

***Research on the effectiveness of Police
practice in reducing residential burglary
Report 8***

Victims of Burglary

Garth Baker and Alison Gray

December 2005



Research on the effectiveness of Police practice in reducing residential burglary

- Report 1: *Surveys of Household Burglary part one (2002): Four Police Areas and national data compared*, Dr Sue Triggs, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 2: *Surveys of Household Burglary part two: Four Police Areas compared between 2002 and 2004*, Dr Sue Triggs, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 3: *Literature review: Police practice in reducing residential burglary*, Dr Sally Harvey, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 4: *Case study of the Manurewa Police Area*, Karen Johns, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 5: *Case study of the Rotorua Police Area*, Tanya Segessenmann and Karen Johns, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 6: *Case study of the Lower Hutt Police Area*, Alison Chetwin and Helena Barwick, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 7: *Case study of the Sydenham Police Area*, Dr Sue Carswell and Karen Johns, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 8: *Victims of burglary*, Garth Baker and Alison Gray, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 9: *Burglary offenders*, Garth Baker and Alison Gray, Ministry of Justice, 2005.
- Report 10: *Overview: Research on the effectiveness of Police practice in reducing residential burglary*, Alison Chetwin, Ministry of Justice, 2005.

First published in December 2005 by the
Ministry of Justice
PO Box 180
Wellington
New Zealand

© Crown Copyright

ISBN 0-478-29016-0

Foreword

Burglary is a problem that considerably affects many New Zealand households. From victimisation surveys we know that it can have a profound effect on victims and that householders are concerned about it. Burglary is also costly both to government and to the New Zealand public. Reducing burglary is a key priority in government's Crime Reduction Strategy and an important outcome for the justice sector.

Although recorded burglary rates show a declining trend since the late 1990s, there is considerable room to achieve further reductions. The extensive research published here helps us understand what strategies might be effective in which contexts, as well as the reasons why they are effective. The research has revealed a wealth of practical and workable strategies and initiatives that can be shared from one Police Area to another.

The research project is the result of a highly productive collaboration between the Ministry of Justice and New Zealand Police. We are grateful for the substantial funding support for the project provided by the Cross Departmental Research Pool (CDRP) administered by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. In the spirit of the CDRP, it has been an excellent example of cross-departmental research on a subject of high priority to government.

The real commitment of the New Zealand Police to reducing crime is evident throughout the ten reports of the Burglary Reduction Research Programme. This substantial series of reports is published to be used in part or in its entirety by front-line Police, as well as managers, advisers and policy makers, all of whom play a variety of roles in the wider justice sector in the effort to reduce burglary.

Belinda Clark
Secretary for Justice

Acknowledgements

The commitment and support of many people have made this research possible. The Burglary Reduction Research Team wishes to especially acknowledge and thank:

- the Police staff and Area Commanders in Manurewa, Rotorua, Lower Hutt and Sydenham, who welcomed us into their working world and so generously shared their time and experience, especially Heather Wells, Alan Shearer, Richard Middleton, Bruce Horne, Bruce Dunstan, Tony Scully, John Doyle, and Andy McGregor
- the District office staff and District Commanders in Counties Manukau, Bay of Plenty, Wellington and Canterbury
- the victims and offenders who talked about their experiences in interviews, and the householders who willingly gave their time by participating in the surveys
- the staff of Victim Support, the Public Prisons Service and the Community Probation Service who assisted with recruiting victims and offenders for interviews
- the people in community organisations and other justice sector agencies who participated in interviews
- those who have advised us along the way, including Dave Trappitt, Mark Heron, Graham Cowle, Mark Loper, Percy Ruri, Christine Jamieson, Steve Bullock, Alasdair Macmillan, Ross Levy, Tony Scully, Colin Braid, Darren Russell, Tessa Watson, Sonia Cunningham, Rachael Bambury, Steve Caldwell, Frank Lawton, Mino Meimand, Francis Luketina, Ben Young, and Justine O'Reilly
- Simon Webber, who produced the trends in Police recorded data and carried out the reconviction analysis
- TNS New Zealand Ltd, who conducted the fieldwork and produced the dataset for the household surveys
- our publication team, including Katie Boyle, Judith Spier and Chris Richardson
- the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology, who provided funding for the project through the Cross Departmental Research Pool.

The Burglary Reduction Research Team: Alison Chetwin, Karen Johns, Tanya Segessenmann, Sue Carswell, Helena Barwick, Garth Baker, Alison Gray, Sue Triggs, and Sally Harvey

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Foreword | 3 |
| Acknowledgements | 5 |
| Contents | 7 |
| Tables | 9 |
| Executive summary | 11 |
| 1 Introduction | 15 |
| 1.1 Background | 15 |
| 1.2 The aims of the study | 15 |
| 2 Methodology | 17 |
| 2.1 Research sites | 17 |
| 2.2 Identifying and recruiting the sample | 17 |
| 2.3 The completed sample | 18 |
| 2.4 Limitations of the sample | 19 |
| 2.5 Interview guide | 20 |
| 2.6 Data analysis | 20 |
| 2.7 The report | 20 |
| 3 Awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary | 21 |
| 3.1 General initiatives | 21 |
| 3.2 Local initiatives | 29 |
| 3.3 Summary of awareness of initiatives | 30 |
| 4 Satisfaction with Police services when reporting a burglary | 33 |
| 4.1 The initial contact | 33 |
| 4.2 First visit | 34 |
| 4.3 Outcome and follow-up | 38 |
| 4.4 Repeat burglaries | 40 |
| 4.5 Expectations of the Police | 42 |
| 4.6 Summary | 43 |
| 5 Details of burglaries and attempted burglaries | 45 |
| 5.1 When burglaries occurred | 45 |
| 5.2 Modus operandi | 46 |
| 5.3 People at home | 47 |
| 5.4 Property stolen | 48 |
| 5.5 Damage and violence | 50 |
| 5.6 Summary and discussion | 51 |
| 6 Security measures before and after burglary | 53 |
| 6.1 Security measures in place at the time of the burglary | 53 |
| 6.2 Security advice from the Police | 53 |
| 6.3 Changes made following burglary | 54 |
| 6.4 Summary | 56 |
| 7 General comments on burglary and Police response | 57 |
| 8 Discussion | 61 |

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Appendix A | Information sheet | 63 |
| Appendix B | Interview guide for victim interview | 65 |

Tables

| | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 2.1 | Ethnicity of sample | 18 |
| Table 2.2 | Household composition of sample | 19 |
| Table 2.3 | Property arrangements of sample | 19 |
| Table 2.4 | Number of victims of repeat burglaries | 19 |
| Table 3.1 | Awareness of Police patrols | 22 |
| Table 3.2 | Awareness of burglary-specific operations | 22 |
| Table 3.3 | Awareness of community constable | 23 |
| Table 3.4 | Awareness of Police targeting known offenders | 24 |
| Table 3.5 | Awareness of Police arresting more offenders | 25 |
| Table 3.6 | Awareness of Police liaison with sellers of second-hand goods | 26 |
| Table 3.7 | Awareness of Neighbourhood Support | 27 |
| Table 3.8 | Awareness of burglary prevention education and security advice | 28 |
| Table 3.9 | Awareness of voluntary community patrols | 29 |
| Table 3.10 | Awareness of 0800 tip-off line at Rotorua | 30 |
| Table 3.11 | Awareness of all initiatives (areas combined) | 31 |
| Table 4.1 | How victims initially contacted Police | 33 |
| Table 4.2 | Length of time until first Police visit | 34 |
| Table 4.3 | Satisfaction with timing of Police visit | 35 |
| Table 4.4 | Activities victims recall the Police doing when they attended a burglary | 37 |
| Table 4.5 | Satisfaction with Police visit | 37 |
| Table 4.6 | Follow-up to burglary | 39 |
| Table 5.1 | When burglaries occurred | 45 |
| Table 5.2 | Means of entry in burglaries in each area | 47 |
| Table 5.3 | Victims at home at the time of the burglary | 47 |
| Table 5.4 | Property stolen | 48 |
| Table 5.5 | Value of stolen property | 49 |
| Table 6.1 | Security measures in place at the time of the burglary | 53 |
| Table 6.2 | Security advice provided by Police | 54 |

Executive summary

This report focuses on the experiences of victims of burglary and their awareness of Police initiatives in the selected Police Areas. It is part of research conducted by the Ministry of Justice in partnership with the New Zealand Police from 2002 to 2004 on the effectiveness of Police practice in reducing residential burglary.

Methodology

Participants had to be victims of a burglary in one of four Police Areas (Lower Hutt, Manurewa, Rotorua and Sydenham) in the period 1 January 2002 to 30 June 2003.

The most obvious limitation of the study is its small sample size (54 victims interviewed). However, information obtained from the interviews is not intended to be statistically reliable. It is qualitative in nature and will complement information gathered through other sources. A second limitation is the retrospective nature of the interviews. A third limitation is a degree of inconsistency between interviewers.

Interviews were semi-structured. The focus was on burglary victims' knowledge of Police and community initiatives relating to burglary, their experiences with the Police when they reported a burglary, and the security measures they used before and after the burglary. All the interviews were taped and transcribed.

Awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary

Not surprisingly, victims were less aware of the less visible initiatives, such as liaison with second-hand dealers and Police arresting more burglars, than of the more visible initiatives. Victims were also more aware of initiatives they had direct experience with.

While victims were generally somewhat ambivalent about initiatives to reduce burglary, they did support initiatives that encouraged people to take responsibility for themselves, such as Neighbourhood Support and burglary prevention education and advice, as well as Police initiatives that focused directly on burglars.

Victims were more convinced of the effectiveness of initiatives like targeting known offenders, burglary-specific operations and liaising with second-hand goods dealers than they were about more general measures like community constables. They were also sceptical about the likelihood that imprisonment would change burglars' offending behaviour.

Satisfaction with Police services when reporting a burglary

Informants were generally well satisfied with the Police response to the offence. Most thought that, although it can often be distressing for victims, burglary was relatively low on the spectrum of offences Police have to deal with. They were realistic about the level of service they could expect.

Victims were most satisfied when they felt the Police responded appropriately to what had happened. Usually that was the case, with phone calls being answered promptly and efficiently. Problems arose when victims who felt personally vulnerable rang 111 instead of the local Police station and were referred elsewhere. They felt rebuffed and unsupported.

Most victims said that Police visited them within a reasonable time and were generally professional and empathetic. Victims particularly appreciated being taken seriously and treated courteously.

The weakest area as far as victims were concerned was a lack of follow-up or information about what happened. Most were resigned to losing their property but they did want to know what had happened in their case.

Overall, victims appreciated the pressures under which the Police worked and thought that they made considerable effort to attend to burglaries in a timely and considerate way.

Details of burglaries and attempted burglaries

While there was no particular pattern in the timing of burglaries, there was some evidence that offenders targeted particular properties. Properties on walkways or close to reserves were vulnerable, as were homes where owners could not afford or did not install security devices. Offenders in some areas appeared to go to considerable lengths to check out whether homeowners were absent, including making anonymous phone calls.

Offenders took some risks when burgling houses. Some were prepared to enter houses while victims were asleep; others risked being caught by owners who were elsewhere on their property or away for a short time.

The most commonly stolen items were electronic goods and personal effects, including jewellery, presumably because they are relatively easy to dispose of.

In this sample, damage to property was mainly confined to the point of entry. While some victims said that the house was left in a mess, only one went so far as to describe the house as 'wrecked'.

The psychological damage, however, was considerable. Even though interviewers did not specifically raise this topic, victims often volunteered information about how they felt and the ongoing effects of the offence. Understandably, victims were particularly upset when personal items were stolen, but it was the fact that they were burgled at all that caused the most distress. Several victims were still upset some months after the burglaries occurred. It is this aspect of burglaries that Police follow-up is most likely to address, giving victims a sense that the Police are still involved in their case and still concerned about them.

Security measures before and after burglary

In 41 (of 54) burglaries, victims recalled that the Police had provided them with advice on security, either verbally or in a written form.

Although about half of the people interviewed had some security measures in place at the time of the burglary, nearly all improved their security significantly following the burglary and having received advice from the Police. Victims were often torn between the need to secure their property and their desire to have a more relaxed and open lifestyle, and some were unable to improve their security because of the expense.

General comments on burglary and Police response

Overall, victims were positive about the Police response when they were burgled. Most felt that the Police did all they could with their limited resources.

- Some people were explicit about the need for more Police resources or a different approach to reducing crime. At the same time, they recognised that most of their suggestions were impractical within the current level of resourcing.
- Not surprisingly, most victims were critical of burglars.
- Some talked of their increased suspicion following their experience.
- Some commented on a perceived increase in crime.
- A few urged a tougher approach to burglars.
- Some people believed that burglaries would still occur, no matter what measures they might take.

Discussion

While the views of those interviewed do not necessarily reflect those of all victims in those areas, the similarity of their experiences and opinions to those reported in other studies suggests that they are not an atypical sample.

Many victims set their comments within a wider context. They recognised that drugs and alcohol played a significant role in offending, and were critical of offenders' lack of respect for people and property. A minority thought that economic pressure contributed to crime. Given a perceived lack of Police resources and the relative intransigence of offenders, most concluded that greater vigilance by homeowners and a higher level of security were the only ways to reduce residential burglaries.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Ministry of Justice, in partnership with the New Zealand Police, is conducting research over three years (2002–2004) on Police practice in reducing burglary. This evaluation report is one of a series of reports examining aspects of burglary initiatives undertaken in four Police Areas—Lower Hutt, Manuwera, Rotorua and Sydenham¹.

The objectives of the wider research project are to:

- examine Police best practice, including Police initiatives in partnership with communities, in relation to residential burglary reduction; to understand which practices are effective in which contexts and why
- gain an understanding of some wider contextual factors that influence the effectiveness of burglary initiatives
- examine effectiveness in relation to the incidence of burglary, the resolution of burglary, public satisfaction and perceptions of safety
- examine any unintended effects of burglary initiatives, such as displacement.

This report focuses on the experiences of victims of burglary and their awareness of Police initiatives in the selected Police Areas.

1.2 The aims of the study

The aims of the interviews with burglary victims were to:

- identify householders' level of awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary and any changes in these between January 2002 and June 2003
- determine burglary victims' satisfaction with Police services when they have reported burglary
- describe details of actual or attempted burglary offences
- identify security measures used by victims before being burgled, and record any changes made following burglary.

¹ The specific area covered in Sydenham was the Spreydon-Heathcote ward of Christchurch city.

2 Methodology

2.1 Research sites

The victim interviews took place in the same four Police Areas as the wider study. This report summarises responses in the victim interviews from all four Police Areas.

2.2 Identifying and recruiting the sample

To be eligible for the research, participants had to be the victim of a burglary in one of the four Police Areas in the period 1 January 2002 to 30 June 2003.

Because the Police refer most burglary victims to Victim Support, the researchers sought the aid of Victim Support to identify an appropriate sample. This worked slightly differently in each area.

Manukau Victim Support reviewed the files of burglaries in Manurewa over this time and selected a number of victims. Victim Support or a contracted research interviewer approached these victims to ask if they wished to participate in this study. They contacted 22 people, of whom 10 agreed to an interview, but one did not keep the appointment. Of the remainder, three declined to be interviewed, six could not be contacted and three said their burglary occurred outside the time frame.

In Rotorua, the Bay of Plenty District Intel sent the Ministry of Justice a list of all burglary victims in the Rotorua Police Area within the time frame, along with their addresses and file references². Ministry of Justice staff then separated out those who were repeat victims and single occurrence victims during the time frame, and provided Victim Support with a random selection from each list. Using the file references, Victim Support obtained the phone numbers of the victims from Police files. Victim Support were asked to stop contacting repeat victims after five agreed to participate, and to stop contacting single occurrence victims after 10 agreed to participate. A large number of victims (33) could not be contacted (e.g. phone cut off, moved, phone not answered). Where contact was made, the response rate was good, with 19 victims being approached to obtain 15 interviews.

From their database of victims, Lower Hutt Victim Support selected people who had been the victims of a residential burglary within the dates specified. They omitted people who Victim Support had surveyed for other reasons and drew the sample from the remainder. Initially Victim Support sent letters to 30 people chosen across the time period. The response to the first letter was fairly poor, and a further 20 letters were sent a fortnight later. People

² The data shared between the New Zealand Police and the Ministry of Justice for this project was on the basis of a Memorandum of Understanding between these two agencies.

willing to be interviewed phoned the Victim Support coordinator, who gave them more details. No one who phoned declined to be interviewed. Fifteen people were interviewed.

Christchurch Victim Support reviewed the files of burglaries in Sydenham over the time frame and selected 36 victims who lived in Spreydon-Heathcote. Victim Support approached these victims asking if they wish to participate in this study. Sixteen could not be contacted and four declined, leaving 15 who agreed to be interviewed. When Victim Support selected the files of possible informants, they were unable to identify victims of repeat burglaries.

Once victims agreed to take part in the research, the interviewer/s for each area contacted them to arrange a time and place for the interview. The interviewer gave each participant an information sheet prior to the interview, containing information about the research, its key objectives, how the information would be used and ethical considerations. A copy of this information sheet is included in Appendix A.

The interviewer offered participants a koha (a choice of a grocery, petrol or music voucher to the value of \$30) to compensate for their time and travel expenses.

The interviews in Lower Hutt, Rotorua and Sydenham took place in October 2003; those in Manurewa took place between December 2003 and February 2004.

2.3 The completed sample

Fifty-four interviews were completed in total, 15 in each area except Manurewa, where nine victims were interviewed.

The ethnicity of the victims interviewed is set out in Table 2.1. It shows that the sample is overwhelmingly Pakeha/European.

Table 2.1 Ethnicity of sample

| Area | Pakeha/ European | Maori | Pacific people | Declined to say | Total |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Manurewa | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Rotorua | 14 | 1 | — | — | 15 |
| Lower Hutt | 15 | — | — | — | 15 |
| Sydenham | 15 | — | — | — | 15 |
| Total | 49 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 54 |

The household composition of the sample is given in Table 2.2. The sample consists mainly of couples, with or without children, or people living alone. The Rotorua sample had the most couples with children; the Lower Hutt sample had none.

Table 2.2 Household composition of sample

| Area | Couple with children | Couple without children | Solo parent with children | Living alone | Extended family | Group flatting | Total |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| Manurewa | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | — | — | 9 |
| Rotorua | 7 | 1 | — | 5 | 2 | — | 15 |
| Lower Hutt | — | 7 | 1 | 5 | 2 | — | 15 |
| Sydenham | 6 | 6 | — | 2 | — | 1 | 15 |
| Total | 17 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 54 |

The property arrangements of the people interviewed are given in Table 2.3. Over two-thirds owned the house they were living in, and one-quarter were renting. Home ownership was particularly high in Lower Hutt and Sydenham.

Table 2.3 Property arrangements of sample

| Area | Owned house | Rented house | Other | Declined to say | Total |
|------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Manurewa | 7 | 1 | — | 1 | 9 |
| Rotorua | 8 | 5 | 2 | — | 15 |
| Lower Hutt | 13 | 2 | — | — | 15 |
| Sydenham | 10 | 5 | — | — | 15 |
| Total | 38 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 54 |

The sample included 10 victims of repeat burglaries.

Table 2.4 Number of victims of repeat burglaries

| Area | Number |
|------------|--------|
| Manurewa | 3 |
| Rotorua | 5 |
| Lower Hutt | 2 |
| Sydenham | 0 |
| Total | 10 |

2.4 Limitations of the sample

The most obvious limitation of the sample is its size. Fifteen people constitute only a small proportion of the total burglaries recorded in each area in the sample period, and the sample size in Manurewa is particularly small. The sample size was chosen for practical reasons. The information is not intended to be statistically reliable. It is qualitative in nature and will complement the information gathered through other sources.

A second limitation is the retrospective nature of the interviews. The interviewers asked victims to recall incidents that had taken place up to 20 months earlier. Some informants could not recall the detail of what took place or how they felt at the time. Victims of repeat burglaries found it especially difficult to remember specifically what occurred before, during or after each burglary.

A third limitation is a degree of inconsistency between interviewers. For example, in discussing Police and community initiatives, the Rotorua interviewer asked a general question about initiatives to reduce burglary that were common to all four areas, before focusing more closely on local initiatives. Some interviewers discussed perceptions of the effectiveness of initiatives only with those who were aware of them; others raised this topic with everyone.

2.5 Interview guide

The interview guide was developed in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice and the Police. Interviews were semi-structured, using the interview guide included in Appendix B. The focus was on burglary victims' knowledge of Police and community initiatives relating to burglary, their experiences with the Police when they reported a burglary and the security measures they used before and after the burglary.

2.6 Data analysis

All the interviews were taped and transcribed. The researchers used a computer programme, Nvivo, to assist in coding the interviews.

2.7 The report

The report is in eight sections:

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. Awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary within each Police Area
4. Satisfaction with Police services when reporting a burglary
5. Details of actual or attempted burglaries
6. Security measures
7. General comments on burglary and the Police response
8. Discussion.

3 Awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary

Police in each area undertook a number of initiatives, some in partnership with the community, to reduce residential burglaries. This section reviews victims' awareness of initiatives in their area and discusses how effective victims thought each initiative either was or might be.

3.1 General initiatives

All four Police Areas had a number of initiatives in common. These were:

- Police patrols
- Police burglary-specific operations
- community constables
- Police targeting known offenders
- Police arresting more offenders
- Police liaising with sellers of second-hand goods
- Neighbourhood Support
- burglary prevention education and security advice.

The Rotorua Police Area had a high concentration of local initiatives and the interviewer focused on these, so responses from Rotorua victims on some of the general initiatives are limited.

3.1.1 Police patrols

Overall, slightly over half of the total sample was aware of Police patrols in their area.

Two people knew of this initiative without prompting. When prompted, 27 more said they were aware of Police patrols. Awareness was highest in Sydenham (14 of 15) and lowest in Manurewa (2 of 9).

Table 3.1 Awareness of Police patrols

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Unprompted | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Prompted | 1 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 27 |
| Not aware | 7 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 25 |

Victims were divided as to whether Police patrols are an effective way to reduce burglaries.

Neither of the Manurewa victims who was aware of this initiative offered a view on the effectiveness of Police patrols. The three Rotorua victims who were aware of the patrols believed they focused on 'boy racers, drinkers and parties' or on disqualified drivers, rather than burglaries. While some of the Lower Hutt people who knew of the Police patrols questioned their value, most thought they would be effective.

Anybody that sees a Police car, if you're doing something you shouldn't be, you would think twice about it, wouldn't you? [LHV-12]

The nine Sydenham victims who were aware of Police patrols and thought them effective used the same reasoning. The remaining five Sydenham victims questioned their effectiveness.

I think it's the sort of people who are doing these crimes. I'm not sure that (patrols) would put them off. [SV-12]

It wouldn't be very effective at all because the chances of just randomly meeting one, but I guess if you see someone suspicious as you're going along then. [SV-06]

3.1.2 Burglary-specific operations

Another initiative was the Police undertaking burglary-specific operations, such as having bursts of activity targeted at burglars, making bail checks, executing search warrants, and stopping cars.

Overall, nearly two-thirds of the sample were aware of this initiative. Only two knew of it without prompting. When prompted, a further 22 said they were aware of it. Awareness was lowest in Manurewa (3 of 9) and highest in Sydenham (12 of 15).

Table 3.2 Awareness of burglary-specific operations

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total* <i>n=39</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Unprompted | 2 | no information | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Prompted | 1 | no information | 9 | 12 | 22 |
| Not aware | 6 | no information | 6 | 3 | 15 |

*Rotorua not included in total.

A majority of those who commented thought that burglary-specific operations would be effective.

One of the Manurewa people who knew of this initiative was positive about its effectiveness.

It is the way to go—keep watching them. The [Police] watch known receivers or people who have involvement. That is what they should be doing, being proactive, rather than after the event. Try and prevent it. [MV-06]

Most of the nine Lower Hutt victims who knew of this initiative were also positive, as they believed the Police would only take action if they had grounds for suspicion.

I suppose if they have got a good reason to suspect there are stolen goods harboured somewhere, they would really have to go and have a look, wouldn't they? [LHV-09]

I think when they are looking for something and they are stopping cars, that is good. [LHV-12]

Seven of the aware Sydenham people considered these operations would be effective in reducing burglaries, especially if they were suitably resourced, had community support and targeted organised burglars.

You hear of the tasks forces that the Police have for bigger operations, burglaries and things like that, and that must make a difference. Hopefully it does. [SV-14]

Two other Sydenham victims expressed doubts about their effectiveness, questioning what Police could do, as 'burglary is probably small fry compared with everything else that they have to do' [SV-03].

3.1.3 Community constables

Just over half the total sample, 28 out of 54, were aware of this initiative.

No Manurewa people were aware of community constables in their area. Eight Rotorua victims were aware of this initiative but had no personal experience of it. 'I've heard about the community constable, but I haven't seen him' was a typical response. A majority of Lower Hutt people (12 of 15) were aware of the community constable initiative, as were just over half of the Sydenham victims (8 of 15).

Table 3.3 Awareness of community constable

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n</i> =9 | Rotorua <i>n</i> =15 | Lower Hutt <i>n</i> =15 | Sydenham <i>n</i> =15 | Total <i>n</i> =54 |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Unprompted | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Prompted | 0 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 23 |
| Not aware | 9 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 26 |

There was no consensus among victims as to whether community constables were effective in reducing burglaries.

No Manurewa victims offered a view on the effectiveness of community constables and Rotorua victims were unsure how effective they would be. Lower Hutt victims were also ambivalent, with about half believing that community constables might be effective.

I think that they could be effective, especially with these youngsters getting into bother. I think probably with young people more than anything else. [LHV-09]

I certainly think they're effective in explaining to people how not to get burgled. So I would say it's better to have one than not, put it that way. [LHV-10]

The other half of Lower Hutt victims expressed doubt about the effectiveness of community constables in reducing burglaries, especially compared with other initiatives.

Can't turn back time to community constables. Need to police for today. [LHV-04]

I believe that would be good, more effective in smaller towns. [LHV-05]

Patrolling the streets was much more effective. [LHV-16]

This fifty-fifty split was also apparent among Sydenham victims. Some of the Sydenham victims who did not know about this initiative thought that it could be effective.

It's good to have that because it's getting more of a relationship with the people in the region itself. Obviously they target places like schools. It's got to be a good thing. [SV-05]

3.1.4 Police targeting known offenders

Over half (23 of 39, no information from Rotorua) of the total sample was aware of Police targeting known offenders as an initiative in their area.

Awareness of this initiative among Manurewa victims was low (2 of 9). It was higher among Lower Hutt victims (7 of 15), while nearly all (14 of 15) Sydenham informants knew about Police targeting known offenders.

Table 3.4 Awareness of Police targeting known offenders

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua* <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total** <i>n=39</i> |
|------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Unprompted | 0 | no information | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prompted | 2 | no information | 7 | 14 | 23 |
| Not aware | 7 | no information | 8 | 1 | 16 |

* In Rotorua this was covered under burglary-specific operations.

** Rotorua not included in total.

Overall, victims thought that targeting known offenders was an effective way to reduce burglaries.

Neither of the Manurewa people who knew of this initiative expressed a view on its effectiveness, while most Lower Hutt and Sydenham people supported it.

I think that is good because I think if they are doing that, [the offenders] are going to think twice about doing it again. Because some of them are young and I am sure that with some help they won't do it again if they have that policeman eyeing them. [LHV-12]

I think that's got to have an impact because there are people out there that are known to act in a particular way. [SV-05]

I would say [it is effective] knowing that most burglars are repeat offenders, definitely. [SV-10]

A minority was less positive.

I think it is probably not a bad idea, but I think there are much more important things. I mean, it's only property when it comes right down to the wire and I'm sure that there are more grievous things that they could probably keep an eye on. [LHV-10]

It would be bloody effective if you do it 24 hour seven but I can't imagine that happens. [SV-14]

There are a lot of issues there. I mean they can't know them all. And of course there are school holidays, [when burglaries are committed by] kids. And there are opportunist thieves. [SV-04]

One informant was concerned about the rights of offenders, saying:

Well, that's a bit hard if they [offenders] have done their time, they've done their time. I mean you don't carry on watching people who have done their time. [SV-08]

3.1.5 Police arresting more offenders

Just under half (19 of 39) of the sample from three Police Areas was aware of Police arresting more offenders as an initiative to reduce burglaries. All required prompting.

No Manurewa victims were aware of this initiative, compared with one-third (5 of 15) of Lower Hutt victims and 14 out of 15 Sydenham victims.

Table 3.5 Awareness of Police arresting more offenders

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total** <i>n=39</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Unprompted | 0 | no information | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prompted | 0 | no information | 5 | 14 | 19 |
| Not aware | 9 | no information | 10 | 1 | 20 |

*Rotorua not included in total.

Again, informants were divided as to whether or not this was or might be an effective way to reduce burglaries.

Three of the five Lower Hutt people who were aware of this initiative thought it would be effective, while two were uncertain whether it would reduce burglaries long-term.

My theory is that a lot of it is drug related. Maybe drug education or getting on top of it will have a flow-on effect to help with burglaries. [LHV-05]

I expect if they go to prison and meet up with a few who are really seasoned with crime, it doesn't help. [LHV-09]

As with Lower Hutt, six of the Sydenham victims were moderately positive, but had some doubts. They too thought that burglary was related to drug use, that prison sentences were not long enough or that there would be 'another burglar to take their place'.

Eight Sydenham informants were concerned that imprisonment would not adequately address offenders' criminal behaviour.

Well I don't really know whether it's a big deal to be in there for a while and then come out and do what they like again. That's the life of a lot of those people. That's all they do, they just go to jail, serve their time and get out and do it again. I mean they get well looked after. I think that's one of the problems, they're too well looked after. [SV-02]

There's always going to be more burglars. I believe in trying to find out why people burgle and if it's a drug-related crime or is it property related. You know, working more on that end of things, because I don't think prison stops them. [SV-07]

I think it probably goes back further. I think some of the burglars are very young. I think it's got to be down, right down at the grass roots, I think you have to start a lot earlier. [SV-12]

3.1.6 Police liaison with sellers of second-hand goods

When prompted, just over half (20 of 39) of the sample in three Police Areas had some awareness of Police liaising with second-hand dealers.

No Manurewa people knew of this initiative. About two-thirds of Lower Hutt (9 of 15) and Sydenham (11 of 15) victims were aware of it.

Table 3.6 Awareness of Police liaison with sellers of second-hand goods

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total* <i>n=39</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Unprompted | 0 | no information | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prompted | 0 | no information | 9 | 11 | 20 |
| Not aware | 9 | no information | 6 | 4 | 19 |

* Rotorua not included in total.

Most of the Lower Hutt and Sydenham people who knew of this initiative thought it would be effective in reducing burglaries.

I think it must be quite effective because if you're a professional burglar or if you've stolen things, you must want to sell off something. [LHV-10]

I think they've certainly got to have an impact because those people are stealing property and so they've got to try and look at getting rid of it as soon as they can. So if they're targeting people that are actually taking it off them, that's got to have an impact. [SV-05]

A few did not think it would be effective, with one saying they thought it would only work for 'amateur' burglars. Another commented:

I know the Police have a fairly close communication with second-hand dealers. I know through mates in the Police that system doesn't work to a certain extent. [LHV-02]

3.1.7 Neighbourhood Support

This was the best-known initiative, with a majority of people (46 of 54) in all four areas being aware of the Neighbourhood Support scheme.

Table 3.7 Awareness of Neighbourhood Support

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Unprompted | 1 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 18 |
| Prompted | 7 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 28 |
| Not aware | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |

Awareness did not indicate involvement—only two Rotorua informants and one Sydenham victim had ever been involved in a Neighbourhood Support group. One Manurewa victim and several Lower Hutt victims had informal arrangements with their neighbours.

While most people thought that Neighbourhood Support could be effective, they had some doubts about the ability to sustain it.

Despite their lack of involvement, most Manurewa victims believed that this initiative would be effective. This optimism wasn't reflected in Rotorua, where a more typical comment was:

It doesn't mean a thing. I have stickers all around the place here. Everything is armed, secret numbers and all that, but they still come in. [RV-03]

While Lower Hutt people thought Neighbourhood Support could help to reduce burglaries, they also noted the need for motivated people to keep it going, the limitations of street design and their personal preference for informal arrangements with people they knew.

All Sydenham victims who were aware of this initiative were positive about its effectiveness.

I think that it would be effective. I think it's important when you have been burgled that you tell your neighbours because more could have happened in the same street or in the area. [SV-06]

I suppose they bring neighbours closer together, so it would definitely provide some benefit. [SV-09]

However, several Sydenham people thought that Neighbourhood Support was more effective in the past.

When they're in the first flush of their establishment I think Neighbourhood Watches are very good. But they tend to dwindle because people move away and lose interest and that sort of thing. [SV-04]

I think in the old days about ten years ago when they had a blitz on Neighbourhood Watch I think that was really good because it kept everyone looking out for each other. And certainly if people know that everyone's watching each other's houses they're a bit more cautious. [SV-07]

3.1.8 Burglary prevention education and security advice

Over half of the total sample (31 out of 54) were aware of this initiative.

Around half of the victims in Manurewa (5 of 9) and Sydenham (9 of 15) and one-third in Rotorua (5 out of 15) were aware of the Police's burglary prevention education and security advice. The proportion was much higher in Lower Hutt, with 12 of 15 being aware of it.

Table 3.8 Awareness of burglary prevention education and security advice

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Unprompted | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Prompted | 3 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 27 |
| Not aware | 4 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 23 |

People who knew of this initiative were generally positive about its effectiveness.

The only thing I see is what the burglaries are in the Rotorua Review. It says where they've been. Nothing else. If you see a lot of them in an area you think about security more because of it. They're making people aware of what's going on. [RV-13]

It could be positive, it has to have some effect. Whether that means clearing mail or getting the neighbours to clear mail or draw the blinds. My perception is that there's a total lack at the moment and you could put resources into it. In fact I would think the insurance companies should get involved in that as well. [SV-10]

However, a number of Lower Hutt victims noted that:

They can help people to the best of their ability, but it is up to the people concerned to take their knowledge and advice. [LHV-12]

A Manurewa person expressed discomfort at what this initiative meant for them.

A lot of the information that was in the [security pack] was already things that I would think as commonsense and that we do... We got a letter a couple of months ago, just to keep an eye on houses and things of that nature and to call the Police. Hopefully it will be effective but it makes me less trusting of people on the street. If that car's been sitting there for a while, even if they're there for a couple of seconds, I'll go and check that out. I don't like being that kind of person. [MV-05]

3.2 Local initiatives

Rotorua Police had a number of additional burglary reduction initiatives, such as voluntary community patrols, an 0800 tip-off line and cycle patrols. Rotorua has two community patrol groups who conduct patrols in residential areas—the Community Watch and the Western Heights Cycle Patrol.

3.2.1 Voluntary community patrols

Although no other areas currently had community patrols operating, interviewers in all areas asked victims whether they had heard of such an initiative and whether they thought it would be effective.

It was interesting to note that 9 out of 15 victims in both Rotorua and Sydenham were aware of this initiative. Six out of 15 Lower Hutt victims said that they had heard of community patrols, compared with only one in Manurewa.

Table 3.9 Awareness of voluntary community patrols

| Awareness | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Unprompted | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Prompted | 1 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 24 |
| Not aware | 8 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 29 |

When Rotorua victims talked about community patrols, they usually meant Maori wardens. Only one specifically mentioned Community Watch. They identified Maori wardens with the central business area, and while they were pleased that the wardens were there, they were unsure how effective they were in reducing burglaries.

Five Rotorua victims had heard of the Western Heights cycle patrol. Some were unsure about its effectiveness, although one victim living in the area appreciated having them there.

I'm very, very pleased that we've got those people who are out on pushbikes in our area. [RV-05]

Eight of the 12 Lower Hutt victims who discussed community patrols expressed reservations about them. They were particularly concerned about the amount of power the volunteers would have and how it might be used.

There is the issue of what rights volunteers have and what rights burglars have, and to what extent they can go if they see a burglary or suspicious people. It depends how intrusive they are and what power they have. [LHV-05]

It might be all too effective if they're not aware there are limits to their authority. It may be a pretty good way of settling old scores that have to nothing to do with the law. [LHV-10]

Some people that would do that sort of thing would think they are policemen and maybe use too much authority. I think you have to be a bit careful about things like that. [LHV-12]

Twelve Sydenham residents thought community patrols would be effective in reducing burglaries, as they would have knowledge of the local area and residents, providing a visual presence and being effective with teenagers. The only doubt expressed about their effectiveness was the community patrol's lack of suitable authority.

3.2.2 Rotorua's 0800 tip-off line

In the Rotorua area, the Police provided an 0800 phone service for people to report information on burglars. Eleven out of 15 Rotorua victims were aware of this initiative.

Table 3.10 Awareness of 0800 tip-off line at Rotorua

| Awareness | Number of Rotorua informants (n=15) |
|------------|----------------------------------------|
| Unprompted | 3 |
| Prompted | 8 |
| Not aware | 4 |

Only one person commented on the effectiveness of the tip-off line. In their view, the line was for driving offences, not for burglary, and therefore not effective in reducing that crime.

3.3 Summary of awareness of initiatives

Table 3.11 lists the Police and community initiatives in order of victims' awareness of them.

The only initiative many victims (85%) could recall without prompting was Neighbourhood Support. It is an initiative that has been promoted for a number of years and is highly visible in many neighbourhoods and community newspapers, with signs remaining even where groups are no longer active.

Table 3.11 Awareness of all initiatives (Areas combined)

| Initiative | Unprompted awareness | Prompted awareness | Not aware | Total |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Neighbourhood Support | 18 | 28 | 8 | 54 |
| Police burglary-specific operations | 2 | 22 | 15 | 39* |
| Police targeting known offenders | 0 | 23 | 16 | 39* |
| Burglary prevention education and advice | 4 | 27 | 23 | 54 |
| Police patrols | 2 | 27 | 25 | 54 |
| Community constable | 5 | 23 | 26 | 54 |
| Police liaison with sellers of second-hand goods | 0 | 20 | 19 | 39* |
| Police arresting more burglars | 0 | 19 | 20 | 39* |
| Community patrols | 1 | 24 | 29 | 54 |
| Rotorua's 0800 tip-off line | 3 | 8 | 4 | 15 |

*No information from Rotorua informants about this initiative.

Over half (58%) knew about the Police and community initiative of making burglary education and advice available to victims and the general public. Some knew this without prompting, presumably as a result of personal experience.

Similar proportions of victims (62% and 59% respectively) were aware of the Police engaging in burglary-specific operations—such as making bail checks, executing search warrants, stopping cars and having bursts of activity targeted at burglars—and targeting known offenders. In almost every case, they needed prompting before they could recall either seeing, reading or hearing about such initiatives.

Around half (54% and 52% respectively) had noticed or knew about Police patrols and community constables, both of which provide a visible presence for Police. Not surprisingly, victims were less aware of the less visible initiatives, such as liaison with second-hand dealers and Police arresting more burglars.

While victims were generally somewhat ambivalent about initiatives to reduce burglary, they did support initiatives that encouraged people to take responsibility for themselves, such as Neighbourhood Support and burglary prevention education and advice, as well as Police initiatives that focused directly on burglars.

Neighbourhood Support was considered the most effective initiative overall, but victims did not match their level of confidence in it with any actual involvement. Where they were interested in making arrangements with neighbours, they generally preferred an informal to a formal arrangement.

Victims were more convinced of the effectiveness of initiatives like targeting known offenders, burglary-specific operations and liaising with second-hand goods dealers than they were about more general measures like community constables. They were also sceptical about the likelihood that imprisonment would change burglars' offending behaviour.

4 Satisfaction with Police services when reporting a burglary

This section discusses victims' satisfaction with the Police response to their call or visit to report a burglary, and with the investigation of the burglary itself. It reports on the outcome of the investigation and summarises general comments about Police services, including victims' expectations of Police.

Sections 4.1 to 4.3 discuss the most recent, or in one case the most significant, burglary. Repeat burglaries are discussed Section 4.4.

4.1 The initial contact

Once they realised they had been burgled, most people contacted the Police by ringing the local Police station. Just over one-quarter rang 111. Others visited the Police station; in a few cases, someone else reported the burglary.

Table 4.1 How victims initially contacted Police

| Initial contact with Police | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Victim rang local Police station | 6 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 33 |
| Victim rang 111 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 12 |
| Other | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 9 |

Two people who called 111 were instructed to ring their local Police station. In one case, in Lower Hutt, the burglary had occurred while they were sleeping in the house and they considered this worthy of an emergency call. They resented having to call the Police station directly.

The other ways the Police were contacted included: neighbours ringing (3), other family members ringing (2), the victim visiting the Police station (2) and a member of the public ringing the Police after finding some stolen property (1). One victim could not remember how the Police were contacted and is included in the 'other' category.

The majority of people (50 of 54) were satisfied both with the time that it took the Police to answer their call and with the service they received from the Police during this initial contact. One said, 'they were very helpful and supportive and cordial' [MV-08]. Another appreciated their professionalism.

I thought they were very official and very objective. They showed absolutely no emotion, which you can understand from the Police, I guess. They're doing their job. So it was all very regulated and they asked me questions like, 'What time did the incident happen?'—all the words and terminology that they use, typical. So that was good in a way because it kept my mind sharp to relating information to them. So I would say they were professional. [MV-04]

Four victims expressed dissatisfaction with some aspect of their initial contact—they had to wait longer than they expected, were transferred from one person to another, were told to ring the local Police station or described the manner of the officer handling their case as brusque or dismissive.

Most victims were told when to expect a visit from the Police. A minority (12 of 54) were told not to touch anything.

4.2 First visit

4.2.1 Who came and when

In most cases, uniformed Police officers visited, sometimes with a follow-up visit from a specialist staff member to collect fingerprints.

The Police response was particularly prompt when people thought that the offender might still be in the vicinity. In two cases, the victim suspected that the offender was nearby, and Police sent a Police dog handler and Police dogs to the scene immediately. In one instance, a neighbour had reported seeing the offender driving the victim's car erratically and a number of Police cars arrived. In another case, the neighbours had flushed the offender out of a nearby bush before the Police arrived.

The Police usually (36 of 54) visited the site of the burglary within 24 hours of the call. In 13 cases, they came within two hours. In 15 cases, they took longer—within two days (8 cases) or longer (7 cases). Four Lower Hutt victims requested a later appointment, as they were away at the time.

Table 4.2 Length of time until first Police visit

| Time until Police visited | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Immediately (with dogs or several Police cars) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Within two hours | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 13 |
| Between two and 24 hours | 3 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| Between one and two days | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| Over two days | 0 | 0 | 4* | 3 | 7 |
| Unknown | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

* at victims' request.

4.2.2 Satisfaction with timing

The majority of victims (42 of 54) were satisfied with the time that it took Police to visit. Ten were dissatisfied.

Table 4.3 Satisfaction with timing of Police visit

| Satisfaction | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Expressed satisfaction | 4 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 42 |
| Expressed dissatisfaction | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| No information | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Manurewa had the highest proportion of dissatisfied people (3 of 9), and they tended to be more vocal than those in other areas about their experience.

I reported the burglar at 8am and no one came and I'm sure they said that it wouldn't be too far away, maybe an hour or so. But no one turned up, it was 5 o'clock and we had to go out. So I rang them up and said I reported a burglary and was told someone would come around and check things over because I still had everything open and I didn't want to leave the house left open. A policeman came around within half an hour. [MV-02]

What was frustrating was the fact that I made an appointment for them to come and they didn't come at the time specified. They'd rung me and said, 'We can't make it, we'll come tomorrow'. There was a lot of deferral and then they finally came about two days later. [MV-04]

I wasn't satisfied. It was a bit inconvenient in that the place was a mess and I couldn't really clean it up until they'd come. [MV-10]

Only two Rotorua people were dissatisfied with the timing of the Police visit. Both had rung 111 and expected 'same-day service'. One lived in the country and thought that had influenced the Police response.

I dialled the 111 number and they didn't come out which I was pretty peeved about. Basically I got told because I lived out in the country the chap was going to be out in the morning. I was disappointed they didn't come out that night because you do a bit of a clean-up and go to bed. You wait till the next day and [somebody] comes out and fits a new bit of glass in and nobody's been to have a look. I was a bit disappointed about that. I would have slept easier if I'd known the Police had been and had a look, and that was over and done with. [RV-10]

Three Sydenham victims who had to wait more than two days for a Police visit were dissatisfied with the service they received.

This is the part that I thought was bad, when I phoned they said something along the lines that there's been a massive spate of burglaries and we don't think we'll be able to send anybody around today. He didn't actually ask is it a bad burglary or is it a minor burglar, because if this had been a really bad burglary we really would have wanted their attention straightaway. I got the impression that because

everyone was busy and that burglary was a common thing it was 'Oh well, tough. You've just got to wait your turn'. Two days later I phoned them and said, 'What's the story? I haven't heard anything'. [SV-03]

They said they'd get someone out there as soon as possible and then no one arrived so we rang. They said expect someone the next morning, no one turned up so we rang again. That was four days... It felt like the people on the phone weren't really being up front with you, saying it may take a few days... The thing that annoyed us most was when they said, 'Don't touch anything', and you left all your drawers and your stuff out for a couple of days. Then they get someone else on the phone who said, 'Put your stuff away. They're unlikely to find any fingerprints'. [SV-09]

[The Police said they] were on their way on Thursday. And I waited and waited and waited and I went and spoke to the neighbours and everything like that to see if they'd seen anything. And then I rung them, about 20 past 9 that evening and said, 'What's the story?' And they said they'd changed their plan and would come on Monday... So I couldn't leave the room the way it was, I wasn't going to leave it like that for too long... I thought if we got burgled that they'd be here straight away so they could get evidence and fingerprints. [If the Police] come three days later they couldn't get anything. [SV-11]

Several victims thought that the crime scene should be left untouched, so it was an inconvenience to have to wait for the Police. They believed that the delay impeded Police in gathering evidence and fingerprints.

Most Rotorua (13 of 15), Lower Hutt (14 of 15) and Sydenham (11 of 15) victims described themselves as 'very pleased' or 'very happy' with the speed of the Police response, and had little more to say about their experience. They tended to be realistic about the pressures on Police, the relative seriousness of the crime and the likelihood of achieving an outcome. Typical comments were:

If I remember rightly they simply said they would be here as soon as possible within 24 hours but they actually turned up within an hour. They were very prompt. [MV-01]

My partner thought they should have been there straightaway but as I said to him, 'It's not like an emergency and there's only a limited amount they can do'. [RV-09]

4.2.3 Police activity

Interviewers asked victims what the Police did when they visited the burglary site. Some found this difficult as it was some time ago, they were agitated at the time or they did not watch the Police closely. The most common activity was note-taking or preparing a report, followed by giving security advice and taking fingerprints. Some victims recalled the Police visiting neighbours, presumably to ask if they had seen anything untoward.

Victim Support provided the names of burglary victims for this sample, so the Police had obviously referred all the people interviewed to Victim Support. While some could recall having dealings with Victim Support, others could not, but it is not surprising that 40% of victims mentioned referral to Victim Support as an activity the Police did when they called.

Table 4.4 Activities victims recall the Police doing when they attended a burglary

| Activity | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Note-taking/prepared a report | 4 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 43 |
| Gave advice, information on security | 6 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 30 |
| Took fingerprints | 4 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 29 |
| Called on neighbours | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 24 |
| Referred to Victim Support | 2 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 22 |

4.2.4 Satisfaction with Police visit

A large majority (49 of 54) of victims were satisfied with the Police visit following their burglary.

Table 4.5 Satisfaction with Police visit

| Satisfaction | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Expressed satisfaction | 6 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 49 |
| Expressed dissatisfaction | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| No information | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Victims were most satisfied when they felt the Police took them seriously, were empathetic and understanding, and treated them with respect. Comments from people in all four areas illustrate this.

They were prompt and I think they did a very good job when they got here. I think they were very professional. [MV-01]

He was an understanding sort of cop and he did tell me it would be impossible to get a result. [RV-13]

We were actually very impressed and very pleased. They treated us as individuals. They seemed genuinely upset that it had happened, well, professionally upset that it had happened. [RV-11]

He seemed to just satisfy us. The way he spoke to us, he knew we were a bit upset and he was kind. [LHV-01]

He was very calm and totally professional. I had the thing, 'Is he going to think we're trying to rip off the insurance or something like that?' because people do that. But no he didn't, he didn't make me feel uncomfortable at all. He was very, very good. [SV-04]

I think he took it seriously. It wasn't a big burglary but he treated it [seriously] and wrote it all down and asked all the questions. [SV-07]

One Manurewa person was dissatisfied with the delay in the Police visit because it had prevented them taking fingerprints. In another Manurewa case, the victim's husband noticed teenagers at a nearby house with property stolen from his house. He confronted them and the victim rang the Police, who promptly visited. The Police said they were unable to enter the other property without a search warrant and lacked sufficient evidence to get one. The victim was dissatisfied with the lack of Police action.

All I can say to my friends is they [the Police] don't care. [MV-11]

One Lower Hutt victim was dissatisfied with the fingerprinting procedure.

We retrieved the wheelbarrow by picking it up at the rim very carefully. I explained to the fingerprint man that we had not touched the handlebars. So the first thing the gentleman does is grab the wheelbarrow by the handlebars and turn it over. At that point I lost interest frankly. He said, 'I can't find any fingerprints.' Well, of course you won't. The only thing I've got to say negative about the whole thing was that I think the fingerprint expert wants his head read frankly. He was pathetic. [LHV-02]

One Rotorua victim was dissatisfied as he felt the Police did not take the matter as seriously as he did.

It was a bit disappointing but there's not a lot you can do about it. I was dressed like this, so they just wandered in and saw a whole lot of junky car parts and stuff. The fact is it's probably \$4,000 worth of parts. [RV-06]

4.3 Outcome and follow-up

The majority of victims (40 of 54) had no further contact with Police concerning their burglary. While most were satisfied with this, eight would have liked some form of follow-up.

When follow-up did occur, it was usually by telephone, typically to keep the victim informed of developments in the case.

One Manurewa victim and three from Rotorua were aware of the Police prosecuting an offender for their burglary. The Police informed two other people that they had identified the burglar and the case was concluded in another way. Only one Manurewa victim mentioned completing a victim impact report for the Police.

Table 4.6 summarises the nature and extent of Police follow-up to burglaries and victims' satisfaction with it.

Table 4.6 Follow-up to burglary

| Follow-up to burglary | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| No follow-up | 6 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 40 |
| Some follow-up from Police | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 |
| Satisfaction | | | | | |
| Wanted more follow-up from Police | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Type of follow-up | | | | | |
| Phone call informing of prosecution for their burglary | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Police return property | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Phone call to say no new developments | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Phone call to say that burglar had been identified | 1* | 0 | 0 | 1** | 2 |
| Phone call to ask if any more items were missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Phone call to ask victim to identify recovered property | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Victim Support rang to say there had been no developments | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Victim rang Police after noticing further damage | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

*a Family Group Conference held ** Offender received amnesty for admitting other offences.

The follow-up was usually a phone call from the Police to the victim, informing them of their case's progress: that a prosecution was to occur; that there had been no new developments or that fingerprints were inconclusive; how the identified offender was being dealt with; checking if any more items were noticed missing; or asking them to identify recovered property.

Only four victims were aware of a prosecution for their burglary. Even a prosecution could lead to dissatisfaction, with one victim being disappointed with the outcome of the court case.

[He was] found guilty and given three months apparently and got out in eight weeks. I felt all the work they'd [the Police] put in and that's all you get is a slap on the wrist. That side of it I wasn't very pleased with. [MV-01]

Another victim read about the offender's sentence in the newspaper and would have preferred it if the Police had informed him directly.

In two other cases, the victims knew the offender was to have a Family Group Conference (he was under 18). In one case, the offender was given amnesty for admitting to other offences. They were dissatisfied with this outcome.

In the follow-up, [the Police] let me know that they were able to identify some of the fingerprints of who it was. They were going to have a meeting with this young person and while he was a habitual offender, he would be too young to prosecute. I had been prepared to be at the hearing [Family Group Conference], but I wasn't advised when it was. About a fortnight ago I received a letter from the Police saying that the process had been completed. Along with that letter from them, came a letter from the young person. On the envelope, was 'To the Victim of my Crime'. I don't know whether that is a term that the Police use and that is why this young person wrote that on the cover, but for me it was like, 'Here we go again'. He is still claiming the place. He is still claiming a kind of ownership of me, of the place where I live, by putting that kind of address on it. When I read the letter I wasn't really impressed that he really was sorry. It was something he had to write because that was part of the agreement of whatever process he had to go through. To me it was not even worth the paper it was written on. [MV-08]

We were a bit disappointed that he got amnesty. I mean it's classed as a crime solved. Well it isn't really. That is very disappointing. He just admits it and says he doesn't know where anything went or what happened to all the goods and that's it, finished as far as he's concerned. I just felt that it was an easy out...So that was a big concern as a follow-up to it. [SV-02]

Other people wanted more follow-up, such as a letter, from the Police telling them what had happened.

They've got to follow up on it. There has to be some form of...not closure as such...but we had nothing. If they did find something then that would have been great, but there needs to be some sort of time frame where they sign it off or come back to the victim and say, 'Hey look, we've done everything we can. We haven't found anything. This is what's going to happen. If you have any more problems, give us a call,' or whatever. [RV-06]

The only criticism over the whole thing is the follow-up...Even a letter would be fine, just so that you could feel that it's not just another number. That's great PR. [SV-05]

They could have written a letter to say the prints never came up with a match or there's been no further action or no items identified. Maybe leave it six months or something like that. [SV-15]

The recovery rate for property was very low, with only three people receiving some items back. At Rotorua, the Police gave one person a wallet back (minus contents). A couple found a coat hangar and one of their bags in the street. Another couple reported being intrigued by a newspaper advertisement for two green sofas that sounded exactly like those they had lost but they did not pursue the matter. At Lower Hutt, one person had a watch returned after Police arrested a burglar for a different offence.

4.4 Repeat burglaries

Ten victims—three in Manurewa, five in Rotorua and two in Lower Hutt—had had repeat burglaries.

All the Manurewa and Rotorua victims contacted the Police, who visited the house, took fingerprints, completed a report, and where appropriate gave security advice. There was no follow-up to these burglaries and no property was recovered.

In two of the three Manurewa cases, the victims were dissatisfied with the Police service. One wanted the Police to have visited earlier; the other did not think the Police were interested.

Thinking back, all I can remember is being made to feel, 'Well, why are you bothering?' [MV-08]

All Rotorua victims of repeat burglaries were satisfied with the Police response, with one describing it as:

More than I expected because both [burglaries] were Sunday mornings and they were flat out. [RV-16]

One of the Lower Hutt victims had experienced three burglaries over a three-week period. The family did not discover the first burglary until after the second, which occurred while they were away and a neighbour rang the Police station after visiting the house to feed the cat and finding it ransacked. The third burglary occurred while the major burglary was being investigated. The victim rang 111 and the Police again visited the property, took fingerprints, completed a report and offered security advice. Police kept the victim informed of their investigation, though no property was recovered from any of the burglaries and no arrests were made. The victim was very satisfied with the Police response, saying:

I actually wrote a letter to the editor of the paper and I wrote to the District Commander of the Police because I was very, very impressed by the level of service after the second burglary. The Police have been very good and Victim Support was very good. [LHV-15]

The other Lower Hutt repeat victim had been burgled six times between February and October 2003. He rang the local Police station on each occasion except when the burglars had broken into his lounge while he was sleeping in another room. On that occasion, he rang 111 when he woke in the morning but was told it was not an emergency and to ring the Police station. He was disgruntled about this, although he said:

I was happy with the way I was treated. I have got no malice against the Police at all. It was just unfortunate. In a way I just feel a bit uptight about it when I was told when I rang 111 for a burglary, that it wasn't an emergency. To me, my privacy had been invaded, and I could have been harmed while I was in the house...I was happy with the way the investigations went. The only way I felt inconvenienced was because of the delay, but I still understand why there was a delay. [LHV-15]

At his different burglaries the Police visited the property, took fingerprints, talked with neighbours, completed a report and offered security advice. On one occasion the Police visit was delayed two days but they rang him and kept him informed. No other follow-up occurred after these burglaries and no property was recovered.

Several Manurewa people mentioned that items had been stolen from their property on other occasions but they had not reported this to the Police.

4.5 Expectations of the Police

Victims were generally satisfied with the way the Police handled their particular burglary.

There's nothing much more they could have done. [MV-05]

They couldn't have done any more, I think. [MV-07]

I was very impressed with it. I heard that people have had burglaries and the Police never even came round. Well I was really very impressed that they responded so quickly...I've had experiences that aren't so good but that was a good experience and they treated it seriously. [SV-07]

I thought it was such a small thing that I was actually surprised at how thorough she was when she came round. [SV-14]

Victims acknowledged the pressures on Police, which they identified as excessive paperwork, understaffing, inadequate resourcing and the need to deal with more crime. This gave them a realistic appreciation of what victims could expect from the Police in the case of a household burglary.

I think they are understaffed so they can't respond as fast as you would like them to respond. [MV-08]

It's just unfortunate that the Police resources are so limited that [with a] burglary, there's not much chance of getting all the stuff back. It's mainly a life or death situation that is a priority, which it should be. Any of the small stuff is just for the record in the end. [RV-09]

I have a bigger appreciation of what they are doing, and the hopeless job they have got with everything getting so much worse. They have been taxed to the max. [LHV-13]

To be absolutely honest I was grateful for the concern. I didn't think it warranted that. I thought they were really punctilious over a matter that I didn't regard as being particularly high on my list of things that can happen. [LHV-10]

To me, the Police can't do much about it because they are committed to other crimes that are much more important. The delay of interviewing a person after a burglary is the thing that concerns me. Maybe more manning—just three or four Police dedicated to burglars. It is the resourcing that is the main problem. [LHV-15]

I know they have so much to do with their resources, so you kind of expect that it's going to be two days before they come round. I wasn't really surprised...They need more, more people. They haven't got the staff. I think that's where the problem is. [SV-03]

Almost all of those interviewed thought that the Police were doing the best they could.

I was very impressed. I don't know about other people but for me they certainly did their best. [MV-01]

I have never really had a lot to do with the Police, but when I have had, it has always been positive. [LHV-12]

I am full of admiration for the Police force and what they are doing. [LHV-14]

I've got quite a positive view of the Police anyway and I think they did the best they could do. [SV-01]

People were more likely to blame the system as a whole than local Police for any perceived shortcomings in the service. 'It comes back to government policy', one said. One thought that larger social change had contributed to an increase in crime.

All this political thing... Free market philosophy... This is now a dormitory valley because there is not enough work for the young. Unemployment is the thing. There was tons of work here when all the factories were going. Anybody could get a job. But these young ones, they can't get jobs. These teenagers wandering the street during working hours... what are they doing? [LHV-16]

Friends and family say, 'Oh get onto them and do this and do that.' But when you're looking at the bigger picture, it's not that the Police don't want to do anything about it. That's not the situation. They do want to do something about it but they can't. There's obviously not enough money being spent in the right areas so overall it's the whole system that fails. It's not the localised Police it's the whole system on how they work. [RV-06]

Any dissatisfaction victims expressed concerned the particular way their case was handled, rather than dissatisfaction with the Police in general.

Dissatisfaction with how the Police managed their particular burglary was highest in Manurewa. Three of the nine Manurewa victims thought that the Police could respond more quickly to burglaries, and have a more efficient approach to receiving information on the phone. They thought that the Police person answering the call could give 'some recognition that something has been done to you'. Several Manurewa victims also wanted better Police follow-up on reported crime in that area. In the Manurewa case where the victim saw the family's stolen goods at a neighbouring property, which the Police declined to search, the victim did not think she or her husband had been listened to or that their burglary was effectively investigated.

4.6 Summary

Informants were generally well satisfied with the Police response to the offence. Most recognised that although it can often be distressing for victims, burglary is relatively low on the spectrum of offences Police have to deal with. They were realistic about the level of service they could expect.

Victims were most satisfied when they felt the Police responded appropriately to what had happened. Usually that was the case, with phone calls being answered promptly and efficiently. Problems arose when victims who felt personally vulnerable rang 111 instead of the local Police station and were referred elsewhere. They felt rebuffed and unsupported.

Police visited most victims within a reasonable time and they were generally professional and empathetic. Victims particularly appreciated being taken seriously and treated courteously.

The weakest area as far as victims were concerned was the lack of follow-up or information about what happened. Most were resigned to losing their property but they did want to know what had happened in their case. Some suggested that Victim Support could be responsible for this; others would like the Police to introduce a system to routinely inform victims about progress on or the outcome of their case.

Overall, victims appreciated the pressures under which the Police work and thought that they made considerable effort to attend to burglaries in a timely and considerate way.

5 Details of burglaries and attempted burglaries

This section describes how and when burglaries happened, the damage that occurred and the nature and value of the property stolen. Victims were recalling events that took place, in some cases, over a year earlier. Some noted that their memories might be faulty.

5.1 When burglaries occurred

Twenty-five of the 54 'most recent' burglaries for which more details were given occurred during the day and 21 happened at night. Victims did not know when the remaining eight burglaries occurred. In Manurewa and Sydenham, about two-thirds of the burglaries occurred during the day.

Of the burglaries that happened at night, at least six happened before 11pm. Two of these were in Sydenham and four in Rotorua. In Rotorua, three families were home at the time and the fourth family disturbed the burglars when they arrived home. Otherwise, there was no particular pattern in the timing of offences.

Table 5.1 When burglaries occurred

| When burglaries occurred | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Daytime | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 25 |
| Nighttime | 3 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 21 |
| Unknown | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |

It is difficult to tell how many burglaries were planned and how many were opportunistic. This was particularly so in Sydenham, where no victims speculated on this aspect of the burglary. In Lower Hutt, both victims of repeat burglaries believed the burglars had targeted them. One family had three burglaries within a month, where the burglars came through the same window each time. They were convinced they had been targeted. The Police later told them that a group of known thieves had moved into the area and the level of burglaries had risen. The other lived beside a pedestrian walkway and had no specific security measures because of cost. He rented his property and felt that his place was easily targeted. Others also felt that their place might have been cased.

It gives me that sort of feeling they knew something, you know what I mean? Or cased the place out or something like that. I don't really know. [LHV-01]

We decided to go out for the afternoon and I just had the feeling that somebody saw me leave and knew the coast was clear... There was a tinnie house opposite here at the time. [LHV-14]

Three victims in Manurewa also suspected that their homes were targeted.

We feel that they were actually up the road because there were groups of people on the footpath at the time. They fitted the description that a neighbour saw when the alarm went off. He saw two young Polynesian males running from the house into the bush. He was across the road. Funny the next time we went out [the second burglary], exactly the same thing happened. Two people were seen leaving when the alarm went off, running into the bush and carrying something white, which obviously were these white dress shoes of our son's. [MV-06]

I think they're very careful. They're scouting the area and because we back onto a reserve, I think they're regularly making checks. And I don't think it's just one group of people, I think they're looking together. I don't know whether I'm being paranoid but I think they're working together. I've been getting phone calls after the burglary. They're not nasty but they just ring up; I feel they're just seeing if I'm home and then they hang up and that's been regular for the last two to three months. At least once a week I'd get a call about 2.30 to 4, in between that time. [MV-02]

In Rotorua, the daytime offences suggest at least a degree of careful observation. One victim had experienced a completed and an attempted burglary at a house that he was renovating. No one actually lived there. He believed the offenders had been watching his movements.

The first time they came in, they took all my gear. I put deadlocks on. When they came back the second time they got in through the laundry window but they couldn't get out through the doors. Obviously they couldn't carry the furniture out so nothing was taken the second time. [RV-04]

Another offence appeared to be more spontaneous.

We came home through the sliding door and it wasn't locked. I looked over to the TV and noticed that the place underneath it where the DVD video player should be was empty and there was a big cord coming down the back. I couldn't figure out why it wasn't there... When my daughter came home, she noticed that somebody had been in her room. An old bag of clothes was all tipped out on her bed and the bag and her mobile phone were gone. Perhaps they used the bag to put the DVD player in. We don't know how they got in. There was no sign of forced entry at all, no damage. And I can't recall whether all the other windows were shut. [RV-09]

In Lower Hutt, two burglaries occurred when the victims were gardening outside the house, leaving the doors unlocked, suggesting that the burglaries were opportunistic.

5.2 Modus operandi

As Table 5.2 shows, in half of the burglaries, the offender entered through a window; in the other half, they entered through a door. In 51 of the 66 burglaries, offenders used force or broke windows to gain entry. In the remaining cases, the window or door was unlocked or the burglar had a key. There was no significant variation in offenders' modus operandi between the four areas.

Table 5.2 Means of entry in burglaries in each area

| Means of entry | Manurewa <i>n=12*</i> | Rotorua <i>n=17*</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=22*</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=66*</i> |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Broke window | 3 | 2 | 10* | 2 | 17 |
| Forced window open | 1 | 1 | 5* | 5 | 12 |
| Forced door open | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| Forced shed or garage door or window open | 4 | — | 2 | — | 6 |
| Forced ranch slider open | — | 4 | 1 | — | 5 |
| Entered unlocked house door | — | 2 | 2 | — | 4 |
| Entered open window | 1 | 3 | — | — | 4 |
| Entered unlocked garage door | — | 2 | — | 4 | 6 |
| Committed by someone with key | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |

*Includes repeat burglaries.

Typical descriptions included:

They came in through a small door at the back of the garage and he came through the house and obviously couldn't get out of the doors because there are deadlocks on the house... [With the door they came in], they must have slipped under the door to knock the prop out and got a screwdriver and key, because the key was still in it but it wasn't quite turned round. They must have turned it back with the screwdriver. They didn't break anything. They hadn't forced it. [SV-15]

They jemmied open a side door by the window, just like an access door. We normally keep a hamper in front of it. The door was actually closed and the hamper was at an angle so I thought, 'That's a bit strange' and on closer inspection I found a piece of wood from the doorframe. [SV-03]

The level of force used to gain entry is reflected in the extent of damage to victims' property, discussed in Section 5.5.

Twelve burglaries were of a shed or garage, usually detached from the house.

5.3 People at home

In 11 of the 66 burglaries, the victims were at home. These burglaries were usually at night when the victim was asleep. Only two woke and disturbed the burglars.

Table 5.3 Victims at home at the time of the burglary

| Situation | Manurewa <i>n=12*</i> | Rotorua <i>n=17*</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=22*</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=66*</i> |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| At home | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| Not at home | 10 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 55 |

*Includes repeat burglaries.

In all other cases, the victims were absent when the burglary occurred. They were usually at work and/or due to return later the same day. A small number were away from home on holiday at the time of the burglary.

In both Rotorua and Lower Hutt, a victim who was asleep woke and disturbed the burglar or would-be burglar. In each case the offender rapidly left the property by the window through which he had entered. Both victims called the Police, who attended quickly but did not catch either offender. In another burglary, the offenders broke into a separate garage on a stormy night and the victims and their dog in the nearby house were unaware that the offence was occurring.

In a Lower Hutt burglary, neighbours noticed the victim's car being driven away erratically and rang the Police. The car was abandoned nearby but the offender was not caught.

5.4 Property stolen

The most commonly stolen items, particularly in Sydenham, were electronic equipment, including televisions, video equipment, DVD players, home and car stereos, and computer items (including software). The next most common items taken during the burglary were furniture and household items, personal effects and jewellery, and tools. Money-related items, including wallets, cash, credit cards or personal ID, were also attractive to burglars, particularly in Lower Hutt.

Table 5.4 Property stolen

| Property stolen | Manurewa <i>n=12*</i> | Rotorua <i>n=17*</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=22*</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=66*</i> |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Electronic equipment | 7 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 30 |
| Furniture and household goods | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 19 |
| Personal effects/jewellery | 3 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 17 |
| Tools | 7 | 2** | 2 | 4 | 15 |
| Wallet, cash, credit cards, personal ID | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 |
| Camera | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Food/liquor | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| Car | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| No items stolen (burglary disturbed) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| No items stolen (only property damage) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

* Includes repeat burglaries.

** Includes tools for car restoration.

In Manurewa, a disproportionate number of victims (4 of 9) had had lawnmowers stolen. These thefts meant that the stolen tools category matched the electronic equipment category in that area.

The comment below describes a typical situation.

They took jewellery of mine, rings, brooches, all my earrings, a camphorwood box. It's a jewellery box with the jewellery [my husband] bought me, that's 40, almost 50 years ago, and everything that was in that—a lot of estate jewellery. They took money out of [husband's] wallet, about \$180... They did start to take the computer, they had part of that on the floor, but it was still there. Whether they got panicky or why they left it, I don't know... With the jewellery, it was worth a hell of a lot more than we got, they were keepsakes. [SV-02]

Several victims commented that they thought the offenders were looking for alcohol and drugs.

They went through the house, every drawer, every cupboard, but all that was taken was the toilet roll...and the vodka and the full bottle of Baileys. So whoever it was, was in here for some time...I can only assume that it was drugs he was looking for. [LHV-14]

The value of the property stolen ranged from \$30 (cash) to \$30,000 (for jewellery), both stolen in Lower Hutt. The more usual valuation victims placed on stolen property was around \$2,000.

Table 5.5 Value of stolen property

| Value of stolen property | Manurewa | Rotorua | Lower Hutt | Sydenham |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Range of estimates | \$100 (for CDs) to \$5,000 (for electronic, household and personal items) | \$300 to \$30,000 (for elaborate electronic equipment) | \$30 (for cash) to \$30,000 (for jewellery) | \$300 (for a car stereo) to \$12,000 (electronic equipment and camera) |
| Most common valuation | \$2,000 | between \$1,500 and \$3,500 | \$300 | \$2,000 |

Victims' estimates of the value of stolen property were influenced by the initial purchase price of the stolen item and the number of items stolen during the burglary.

Some victims noted that the stolen property had a high sentimental value to them. One had lost equipment for restoring vintage cars that he described as irreplaceable.

5.5 Damage and violence

Three-quarters (77%) of burglaries involved force which led to property damage at the point of entry. This was the main kind of property damage reported. One victim said that his boat had been partially dismantled. A number of others said the burglars had left a mess.

In Sydenham, most of the damage was described as relatively minor.

They pulled a chair up to the bedroom window, picked up some secateurs and wedged the safety lock up the bedroom window, one of those wee locks on the fanlight, off the window. [SV-06]

I couldn't find how they got in. It was only when the Police came in later on that they realised when they did an exterior search that they noticed one of the windows had been tampered with. [SV-05]

In the kitchen, all the rubbish was put on the floor. Every drawer and cupboard was open... They jemmied the door in the conservatory, got in through there... They pulled the indoor siren out of the plastered ceiling, then they must have put cushions and stuff over the sensors because they were all over the floor. But they opened everything... There was a hang of a mess in the hall, but my rings were out. They found where I'd hidden them and tipped them all over the floor. One of them would have fetched a decent amount, but they never touched them. I think they were looking for money or drugs, and they didn't find either. They just wrecked the place, and that was the worst. [LHV-13]

While a few had confronted the burglar, no victims had experienced physical assaults during the burglary. Although the interviewers did not specifically ask about emotional or psychological damage, a number of victims noted that they or other family members were upset or stressed by the burglary at the time, and, in some cases, were still upset at the time of the interview.

In Lower Hutt, for example, several people were emotionally upset by the experience. They described the burglary as 'traumatic for the children' and were too frightened to sleep.

We had a fright. Just, you know, the thought that maybe he was armed. I don't think it was a gun, but a big stick, or this for cricket. I thought some boy could use it and easily hit me on the head. So I was really frightened. I couldn't sleep for a long time. [LHV-08]

In Manurewa, victims talked about being too scared to open the curtains, and feeling vulnerable, sad and angry. Another described their son as still being upset. Comments included:

I was lucky in that on the first burglary he said, 'You're not the only one who was burgled that night.' He said, 'Three houses down here were all broken into as well, the same street.' Little things like that, little titbits of information helped me to feel more secure again or more, you know, not so vulnerable really. [MV-04]

I feel sad and angry you know because we're not rich people. You know we're not wealthy people. We try to get things that we want and now they just come in and take it away. [MV-11]

This is consistent with findings from the *New Zealand National Survey of Crime Victims 2001*³ that suggest that burglaries have significant impacts on victims and their households. Victims of burglary were more likely than victims of assaults to say they were 'very much' or 'quite a lot' affected by the incident (more than half of the burglary victims said this), to have reported difficulties sleeping and to feel 'afraid for their children'.

5.6 Summary and discussion

While there was no particular pattern in the timing of burglaries, there was some evidence that offenders targeted particular properties. Properties on walkways or close to reserves were vulnerable, as were homes where owners could not afford or did not install security devices. Offenders in some areas appeared to go to considerable lengths to check out whether homeowners were absent, including making anonymous phone calls.

Offenders took some risks when burgling houses. Some were prepared to enter houses while victims were asleep; others risked being caught by owners who were elsewhere on their property or away for a short time.

This sample is too small to allow any accurate comparisons with the sample in the *Surveys of household burglary Part One (2002)*⁴, but there are some similarities. In both samples, offenders were most likely to enter through a window, usually by forcing it open or breaking the glass. Ranch slider doors were treated like windows; if they were not left unlocked, they were usually easy to force. This suggests that households may need to pay more attention to security at these points.

The most commonly stolen items were electronic goods and personal effects, including jewellery, presumably because they are relatively easy to dispose of. The range of goods is similar to that in the 2003 survey, reinforcing the view that offenders are looking for goods that they can convert quickly into cash.

In this sample, damage to property was mainly confined to the point of entry. While some victims said that the house was left in a mess, only one went so far as to describe the house as 'wrecked'. This is a considerably lower proportion than in the victimisation survey, where almost one-third described the house as 'ransacked'.

The psychological damage, however, was considerable. Even though interviewers did not specifically raise this topic, victims often volunteered information about how they felt and the ongoing effects of the offence. It is this aspect of burglaries that Police follow-up is most likely to address, giving victims a sense that the Police are still involved in their case and still concerned about them.

³ Morris, A. and Reilly, J. 2003. *New Zealand National Survey of Crime Victims 2001*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

⁴ Triggs, S. 2005. *Surveys of household burglary Part One (2002): Four Police Areas and national data compared*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

6 Security measures before and after burglary

This section considers the security measures people had in place at the time of the burglary and how they responded to security advice from the Police.

6.1 Security measures in place at the time of the burglary

Victims had a range of security measures in place at the time of their burglary. Most (30 of 54) had ordinary door locks, while a minority (16 of 54) had deadlocks fitted to exterior doors. Only eight had burglary alarms installed, though two were not operating at the time of the burglary.

Table 6.1 Security measures in place at the time of the burglary

| Security measures | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Ordinary door locks | 4 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 30 |
| Deadlocks on doors | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 16 |
| Security catches on window | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| Burglary alarms | 4 | 2 | 1* | 1* | 8 |
| Dogs | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Security lights | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1* | 2 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

* Not operating at the time of the burglary.

Ordinary door locks were the victims' most common security measure, followed by deadlocks on exterior doors, security catches on windows, burglary alarms (although two were not working), dogs, security lights (one was not working) and other arrangements.

Two victims had other measures in place—one had bars fitted to his garage windows (where his burglary occurred) and another had an alarm system box on the outside of his house, along with security company stickers, though no security system or patrols were in place.

6.2 Security advice from the Police

In 41 (of 54) burglaries, victims recalled that the Police had provided them with advice on security, either verbally or in a written form.

Table 6.2 Security advice provided by Police

| Security advice | Manurewa <i>n=9</i> | Rotorua <i>n=15</i> | Lower Hutt <i>n=15</i> | Sydenham <i>n=15</i> | Total <i>n=54</i> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Written advice | 4 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 19 |
| Verbal advice | 2 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 22 |
| None given or couldn't remember | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 13 |

People commonly reported finding the security advice from Police to be helpful and it informed the changes they then made to their security.

I've adhered to [it], I've made a lot of changes. [MV-04]

Yes, they were really good. They gave me a pack and one of those invisible pens, and said mark all your stuff. I liked the way they dealt with that. And just a lot on Neighbourhood Watch, and how to make your house more secure, and just little tips and guidelines. I thought it was quite good. [RV-02]

I'm afraid I found it very useful. You know I don't like following it but I do follow it. It was incomprehensible to me that somebody could burgle you while you were home. [LHV-09]

I think it was good because we cut part of the hedge back so you can see the front door. He did say we [should] put bolts in these double doors and if they wanted to get in they'd just force it open. [SV-09]

6.3 Changes made following burglary

Nearly all victims had improved their security following their burglary and advice from the Police. Changes made included:

- fitting more secure locks to windows or doors (27)
- installing alarm systems (13)
- installing security lights, security screens, or a security camera (7)
- other changes such as putting up curtains, installing gate locks, erecting fences or putting up a dog warning sign
- becoming more security conscious in behaviour, for example:
 - ensuring doors were locked when working in the garden
 - keeping a cellphone close
 - locking doors at night
 - leaving lights on when out
 - locking doors previously left open
 - hiding tools
 - changing door keys or their hiding place

- checking security arrangements regularly
- going out less
- joining a Neighbourhood Watch group.

Several victims did not make any changes because they lived in rental property and thought that it was the owner's responsibility to install security systems or because the costs were too high for them.

Some people said the increased security had improved their sense of safety.

I now have a monitored alarm and I have put bolts on the outside doors so they can't be jemmied out. That makes me feel a lot more comfortable. [LHV-13]

It was good for my son's sake because he was seriously affected and upset. Having all that security right then and there was just marvellous for him. I [was able to say] 'Look A., you can lock the gate now. You can lock the front door now. Nobody can get in now. They'll have to smash the thing and everyone is going to hear it.' This was really good for him. [MV-10]

Some victims were resentful of the changes tighter security brought to their lives and were selective in the changes they made.

I have got a lock on my bedroom window and I really want to have them open all night. But since the burglary I think, 'Oh my god, they could put anything underneath them,' and it really hacks me off that I have to bow down to them and keep my window shut. In the summer I will get a fan, which hacks me off. They are a darn nuisance. [LHV-13]

We decided ourselves that we would secure our doors, but these windows don't work that way really. We don't have valuable possessions that we are so concerned about. I am not prepared to live in a cage and to live in fear that I am going to lose my belongings to a thief. If he wants them, he can have them as far as I am concerned. All in all, we want to feel reasonably free to lead our lives. When we go out the door we lock everything. But I open my doors...I open the front glass door if it is a sunny day and let the sun in. And the whole street by now must know that I don't close it. [LHV-14]

I've been in other countries where people live in fortresses but I don't really want to see that here. I think we need to take moderate steps to make the place as secure as we can and then if someone still gets in I don't want to make it overprotective. What's the point to live here? [SV-01]

Earlier surveys⁵ have shown that over half of all participants nationally were either very or fairly worried about their house being burgled. Among the four Police Areas, concern about burglary was much higher in Manurewa and Rotorua than in Lower Hutt or Sydenham. Both surveys also showed that victimised households were less likely than other households to have security measures at the time of the burglary. As Triggs notes, the preventative effect of such measures may be relative to other houses in the area, rather than a function of the absolute level of security. As in the present study, participants in the two earlier surveys increased their

⁵ Ministry of Justice. 2003. *New Zealand Survey of Crime Victims 2001*. Wellington.
Triggs, S. 2003. *Survey of burglary victimisation, crime prevention and crime perceptions*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

security measures following a burglary. The measures they adopted were limited by what they could afford.

6.4 Summary

Although about half of the people interviewed had some security measures in place at the time of the burglary, nearly all improved their security significantly following the burglary and having received advice from the Police. Victims were often torn between the need to secure their property and their desire to have a more relaxed and open lifestyle.

7 General comments on burglary and Police response

This section reports victims' views about the Police response to burglary, both for themselves and more generally. Some victims also offered suggestions about what might be done to help reduce residential burglaries.

Overall, victims were positive about the Police response when they were burgled. Most felt that the Police did all they could with their limited resources. The comments below are typical.

I've always thought that they had a tough job and did the best that they could. [MV-01]

There are other things that I'm sure they have to do and it's probably better for them to do that sort of thing. [MV-05]

It's pretty hard to stop some of these people that you know. I think the Police are doing their best. [LHV-01]

I am quite happy to put the community's safety into their hands, than for me to try and give suggestions, because I am sure they have heard it all before. I am full of admiration for the Police force and what they are doing. But I do know they would like to have a bigger Police population. That would make life a lot easier for them, and would make our safety better. [LHV-14]

It only reassured me that they are professional. I've always had a reasonably good opinion of the boys in blue. [SV-04]

Some people were explicit about the need for more Police resources or a different approach to reducing crime. At the same time, they recognised that most of their suggestions are impractical within the current level of resourcing.

It would be nice if there would be more surveillance checks on houses but the man-hours involved are horrendous. [MV-01]

I know they say they are overstretched. They are too much sitting out on the road looking out for speedsters and getting revenue. They say themselves that they haven't got the resources to handle burglary. It is not primary to them and that is upsetting because it is people's lives. I think it is a bigger deal than what they are making it out to be. [RV-02]

I know a lot of burglary is gang-related. Those are the ones that usually get caught with gear and for receiving. A lot of burglary at the moment is to supply their drug habit and the cops are cracking down on that, so the Police are actually getting there to cut burglary down. [RV-02]

I think that there needs to be a better presence on the streets and I can understand why there possibly isn't. But particularly when we walk home from town on a Friday or Saturday night we don't really see any Police around and it is quite troubling. It's not necessarily the safest of places to be and I think that's what you need to see, a better presence out there. More of a deterrent. [SV-03]

They're really understaffed. It's money, if they can't give them the money they won't get the staff. It's a stressful job in the bargain too. [SV-08]

I'd like to see a focus on burglary and home invasion. But if it's a resource thing then it's government funds and direction and they've shown that they don't listen so that's where it starts. [SV-10]

Not surprisingly, most victims were critical of burglars. Some of their views were:

These people that do burglaries, have they got nothing better to do? If that is the way they make a living, God help them. How are they going to be when they get old? [MV-07]

It's just a really lowlife thing to do to take things that have no monetary value but are quite precious. [MV-10]

Some talked of their increased suspicion following their experience.

I've changed my probability in chances that it will happen. I often used to think it won't ever happen to me but now that it's happened here so many times I have resigned myself to the fact that I will get burgled at some stage in my life. [MV-04]

It just makes you think about who's watching the property. You have to be vigilant in what you do. [MV-05]

Specific suggestions for reducing burglary rates included:

- more effective sentencing with more severe penalties
- more policemen on the beat, both on foot and in patrol cars
- more flexibility for Police, with fewer cases being dismissed for technicalities and less political correctness
- continued cracking down on drug dealing and consumption
- armed Police
- more alarms or security lights fitted to houses
- security reminders delivered to householders at times of high risk, such as before Christmas holidays
- more newspaper publicity on local crime and possible security measures
- insurance companies providing more resources to Police
- increased public awareness of the risks of crime.

Others made more general suggestions, saying burglaries would be reduced if:

- all the population was employed or in trade training
- neighbours looked out for each other
- there was increased drug education for young people
- drug testing occurred in workplaces
- compulsory military training was reintroduced
- more children were taught respect for others' property
- politicians were better.

Some commented on a perceived increase in crime.

I personally think the standard of morals and respect for other people and their property has fallen so low, that until we get back to the Ten Commandments, nothing is going to change. I really believe that—those commandments were the basis of British law. [MV-07]

It is a terrible shame when you think not that many years ago, you were able to go away and leave your doors open. [MV-07]

A few urged a tougher approach to burglars.

Round them all up and put them in a paddock and let them fight to the death, I think would be a good idea. Get them out of our hair. I think they're a scourge on society really, [and should] be locked up for a very long time. I don't think the justice system comes down hard enough on them. It's way too lenient. A slap on the wrist, it's nothing. It's 'Oh well, we'll give you a holiday for a few weeks. You've been a bad boy. I'll give you three square meals and a warm place to sleep.' Meanwhile the person you've burgled is still scared to go outside. [MV-01]

There are always going to be people out there who have just got no other way of life other than getting into somebody's house and taking what they want. I don't know how they can stop it, other than putting them away, and making sure that instead of giving light sentences and throwing them back on to the street, they bang them up and that's it. Unfortunately, the court says, 'We haven't got enough money for this carry on,' and they are let loose. They need money to feed their habit, so they take it from somebody else. We need more Police and make them effective. People are let off too easily. Parents should be liable for their children and costs incurred. It probably would help. [RV-15]

I believe quite a lot of what we read about with the prosecutions, that a lot of the sentences aren't reflecting the crime and are not harsh enough. [SV-04]

Some people believed that burglaries would still occur, no matter what measures they might take.

They say that to lock up carefully and properly you only keep the honest ones out. You're not keeping the burglar out if he wants in. Even with an alarm they've still got a set time that they can get in and out and be gone before anybody gets there. So they're only good up to a point too. They frighten the hell out of them but I don't know how they could ever stop it, really I don't. [SV-02]

8 Discussion

This report documents the experiences and views of a small number of victims of burglaries in four Police Areas. They are all people who were able to be contacted and who agreed to be interviewed. While their views do not necessarily reflect those of all victims in those areas, the similarity of their experiences and opinions to those reported in other studies suggests that they are not an atypical sample.

Victims were most immediately aware of Police and community initiatives that were either visible in their community, like Neighbourhood Support and the community constable, or of which they had had some direct experience, such as burglary prevention education and advice. When prompted, they recalled a much wider range of initiatives, but it was apparent that most had very little personal experience of these. Even where they had heard of initiatives, most victims were ambivalent about their effectiveness. They were sceptical of the willingness of offenders to change, even if Police caught and imprisoned more of them. They did support initiatives that encouraged people to take more responsibility for their own security needs.

Victims' ambivalence about the effectiveness of Police initiatives in relation to burglary was in line with their perception that the Police are under-resourced to deal with burglary and usually have other more important matters to deal with. Within that framework, most were well satisfied with the Police response to their particular burglary. Apart from the lack of follow-up, it was at the level they expected. They particularly appreciated Police professionalism and courtesy. Most were resigned to losing their property but would have liked some closure on the case.

The interviews suggest that offenders did take into account ease of access, lack of security measures and the presence or absence of people either in the house or nearby, when selecting a house to burgle. They were also relatively selective in what they took, preferring items that would be relatively easy to dispose of for cash. Understandably, victims were particularly upset when personal items were stolen, but it was the fact that they were burgled at all that caused the most distress. Several victims were still upset some months after the burglaries occurred.

The experience of burglary was enough for most victims to improve the security round their home, although a number resented having to do so. This was partly because of the cost and inconvenience and partly because they wanted to live in a more relaxed way.

Many victims set their comments within a wider context. They recognised that drugs and alcohol play a significant role in offending, and were critical of offenders' lack of respect for people and property. A minority thought that economic pressure contributed to crime. Given the lack of Police resources and the relative intransigence of offenders, most concluded that greater vigilance by homeowners and a higher level of security were the only ways to reduce residential burglaries.

Appendix A Information sheet



Research on Police practice in reducing burglary

Information for victims

We would like to invite you to take part in a research project on burglary.

What the research is about

Burglary is one of New Zealand's highest recorded crimes. It has a serious impact on victims and communities. The Police are trying new ways to reduce the number of burglaries. We would like to find out how well this is working and one of the best ways to do this is by talking to victims of burglary. We would like you to tell us about your own experiences of what the Police are doing.

How we are doing the research

Four Police Areas have been chosen for the evaluation: Manurewa, Rotorua, Hutt City and Spreydon/Heathcote. We would like to talk to 15 victims in each area.

How we chose you

We asked Victim Support to identify people who had been the victim of a burglary between 1 January 2002 and 30 June 2003 and to approach you to see if you would be willing to talk to us.

Who will be doing the interview

The interviewer will be an independent person working under contract to the Ministry of Justice. If you agree to take part, your interviewer will contact you to arrange a time and place for the interview. The interviewer will offer you the choice of a music, grocery or petrol voucher to the value of \$30 for taking part.

What the interview will involve

We expect the interview to take about 45 minutes. We will ask you about things like:

- what happened in the actual or attempted burglaries
- your satisfaction with Police services when you reported a burglary
- the security measures you used before being burgled, and any changes you made following the burglary
- your awareness of specific Police and community initiatives relating to burglary.

If you agree, the interviewer would like to tape the interview for accuracy. This tape will be confidential and only used for the research.

Choosing to take part

You can choose whether or not to take part. If you do decide to talk with us, you don't have to answer every question and you can pull out of the interview at any time.

Confidentiality

The interviews will be confidential to the research team. The four Police Areas will be identified in the final report but any information that could lead to you being identified will be removed.

The interviewer will also ask you if you agree to be quoted anonymously in the report. You will have a chance to check any direct quotes the researchers plan to use. If you want to, you will be able to check the typed interview notes.

Who to contact for more information

If you would like to know more about the research, please ring Alison Chetwin, Principal Adviser, Research and Evaluation, Ministry of Justice on 04 4949 864.

Appendix B Interview guide for victim interview

Note: The Police initiatives discussed with victims varied slightly from one area to another.

Interview guide for victim interview

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to talk to me. My name is and I'm doing this interview on contract to the Ministry of Justice.

I'd like to talk to you about what the Police are doing to try to stop burglaries inand about your own experiences as a victim of burglary. What you tell me will help us understand more about what it is like to be a burglary victim dealing with the Police, and about Police initiatives to reduce the number of burglaries.

The interview will take about three-quarters of an hour. You don't have to answer any questions that you don't want to and you can stop the interview any time you want. If it's OK with you, I'd like to tape the interview as it is more accurate and we'll be able to be faster, and I'll take brief notes as well.

Remember that only the research team will see the interview and any information that could lead to you being identified will be removed before we use any interview material.

If the researchers want to quote you anonymously in the report, you will have a chance to check any direct quotes the researchers plan to use. If you want to, you will be able to review the notes from the interview. They will be available before Christmas.

Is that all OK with you? Do you have any questions at all? Remember you don't have to answer questions you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time.

Thank you. Can you please sign the consent form and we'll begin.

Research on Police practice in reducing burglary

Consent form

I, _____, agree to be interviewed for this research study.

The interviewer explained to me the purpose of the research, and my right not to answer any question I don't like or to stop the interview, without having to explain why.

I understand that what I say will be kept confidential by the researchers and will only be used for research purposes. My name will not be used in any research reports and nothing will be published that might identify me.

I agree to the interview being tape-recorded.

Signed _____

Date _____

Introduction

The main focus of this interview is on how you feel about the Police response to your burglary and to burglaries in general, and on the security measures you use. It's not on how the burglary affected you personally, although I appreciate that that must have been a difficult time.

I would like to begin by hearing about your experience of burglary or attempted burglary.

1. Since the beginning of 2002—January last year—has anyone *tried to* get into your home or a garage or shed without permission but *not succeeded* in getting in?
2. How many times did that happen?
3. Did you report all/any of these attempts to the Police? Why or why not?
4. In the same period, has anyone *succeeded in* getting into your home, garage or shed without permission?
5. How many times did that happen?

Most recent burglary

6. Can you tell me more about the [most recent] attempted or successful burglary—when did that happen? **Record attempted or successful; month and year**
7. What happened?

Checklist:

- Was it a house/garage/shed entered without permission?
- Was anyone home at the time—were they aware of what was happening?
- Was the intruder still there?
- Was it during the day or at night?
- How did the person or people get in—door, window, some other way?
- Was any property stolen? What kind? About what was it worth?
- Was any property damaged? What kind of damage?
- Was any violence or physical force used? To break in? On the occupants?
- Was anyone injured—victims, offenders, both?
- Was there any threat of violence?
- Did you report the burglary to the Police?
 - Telephoned 111
 - Telephoned local Police station
 - Telephoned community Police

- Called in to a Police station? If no, why not?
- Did the Police find out some other way?

Police response

8. I'd like to talk now about your first contact with the Police.

- Did your call get answered/did someone come to the counter?
- How long did that take?
- were you given any advice? **(prompt)** e.g. don't touch anything, ask the neighbours if they saw anything suspicious, note down stolen property, whether you had photos or serial numbers recorded, offered Victim Support.
- Did the Police tell you when they would attend/arrange a time?
- Were you satisfied with the service you received with that call/visit to the station?
 - Yes—why?
 - No—why not?

9. Were you satisfied with the manner of the person who took your call/attended to you?

I'd now like to talk to you about when the Police came to your house.

10. How long did the Police take to come to your house? **If they did not come—go to Q. 17.**

11. Was that within the time they said?

12. Were you satisfied with that? (Note: Might be two visits, first by a uniformed officer taking details of burglary for the offence report and secondly a visit from the scene of crime officer [SOCO] to take fingerprints etc.)

- Yes—why?
- No—why not?

13. What did the Police do when they came?

Checklist:

- collected evidence, e.g. fingerprints, blood
- completed a report
- approached neighbours
- provided security advice
- gave Victim Support and/or Neighbourhood Support information

14. Were you satisfied with what they did?

- Yes—why?
- No—why not?

15. Were you satisfied with their manner when they came to the house?

16. Were you inconvenienced in any way because of the investigation—e.g. had to stay home from work?

Ask all

17. Did you have any further contact with them after that? If yes, what was that about?

Prompts:

- follow-up
- prosecution and court case
- took part in Family Group Conference.

18. Were you satisfied with the further contact you had?

- Yes—why?
- No—why not?

19. Did you get support from anywhere else—e.g. Victim Support, Neighbourhood Support, other? If yes, what did that involve? Were you satisfied with that?

- Yes—why?
- No—why not?

Outcome

20. What was the outcome of your contact with the Police?

Checklist:

- not an outcome, more a service
- Police caught the burglar/s
- Police recovered all/some of the property.

Security measures

21. Did you have any security measures in place at the time of the burglary?

22. Did you make any changes in security following the burglary? If yes, what changes did you make? If no, why not?

23. How useful was the security advice the Police provided?

24. Have you changed the way you think about burglary as a result of your experiences?

25. What about the way you think about the Police—has that changed in any way?
26. Overall, is there any way in which the Police could improve their service?
27. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences with Police?

For repeat victims only—for others go to Q. 33

Can we now go back to the burglary/attempted burglary that happened before the one you've just described?

28. When did that burglary/attempted burglary happen? **Record month/year; attempted/successful**
29. What happened?

Checklist:

- Was it a house/garage/shed entered without permission?
 - Was anyone home at the time? Were they aware of what was happening?
 - Was the intruder still there?
 - Was it during the day or at night?
 - How did the person or people get in—door, window, some other way?
 - Was any property stolen—what kind, about what was it worth?
 - Was any property damaged—what kind of damage?
 - Was any violence or physical force used?
 - Was anyone injured?
 - Was there any threat of violence?
 - Did you report the burglary/attempted burglary to the Police?
 - Telephoned 111
 - Telephoned local Police station
 - Telephoned community Police
 - Called in to a Police station? If no, why not?
 - Did the Police find out some other way?
30. Were you satisfied with the Police response to this burglary/burglary attempt?
 31. Is there anything they could have done better or differently?

Repeat for other burglaries/attempts.

32. Overall, is there anything the Police could do to improve their service for repeat burglary victims?

Ask all respondents—Police initiatives

33. Do you know of any specific Police and community initiatives in **(mention your area)** that aim to reduce burglary? For **each one mentioned, ask:**
34. How effective do you think these initiatives are?

Record the initiatives they mention without prompting and their effect. Note when you start using the checklist as a prompt.

Checklist:

- burglary prevention advice/education
- Police patrols
- community patrols (voluntary)
- community meetings
- Neighbourhood Watch/Support
- Police burglary-specific operations
- brief periods of intense Police activity (e.g. stopping cars)
- Police focus on sellers of stolen property
- Police keeping an eye on known burglars
- Police arresting more burglars/more in prison
- Community constable.

35. Is there anything else you would like to add about the Police or about Police initiatives?
36. Do you have any ideas about how burglary might be reduced?

Finally, can I ask a few questions to help us describe the range of people we talked to:

37. Which one of these statements best describes this household? **Read out and write the answer on your notes.**
- One person living alone
 - Solo parent with child/children
 - Couple without children/children not living at home
 - Couple with children
 - Extended family/whanau
 - Flatmates
 - Family—other combination

- Other (specify)
- **(Do not read)** Refused

38. Can you please tell me which ethnic group you belong to? **Read out and record answer. More than one answer is OK.**

- New Zealand European
- Maori
- Samoan
- Cook Island Maori
- Tongan
- Niuean
- Chinese
- Indian
- Other **write down**

39. Does your household own this house/flat or rent it? **Write the answer down.**

Rented

Owned (including with mortgage)

Other

Refused

Thank you.

I'd just like to check a few things with you about what happens next. Is it OK for the researchers to quote you (without your name being given) anonymously in the report?

Would you like to see any quotes they want to use? **If yes, check contact details.** The researchers will assume that it is OK to use the quotes unless you specifically object.

You can also check the transcript from the interview. Do you want to do that? **If yes, say that the transcript will be available sometime before Christmas.**

Would you like a summary of the final report in 2005?

That's all I need to ask. Is there anything else you'd like to know? Thank you again, and now I'd like you to choose a voucher for your time. **(Offer of music, grocery and petrol vouchers.)**