglary patterns carried out in Tehran suggests the limited utility of situational policies and their theoretical assumptions in explaining crime patterns and in reducing crime rates. Almost all the burglaries required a higher level of skill and determination, they were involved in a more extensive search for more diverse targets, with more planning and spent more time and effort prior to burglary in order to obtain detailed information about their target site. The offender’s higher knowledge of tight security in some houses, the care given to selecting the time and place in order to minimise the risks of being seen and reported to the police, all suggest that situational policies are less suitable in dealing with crime levels in Tehran, or at least in the most
frequently targeted wealth areas of Tehran.

On the other hand, patterns of burglary in Tehran showed that burglary is a rational response to socio-economic factors and to the social and cultural trends on behalf of offenders who have decided to commit a crime— at least when the time and place is right. The current pattern showed that the burglaries of only a small proportion of offenders were based on mere availability of opportunities. These offenders were mainly occasional offenders who tend to commit crime as a temporary solution to respond to a particular difficult financial situation. The majority of offenders tended to seek opportunities that were associated with higher gain, they were prepared to spend a considerable time and effort to overcome difficulties that were considered as risk factors. Drug-addicts and especially those with a previous criminal record, who have no other income, are even more determined, and are less likely to be deterred by situational preventive measures. They were prepared to take higher risks by carrying guns and knives, and by learning how to handle tighter locks, and by learning about methods by which the multi-stage act of burglary may be successfully accomplished.

This shows that factors that motivate offenders have more profound effects on them than mere availability of opportunities, and these factors have to be taken seriously in establishing policies for preventing or reducing crime. Whereas a small minority of opportunity offenders may be deterred and stop offending, the vast majority of more determined offenders are less likely to be deterred by policies aimed at making crime more difficult for offenders through situational constraints. The easy life afforded by the high income obtained from illegal activities, a luxurious life-style inhabited by offenders, association with the criminal community and isolation from an ordinary life-style, plus convictions and a crime record, perhaps involvement in drug-use or drug-addiction, are all distinctive consequences of crime. They inevitably follow a certain amount of criminal activity, and are all good reasons for making offenders even more determined to continue with criminal activities to become career burglars. Therefore, while opportunity reduction policies may deter the majority of opportunistic offenders in
Western countries, in Tehran it is predicted to have little effect in deterring the majority of residential burglars.

8.2 Recommendations

8.2.1 Proposing Grounds for Crime Control in Tehran

The results from the study carried out in Tehran suggest the unsuitability of opportunity-based theories in explaining burglary patterns, and therefore it is predicted that situational measures will show less effective results in reducing crime rates in Tehran. This leads to a suggestion that crime control policies need to be more compatible with the patterns of burglary found by this research. The following recommendations are proposed in order to produce policies which combat burglary in Tehran. It is important to note, at this stage, that there are limitations involved in conducting research in Tehran, i.e. inadequate crime statistics, absence of research studies, limitations with conducting research on a larger sample enabling generalisation, etc. - all restrict the ability of the researcher to achieve data which can apply to a wider population of offenders. Hence, the followings are only brief hints, not policy recommendations. They point only to the 'tip of the iceberg' and it is hoped that better opportunities will become available for conducting further research. In addition, discussions on the suitability of situational measures are based on predictions being made from the findings of the current study, and it is the responsibility of criminologists, research centres, and policy-makers to establish precise strategies for implementing and evaluating the level of effectiveness of such measures in the reduction of crime rates in Tehran.

The recommendations made by his research are of three types: (1) recommendations 1 and 2 deal with the limitations of the crime statistics and crime studies that profoundly affect the ability of the current study to conduct precise and detailed analysis; (2) recommendations 3-10 are based on the findings from the current study on patterns of residential burglary in Tehran; (3) since the current research suggested lower effectiveness of situational measures in reducing burglaries in Tehran, some recommendation (11-15) have been made with reference to broader policies with longer-
term effects. Such suggestions address the economic, social, and cultural dynamics affecting crime patterns. These recommendations are more general in nature and their achievement require longer time periods.

1. Policies and strategies based upon findings from systematic crime studies should largely enhance their chances of success in controlling crime levels more effectively. The conduct of such research is not possible unless crime statistics are published and accessible to researchers and criminologists. Publication of crime figures will assist research bodies to become aware of the extent and shape of crimes of different types. They will enable more serious efforts to search for patterns and ways in which such crimes can be controlled. Also, crime prevention agencies can benefit from the results of such studies to employ and implement techniques which are based upon a more realistic picture of crime in society, therefore, leading to the establishment of more effective methods of dealing with crimes including burglary.

2. The search for literature in Tehran made it clear that not only was the quantity of research studies is small, but also the limited number that have been produced are poor in quality and methodology. It is suggested that the conduct of criminological studies should be encouraged by the provision of adequate funding to research centres. Studies should be prioritised based upon problems encountered by those in greater contact with crime issues, i.e. the police and other criminal justice agencies, to concentrate more effectively on those which create the most difficult problems. In addition, researchers should be accountable for the quality of research they produce. Research centres are responsible for the provision of research methods courses being available to researchers to increase their knowledge and improve their research abilities. This, in the long-run is expected to create an environment more adaptable to scientific research and may alter the present attitudes of several institution who take the value of research lightly.

3. A major finding from the study in Tehran suggests that 'time' and 'place' are inseparable concepts from residential burglary, determining when and where crimes
occur. Based on this finding it was evident that night burglaries disproportionately outnumbered day burglaries, and that crimes mainly occur in areas where the gain is higher. Night burglaries were found to be preferable to day burglaries as they permitted such activities to be less visible. Therefore, it seems that preventive strategies should be orientated towards increasing the visibility of such activities. It seems that increasing street lighting, instalment of bulbs and lights on the top of main doors by residents, or sensors that turn on automatically by sensing the presence of an individual attempting entry, may increase the observation of criminal activities at night. Also the larger presence of police patrols in wealthier areas, which are highly targeted by offenders, may have some alleviating effect on crime rates. The police should increase the effectiveness of their presence not only by increasing the number of police being present on the street, especially at night, but also by widening and spreading their presence throughout various localities, covering points which are more remote, less bright, or are more vulnerable for their physical location. The use of more advanced communication techniques can improve the effectiveness of the police by enabling them to supply immediate assistance to their colleagues when additional help is required.

4. Also it was found that offenders target houses that are left unoccupied, therefore, strategies should aim at increasing the actual or the false presence of residents. Burglaries may be combated by shortening the time of absence from home, as it was discovered that short time opportunities are less desirable. Longer absences at night seem to produce more desirable opportunities for burglars. Perhaps night absences especially in wealthier areas should be avoided unless necessary. In such occasions may be it is a good idea to leave one or two members of the family inside. Longer term absences, i.e. holidays and long weekends, may be managed by calling a trusted friend or a relative to stay at home for the period that the resident intends to leave the house unoccupied. Advanced lights with timers, leaving the radio/TV on, etc. may be used to create a sense of occupancy; although the majority of burglars hitting targets in wealthy areas are skilled and are familiar with such tricks, they
often check occupancy by other means, i.e. ringing the bell.

5. The visibility of criminal activities may be increased by effective neighbourhood watch, neighbours can watch over each other's houses, especially when they are absent from home. However, the effectiveness of such strategy is predicted to be reduced, in affluent areas, because of the large distant between the houses. In addition, the presence of offenders in wealthy areas is less observed by residents as the majority of burglaries in such areas are conducted at nights.

6. Since the study showed that most offenders had little problem with gaining access to the targeted home, it seems that target-hardening techniques i.e. fitting more advanced locks and bolts will be of little effect in reducing crime levels in Tehran. The study, however, suggest that burglar alarms and dogs produce more deterrent effects on offenders, however, it is expected that such a provision may have a short-term effect and the majority of offenders who are determined in conducting their burglaries, will soon learn how to deal with these devices.

7. The availability of a lump sum of cash being kept by households in Tehran makes them prime targets. Once cash is stolen by a thief, it has the advantage of being used immediately, for its exact value, and it is untraceable by the police or the owner as it is similar to any other good money. It is suggested that replacement of cash with other means, that at anytime, are consumable by the owner but not by others, can significantly reduce the purest form of financial gain of offenders. Cheques and credit cards can make the life of burglars more difficult. Major institutions should be encouraged to accept such means that are more convenient for customers which also lead to a significant reduction of the amount of cash being kept at home or being carried by people on the street. The recent credit notes issued by banks in Iran, have started to replace large sums of cash. However, this is more a solution for reducing street robberies and is less useful in reducing the financial gain of residential burglars. Jewellery was found to be the second best target; this can produce a large
income for offenders, and since it can be changed to other forms unrecognisable to owners it is easily bought by jewellery shopkeepers. It is important that the use of disproportionate amount of jewellery by wealthy women should be culturally discouraged, or that the highly valuable quantities should be kept in banks for safekeeping. Carpets are also highly desirable targets, but the difficulties associated with their disposal make them attractive only to those who have the means of disposal, as carpets are unique in design and are easily identifiable by their owners. This increases the chances of retrieval if the offender is caught. However, stolen carpets sold to unknown customers, or being taken abroad, have a lower chance of retrieval by their owners, even when the burglar is known to authorities.

8. There is a well-known statement, which accurately suggests that without a fence, or a buyer of stolen goods, property offenders have little chance of survival. Buyers of stolen properties play a vital role in the level of burglary. On the other hand, elimination of markets for stolen properties, or policies that assist with identification of illegal trades should result in a reduction in crime levels. For example, recording the transactions made by second-hand shops, as are required for shops and businesses which sell new goods, could have some preventive effect on some thieving trades.

9. From the victims point of view, burglary is not merely an act resulting in financial loss, it is more the thought of being intruded into the private life that creates anxiety, fear, and depression to the victims. This is aggravated when attempts at burglary are made by offenders while the resident is at home sleeping at night or come back home to find a burglar at home. Residents who panic in such situations may try to stop or even get physically involved with burglars. However, it is important to bear in mind that the burglar who is confronted by the resident will be in a more state of panic than the resident; the large proportion of more determined offenders will be prepared to do any thing to get out of such situations safely, therefore, any harsh or unwise attempt by the resident may provoke the desperate offender and turn him/her to a dangerous man/woman. Residents should be given awareness that offenders in
such a state are not confident and rational, but more scared than they are, therefore, should avoid reacting harshly, instead they ought to remain calm and react wisely. Residents should be convinced that loosing material is preferable to loosing a life, as offenders in many such situations are capable of murder, if they feel that they have to.

10. This research illustrated the moderate effect of drugs on crime levels. However, the fact that many crimes are conducted as a response to the large costs associated with drug-abuse, is undeniable. A drug-addict who has to become engaged in criminal activities in order to be able to feed the habit, or an individual who becomes a drug-abuser as a result of engagement in criminal activities, contribute to increasing crime levels, as they have to increase the frequency of their criminal activities to satisfy their habitual needs. The effects of drugs on the prevalence of crime calls for the attention of authorities to combat drug problems, as it is certain that lowering the availability of drug will result in a decrease in crime rates by reducing the number of potential offenders who become engaged in criminal activities to feed their drug habit. It can also, to a certain extent, reduce the frequency of burglaries by reducing the offender’s financial needs through cutting-down their drug dependency. Although drugs are an international problem and require an international solution, independent policies directed at their control should have some alleviating effect on crime problems. Educational policies providing information on drugs and the consequences of drug abuse, through schools and the media, are expected to play a major role in producing drug awareness especially for the younger generation, a group which is more vulnerable to drug-use. Also, diminishing the availability of drugs, or possibly, and in certain circumstances, toughening punishments, of drug-dealers who constantly search for prey, may reduce crime levels.

11. It seems that the bulk of crime in Tehran, its nature and patterns reveal that crimes are socially and politically determined. Therefore, it is appropriate to suggest that the criminal justice system, the policies, and legislators concentrate more intensively
of more profound social, legal, and political ratifications, although the limitations associated with such changes, which are slow in showing effects and their efficiency is difficult to measure, and make such policies less desirable. Since crime is the outcome of multi-factor interaction, multi-agency intervention seems to be more appropriate.

12. A large gap between the socio-economic features of various areas, which allocates some extremely rich people in the northernmost areas and the poor and deprived in the southernmost areas of Tehran, was found to have profound effect on the prevalence of criminal activities being carried out by the latter group against the former. The inability of highly deprived groups of people to afford moderate living facilities, and the existence of groups of people where money is not an object at all, triggers the deprived to retaliate to the injustice which s/he believes to be derived from uncountable ownership of wealth by some and depriving him/her of his/her natural rights of having a comfortable life. Therefore, policy-makers should direct their efforts towards provision of basic welfare of such division and preventing of accumulation of enormous wealth in certain other division of society. Improvements in educational, social and health conditions of such groups of people should be able to remove such hatred and revenge attitudes of highly professional offenders, who enjoy seeing the wealthy suffer.

13. Similarly, immigration was shown to have a major effect in the production of offenders. Residents of towns and villages surrounding Tehran, who face lower educational, health, and employment facilities in their home-town, expect to improve their living quality by immigrating to Tehran. These less deprived areas, which contain the bulk of burglars and drug dealers, intensifies the socio-economic problems of such areas. The unfulfilled expectations of immigrants, however, lead a large number of immigrants into criminal activities. It is assumed that policies ought to be directed at solving the problem of immigration by provision of reasonable facilities for such people in their home-towns, and by providing them with an
awareness about the realistic picture of living circumstances in Tehran, and to
prevent this city from becoming a utopia for so many villagers who might have false
perceptions about life in the capital city.

14. Interviews with residential burglars in Tehran revealed the negative effects of
toughening sentences and intensification of forms of punishment in reducing crime.
Informal conversation with residential burglars suggests that more severe
punishments and lengthier sentences only aggravate offenders against authorities.
Offenders more often continued criminal activities after being released from prison,
only to compensate for the losses during imprisonment. Conviction and criminal
records also removed any chances of taking up legitimate activities, and often
resulted in the reinforcement of involvement with criminal activities. Therefore, the
results from the current research suggest that unless released offenders are assisted
and guided in returning to a normal life by receiving social and psychological
support, they are most likely to continue with offending in a more subtle way to
reduce the risks of arrest.

15. The results from this research also suggested that many offenders, especially the
persistent offenders, after receiving a number of convictions, decided to toughen
themselves and use more dangerous initiatives in conducting their crimes, for
example they tended to carry firearms and sharp tools when committing burglary
and use them against innocent citizens to reduce the risk of arrest. Therefore, special
attention from authorities should be made to firearm control policies to make guns
and other firearms less accessible and harder to attain.
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**Interview Questions**

Date:  
Code No.:  
Prison:  
Time:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Col.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Socio-demographic Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What is the subject's sex?</td>
<td>(01) Male</td>
<td>1.sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(02) Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What is the subject's age?</td>
<td>(01) Under 18</td>
<td>2.age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(02) 18-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(03) 21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(04) 26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(05) 31-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(06) 36-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(07) 41 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What is your place of birth:</td>
<td>(01) Inside Tehran</td>
<td>3.birthplc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If outside Tehran, specify the town or village</td>
<td>(02) Outside Tehran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(03) Other, abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What is your permanent place of residence?</td>
<td>(01) Inside Tehran</td>
<td>4.residplc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If resident in Tehran, specify the area</td>
<td>(02) Outside Tehran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(03) Other, abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If unstable, explain your movement</td>
<td>(04) Unstable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What is your level of education?</td>
<td>(01) Illiterate</td>
<td>5.edcation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(02) Reading and writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(03) Primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(04) Secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(05) High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(06) National Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(07) University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(08) Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. What is your marital status?
   If divorced as a result of conviction, explain____________________
   If other, specify____________________

7. Have you got any children?
   If yes, how many?____________________

8. Are your children under your parental care?
   If yes, specify their sex and age____________________

9. Did you have a legal occupation before getting arrested?

10. If yes, what type of occupation?
    Describe your job, duties and responsibilities____________________

11. Was the income earned from the legal employment sufficient for your living?
    In each case, explain your answer____________________

General Crime Information

12. Did you do any of the followings:
    A) Smoking
    How often do you smoke?

    B) Consuming alcohol
    How often do you consume alcohol?
C) Using drugs

How often do you use drugs?

13 Is any member of your family drug-addicted?
If yes, circle as appropriate:
Father
Mother
Brother
Sister
Spouse
Children

14. Is any member of your family involved in crime activity?
If yes, circle as appropriate, and specify number of members involved, and the type of crime they are engaged with.
Father
Mother
Brother
Sister
Spouse, specify

15. How old were you when you first committed a crime?

16. What is your main type of criminal activity?

17. What other types of crimes have you committed?

18. On average, how many residential burglaries have you committed?

19. Is any member of your family involved in crime activity?

20. How old were you when you first committed a crime?

21. What is your main type of criminal activity?

22. What other types of crimes have you committed?

23. On average, how many residential burglaries have you committed?
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### 19. How frequently did you steal from dwellings?

In any case, explain your choice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(01) Once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Twice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04) Weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(05) Daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(06) Whenever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(07) Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20. Have you ever been arrested or convicted before this time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(01) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21. If yes, how many previous convictions have you had?

Specify the type of crime, and the time spent for each conviction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conviction</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. What sentence have you received for your current burglary? (applicable only to those currently serving sentence for residential burglary)

Specify the length of sentence received, and the remaining time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>&lt; one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>&gt; one year &lt; two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03)</td>
<td>&gt; two years &lt; five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04)</td>
<td>&gt; five years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23. What factors do you believe have motivated you towards crime? Explain your answer.

Tick all that apply:

- A) Need for money
- B) Familial problems
- C) Friends
- D) Drug-addiction
- E) Excitement
- F) Leading a luxurious life
- G) Revenge
- H) Only myself to blame
- I) Other, please specify

### The Use of Time in Burglary

### 24. In which seasons did you often committed your burglaries?

Specify your preferences, if any, and the reason for your preference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Seasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>Cold seasons, autumn, winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>Warm seasons, spring, summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25. What days of the week do you often commit your burglaries?

Specify the reason for your choice ____________

(01) On weekdays
(02) On weekends & holidays
(03) Days did not matter

26. What times of day do you often commit your burglaries?

Specify the reason for your choice ____________

(01) During the day
(02) During the night
(03) Time did not matter

27. Is there any time or occasion that you especially find more suitable for burglary?

(01) Yes
(02) No

28. If yes, tick as appropriate and explain the reasons for your choice:
A) Summer holidays
B) New Year holidays
C) Other, specify

29. Is there any time or occasion that refrains you from committing any crime?

(01) Yes
(02) No

30. If yes, tick as appropriate and explain the reasons for your choice:
A) Religious occasions, i.e. Ramadhan, nights of Ehya, etc
B) New Year holidays
C) Other, specify

31. Apart from Tehran, have you ever travelled to another cities or towns to commit a burglary?

If yes, where? Explain ____________

(01) Yes
(02) No

32. If yes, how often do you travel, and why?

(0) Not applicable
(01) Quite often
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33. Did you commit a burglary in your residential neighbourhood? Explain your answer: 
   (01) Yes, often  
   (02) Yes, occasionally  
   (03) Never

34. Do you often select your targets in a specific district of the city? 
   (01) Yes  
   (02) No

35. If yes, specify the area, tick all that apply: 
   A) North  
   B) South  
   C) East  
   D) West  
   E) Central

   Explain the reasons for your choice of area.

36. Which of the following characteristics in an area would you consider desirable for burglary? 
   A) crowd and population 
      (01) Crowded and populated areas  
      (02) Quiet and less populated areas  
      (03) Doesn’t make a difference
   B) Vehicle traffic 
      (01) Heavy traffic  
      (02) light traffic  
      (03) Doesn’t make a difference
   C) Neighbourly communication 
      (01) High communication  
      (02) low communication  
      (03) Doesn’t make a difference
   D) Wealth 
      (01) Wealthy areas  
      (02) less wealthy areas  
      (03) Doesn’t make a difference
   E) Street lighting 
      (01) Light areas  
      (02) Dark area  
      (03) Doesn’t make a difference
   F) Other, please specify

37. Do you consider the location of the target (house) important for burglary? Explain your choice: 
   (01) Yes  
   (02) No  
   (03) Don’t know
38. What types of housing do you select for your burglaries? Specify the reason for selection of each type:

- (01) Northern type
- (02) Southern type
- (03) Doesn't make a difference

39. Do you consider the type of housing, from the height point, important for burglary?

- (01) Yes
- (02) No

40. If yes, specify which of the followings do you select, and state your reason for your choice:

A) Bungalows and houses, up to two floors
B) Apartments, up to four floors
C) High-rise buildings, over four floors

41. Which of the following characteristics would you consider important in the selection of a dwelling for burglary? Explain your answers

A) Occupancy,

- (01) Yes
- (02) No
- (03) Don't know

B) Easy access,

- (01) Yes
- (02) No
- (03) Don't know

C) Being overlooked by other dwellings,

- (01) Yes
- (02) No
- (03) Don't know

D) Superficial features, i.e. attractive and push-looking houses

- (01) Yes
- (02) No
- (03) Don't know

E) Other, please specify

42. Imagine a house with a door or a window left open, nobody is around in the area, would you immediately consider burgling that house? Explain the reason for your choice:

- (01) Yes
- (02) No
- (03) Don't know

43. Which of the following dwellings would you

- (01) Dwelling (A)
prefer to burglar:
A) An attractive and wealthy looking house, possibly with high amount of valuables, but highly secured
B) A less attractive dwelling, with possibly less valuables, easy access, no modernised security devices installed
Explain your choice

44. Which of the followings do you consider as 'no go' factor in the selection of a target?
A) Occupancy
B) Modernised security devices, i.e. burglar alarms, modern locks and bolts
C) High walls with fences
D) Protective iron bars behind doors and windows
E) Police patrol, private patrol
F) Dogs
G) Other, specify

Entering the Target

45. Are you prepared to enter a dwelling which is occupied?
Explain your choice

46. If no, do you use any techniques to ensure the dwelling is unoccupied?
If yes, specify

47. Do you tend to gather information from inside the target that you have decided to burglar, before the burglary?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. If yes, how do you obtain the information?</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. How would you often enter the exterior obstacles of your selected target?</td>
<td>(01) Main door (02) Jump over the walls (03) Parking doors (04) Other, specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. How would you often enter the interior obstacles of your selected target?</td>
<td>(01) Main door (02) Patio doors (03) Windows (04) Roof (05) Other, specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Do you use a special key for opening the main doors?</td>
<td>(0) Not applicable (01) Yes (02) No (03) Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. How long does it usually take to enter a dwelling?</td>
<td>(01) Less than 5 minutes (02) 5-10 minutes (03) More than 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside the Dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Do you usually work individually, when going for burglary?</td>
<td>(01) Yes (02) No (03) Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. If in a group, do you usually work with:</td>
<td>(0) Not applicable (01) A (02) B (03) A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Consistent partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Different partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In each case specify the work pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. If in a group, how large usually the group is?</td>
<td>(0) Not applicable (01) Two (02) Three to five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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56. Do you usually search for means of escape, when first entering a target for burglary?
   (01) Yes 67.escprt1
   (02) No
   (03) Sometimes

57. If yes, specify your usual means of escape:
    Explain your answer
    (0) Not applicable
    (01) Main door
    (02) Front windows
    (03) Roof
    (04) Back door
    (05) Other

58. Do you feel anxious, when going for burglary?
    Explain your feelings
    (01) Yes, very nervous 69.anxiety
    (02) Yes, little nervous
    (03) No

59. Do you normally carry a weapon, when going for burglary?
    (01) Yes, all the time 69.wepn
    (02) Yes, sometimes
    (03) No

60. If yes, what type of weapon?
    Provide specifications for each type
    (0) Not applicable
    (01) Gun
    (02) Knife
    (03) Other

61. If you carry a weapon for burglary, under what circumstances are you prepared to use it?
    (Not coded)

62. When entered a dwelling, which places do you search for valuables?
    Number as given priority:
    A) Bedroom/s
    B) Sitting-dining rooms
    C) Kitchen
    D) Bathrooms
    E) Other, specify

63. What types of valuables are you more interested in, when going for burglary?
    Number as given priority:
    A) Cash
    B) Jewellery
    C) Carpet, specify the type
**APPENDIX I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the size of good important for stealing?</td>
<td>(01) Yes</td>
<td>71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain your choice</td>
<td>(02) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you react if the house residents arrive or wake up while on burglary?</td>
<td>(01) Escape, if possible, if not give in</td>
<td>72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Escape, if possible, if not threaten them to let you go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) Escape, if possible, if not get in a fight and hurt them if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04) Escape, if possible, if not hurt yourself to scare them off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(05) beat them up, kill if in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(06) Other, specify</td>
<td>(07) Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you take any vehicle when going for burglary?</td>
<td>(01) Yes, always</td>
<td>73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Yes, sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what type? Specify</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04) Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you take a vehicle for burglary, how does it help you with burglary?</td>
<td>(01) Use it for going to the burglary site</td>
<td>74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Use it for transferring the stolen goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) 2&amp;3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you take a vehicle for burglary, explain how close to the dwelling do you park your vehicle?</td>
<td>(01) Take it inside the dwelling</td>
<td>75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(02) Park it in front of the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(03) Park it a few houses away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you take a vehicle for burglary, explain how do you transfer your stolen goods to your vehicle?</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(04) Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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71. If you do not take a vehicle for burglary, explain how do you keep, and carry your stolen goods? [Not coded]

**Selling Stolen Property**

72. What do you usually do with the stolen property? (01) Sell them (02) Keep them for my own use (03) Give it to friends and relatives (04) Exchange it to drugs (05) Other, specify [76.stprpr]

73. To whom do you sell your stolen property? (00) Not applicable (01) My usual dealer (02) Any dealer (03) Second-hand shops (04) Ordinary shops (05) To customers (06) Other, specify [77.stdeale]

74. Have you ever carried out a burglary based on orders from dealers, customers, or friends? (01) Yes (02) No (03) Occasionally [78.storder]

75. What do you often trade your stolen property for? (01) Only cash (02) Other goods (03) Drugs (04) Other, specify [79.strade]

76. Do you think you receive a fair price, from your dealer, in trading your stolen goods? (01) Yes (02) No (03) Sometimes [80.fartrad]

77. How do you spend the money earned from burglary? Number as given priority: A) Living expenses [Not coded]
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B) Leading a luxurious life 
C) Helping the family and friends
D) Entertainment
E) Gambling
F) Drugs
G) Other, specify

**Additional Information**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Is the current sentence served for the crime of residential burglary?</td>
<td>(01) Yes</td>
<td>(02) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>If yes, explain how did you get arrested?</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Do you think imprisonment has deterred you from re-offending?</td>
<td>(01) Yes</td>
<td>(02) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain your answer in detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>What do you intend to do, when released from prison?</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II
Figure: 1 - Map of Iran and its neighbouring countries.
Figure: 2 - Map of the Province of Tehran

Figure: 3 The city of Tehran with its 20 Metropolitan Districts
1 – Entrance  
2 – Internal Section (for the family)  
3 – External Section (guest room)  
4 – Winter Section  
5 – Summer Section  
6 – Yard

Figure: 4 – The structure of the traditional courtyard housing system
Figure: 5 – Tehran sits on the southern slopes of the Alburz mountain range
Figure: 6 – Distribution of land use in the urban space, 1992
Figure: 7 – The pattern of the urban structure of the contemporary Tehran
Figure: 8 – The changing pattern of building form, from (1) inward-looking, low-rise courtyard house to (2) an outward-looking, medium house with a courtyard, to (3) high-rise apartment buildings.
APPENDIX II

Figure: 9 – Annual rate of population growth 1980 - 1991

Figure: 10 – Land prices in various districts of Tehran, 1991
APPENDIX III
APPENDIX III

Photo: 1 – Images of Modernity in Tehran, Contemporary Tehran
Photo: 2 – Wealthy houses secured with iron-bars

Photo: 3 – Wealthy houses secured with iron-gates
Photo: 4 – Gas pipes are used for climbing high walls in less wealthy areas
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