SHOPLIFTING AS CONSUMER MISBEHAVIOUR

An exploratory study of shoplifting applying a consumer behaviour approach

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leicester

by

Michele Tonglet B.A. (Hons), Dip M.

University College Northampton

April 1999

UMI Number: U594549

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U594549 Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author. Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC 789 East Eisenhower Parkway P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Shoplifting as consumer misbehaviour: an exploratory study of shoplifting applying a consumer behaviour approach

Michele Tonglet

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an exploratory, quantitative study, concerned with investigating shoplifting as a form of consumer behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), a theory used in consumer research, is applied to situational crime prevention theory, in order to investigate the factors which facilitate or inhibit customer theft. The data were collected by means of two questionnaires. The first questionnaire was completed by 417 shoppers using the shopping centre of Northampton, 32% of whom admitted to shoplifting behaviour, with 7% having shoplifted in the previous 12 months. The second questionnaire was completed by 444 Northampton school students, 51% of whom admitted to shoplifting, with 18% having shoplifted in the previous 12 months. Analysis of the findings indicates that for the shoplifters in this study, shoplifting is a rational crime in that the financial benefits from shoplifting are perceived to outweigh the risks and costs of being caught. Their shoplifting behaviour is facilitated by their lack of moral concerns about shoplifting, their positive attitudes to the behaviour, and peer influence. In comparison, the non-shoplifters were inhibited by their anti-shoplifting attitudes, their strong moral views about shoplifting, social pressure not to engage in the behaviour, and the shoplifting prevention strategies of retailers.

CONTENTS

List of tables	viii
List of figures	xvi
Papers resulting from the thesis	xvii
Acknowledgements	xviii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Overview of the Research Problem	1
1.2	The Research Objectives	2
1.3.	The Plan of the Thesis	3

CHAPTER 2: THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THIS STUDY

2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	The Nature of Paradigms	5
2.3	Research Paradigms in the Social Sciences	6
	2.3.1 The Positivist and Interpretivist Paradigms	6
	2.3.2 Integration of the Positivist and Interpretivist Paradigms	8
2.4	Methodological Issues in Criminological Research	9
	2.4.1 Positivism and Criminological Research	9
	2.4.2 Challenges to Positivism	10
	2.4.3 The "New" Criminological Paradigms	11
2.5	The Methodologies of Consumer Research	13
	2.5.1 The Cognitivist Approach to Consumer Behaviour	13
	2.5.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour	15
2.6	The Methodological Stance Taken by this Study	17

CHAPTER 3: THE CONTEXT OF SHOPLIFTING

3.1	Introduction	19
3.2	The Crime of Shoplifting	19
	3.2.1 Society's Reaction to Shoplifting	20
	3.2.2 Labelling Theory and the Apprehension and Disposition of	
	Shoplifters	22
3.3	The Official Crime Figures and Shoplifting	23
	3.3.1 The Limitations of the Official Figures	24
	3.3.2 Store, Police and Court Apprehension Records	25
3.4	Victim and Retail Crime Surveys	25
3.5	Systematic Measurement Studies	30
3.6	Observation or Following Studies	31
3.7	Self-Report Studies	32
3.8	Qualitative Methods	. 35
3.9	Conclusion	. 35

CHAPTER 4: WHO SHOPLIFTS AND WHY?

4.1	Introd	luction	37
4.2	The C	haracteristics of Shoplifters	37
	4.2.1	Shoplifting and Age	38
	4.2.2	Shoplifting and Gender	39
	4.2.3	Shoplifting and Socio-economic Group and Race	41
	4.2.4	The Professional Shoplifter	41
	4.2.5	The Typical Shoplifter	42
4.3	Expla	nations of Shoplifting Behaviour	43
	4.3.1	Psychiatric and Psychological Explanations of Shoplifting	44
	4.3.2	Shoplifting and Economic Motivations	47
	4.3.3	Shoplifting and the Influence of Friends	50
	4.3.4	Shoplifting and Social Control	52
	4.3.5	Shoplifting and Moral Attitudes	53
	4.3.6	Shoplifting as Exciting or Thrill-seeking Behaviour	54
4.4	Typol	ogies of Shoplifters	55
4.5	Conch	usion	56

CHAPTER 5: SHOPLIFTING AS A CRIMINAL DECISION

5.1	Introdu	uction	57
5.2	Shoplif	ting and Opportunity	57
5.3	Deterre	ence Theory	59
	5.3.1	Shoplifting and the Risks and Costs of Being Caught	60
	5.3.2	The Deterrent Effects of Apprehension on Shoplifting	61
5.4	Econor	mic Theories of Crime	62
5.5	Rational Choice Models		63
	5.5.1	The North American Approach to Rational Choice	64
	5.5.2	The UK Approach to Rational Choice	66
5.6	Situati	onal Crime Prevention .	68
	5.6.1	The Prevention of Shoplifting	69
	5.6.2	Crime Analysis	70
	5.6.3	Evaluation of Shoplifting Prevention Measures	71
	5.6.4	Shoplifting Prevention Communications	75
5.7	Conclu	sion	76

CHAPTER 6: SHOPLIFTING AS CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR - AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

6.1	Introduction	
6.2	Shoplifting as Consumer Behaviour	
	6.2.1 The Shoplifter as an "Ordinary" Consumer	
	6.2.2 The Retail Environment	
6.3	The Consumer Behaviour Approach	
	6.3.1 Deviant or Aberrant Consumer Behaviour	81
	6.3.2 Shoplifting as Deviant Consumer Behaviour	83
6.4	The Approach Taken by this Study	85
	6.4.1 The Theory of Reasoned Action	86
	6.4.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour	87

	6.4.3	Criticisms of the Theories	91
		6.4.3.1 Structural Relationships	91
		6.4.3.2 Additional Variables	92
	6.4.4	Reasoned Action, Planned Behaviour and Rational Choice	94
	6.4.5	Relevance of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Shoplifting	
		Research	95
	6.5	Conclusion	97
	TED 6	THE DESEADOR DESIGN	
	Itte	/: IHE RESEARCH DESIGN	08
7.1 7.2	Drolim	ningry Research Stens	90 00
1.2	7 2 1	Research Assumptions	90
	7.2.1	The Research Objectives	99
	723	Research Hypotheses	100
	724	Setting the Research Boundaries	100
	725	Pilot Testing	100
73	The R	esearch Methodology	101
7.0	7.3.1	The Problems of Researching Shoplifting	101
	7.3.2	Potential Options for Researching Shoplifting.	101
	7.3.3	Choosing Between Quantitative and Qualitative Methods	102
		7.3.3.1 Quantitative Methods	102
		7.3.3.2 Qualitative Methods	102
		7.3.3.3 Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods	103
	7.3.4	The Research Methods Used in this Study	103
		7.3.4.1 Interviews	104
		7.3.4.2 The Quantitative Survey	105
	7.3.5	Ethical Issues	106
	7.3.6	Evaluation of the Research Method	107
7.4	Sampl	le Selection	108
	7.4.1.	Sampling Method for the Consumer Survey	108
	7.4.2	Selection of the Shopping "Site"	109
	7.4.3	Selection of the Location	110
	7.4.4	Selection of the Respondents	. 111
	7.4.5	Timing of the Survey	. 112
	7.4.6	Sampling Method for the School Survey	. 112
	7.4.7	Selection of the Schools	. 113
	7.4.8	Selection of the Respondents	113
7.5	Opera	tionalising the Theory of Planned Behaviour	114
	7.5.1	How the Theory "Works"	114
	7.5.2	Measuring the Variables	116
	7.5.3	Reliability and Validity	. 117
7 (7.5.4	Scale Development and Keliability and Validity	. 118
1.6	The C	Onsumer Survey	120
	/.0.1	Stage 1: The Elicitation	120
	1.0.2	Stage 2: The Questionnaire	121
	1.0.5	I ne Cover Letter	123
	1.0.4	Stage Inree: Ine Pollow-up Survey	123

	7.6.5 Pretesting the Consumer Questionnaire	124
	7.6.6 The Final Version of the Consumer Questionnaire	125
7.7	The School Survey	126
7.8	Data Collection Procedures	127
	7.8.1 The Consumer Survey	127
	7.8.2 The School Survey	128
7.9	Data Analysis Procedures	129
	7.9.1 Selection of the Methods of Analysis	129
	7.9.2 The Statistical Procedures	131
7.10	Problems with and Limitations of the Research Design	136
	7.10.1 The Sample	136
	7.10.2 The Questionnaire	137
	7.10.3 Operationalising the Theory of Planned Behaviour	139
	7.10.4 The Data Analysis	139
7.11	Conclusions	140

CHAPTER 8: FINDINGS ABOUT THE CONSUMER RESPONDENTS

8.1	Introd	uction	141
8.2	Questi	onnaire Distribution and Response	142
	8.2.1	Distribution and Response by Location and Type of Retail Outlet	142
	8.2.2	Distribution and Response by Age and Gender	143
8.3	Break	lown of the Response by Demographic Characteristics	144
	8.3.1	Comparisons with the General Population of Northampton	145
	8.3.2	Frequency of Shopping Activity	146
	8.3.3	Shoplifting Experience	147
	8.3.4	Shoplifting and Age	148
	8.3.5	Shoplifting and Gender	149
	8.3.6	Shoplifting and Employment and Income	150
	8.3.7	Shoplifting and Frequency of Using Shops	151
	8.3.8	Statistical Significance of the Demographic Characteristics	151
	8.3.9	Frequency of Shoplifting Behaviour	. 151
	8.3.10	Shoplifting and Being Caught	152
8.4	Shopli	fting Motivation and Attitudes to Shoplifting and Shoplifting	
	Preven	ition	153
	8.4.1	Shoplifting Motivation	153
	8.4.2	Attitudes to Retailers	156
	8.4.3	The Decision to Shoplift	156
	8.4.4	Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures	157
	8.4.5	Attitudes to the Control of Shoplifting	158
8.5	Influer	ce of the Demographic Variables on Shoplifting Attitudes and	
	Opinio	ns	159
8.6	Evalua	tion of the "Traditional" Approach	160
8.7	Shopli	fting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour	161
	8.7.1	Reliability of the Global Measures	161
	8.7.2	Multiple Regression of the Global Measures on Shoplifting	
		Intentions	162
	8.7.3	The Belief Measures	163

	8.7.4	Multicollinearity and Scale Reliability	165
	8.7.5	Multiple Regression Based on the Revised Global and Belief	
		Measures	168
	8.7.6	The Intentions of the Non-shoplifters, Past Shoplifters and	
		Recent Shoplifters	168
		8.7.6.1 The Non-shoplifters	169
		8.7.6.2 The Past Shoplifters	170
		8.7.6.3 The Recent Shoplifters	172
8.8	The Influ	uence of the Individual Variables	172
	8.8.1	The Statistical Procedures	173
	8.8.2	Attitudes and Moral Views	174
	8.8.3	The Outcomes of Shoplifting Behaviour	175
	8.8.4	Social Influence and Shoplifting	179
	8.8.5	Factors which Facilitate or Inhibit Shoplifting	181
	8.8.6	The Impact of the Individual Variables on Shoplifting Intentions	185

CHAPTER 9: FINDINGS ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS TO THE SCHOOL SURVEY

9.1	Introd	luction	186
9.2	Quest	ionnaire Distribution and Response	187
	9.2.1	The Respondents from School A	187
	9.2.2	The Respondents from School B	188
	9.2.3	The Combined School Sample	188
9.3	Demo	graphic Characteristics and Shoplifting Experience	189
	9.3.1	Shoplifting and Age	190
	9.3.2	Shoplifting and Gender	191
	9.3.3	Shoplifting and Money	192
	9.3.4	Shoplifting and Frequency of Using the Shops	192
	9.3.5	Shoplifting and the Sample Characteristics	193
	9.3.6	The Deterrent Value of Apprehension	193
9.4	Shop	ifting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour	194
	9.4.1	Reliability of the Global Measures	194
	9.4.2	Multiple Regression of the Global Measures on Intentions	195
	9.4.3	Inclusion of the Belief Measures	196
	9.4.4	Multicollinearity and Scale Reliability	197
	9.4.5	Multiple Regression based on the Revised Global and Belief	
		Measures	199
	9.4.6	The Intentions of the Non-shoplifters, Past Shoplifters and	
		Recent Shoplifters	199
		9.4.6.1 The Non-shoplifters	. 200
		9.4.6.2 The Past Shoplifters	200
		9.4.6.3 The Recent Shoplifters	. 201
	9.4.7	The Influence of Previous Experience	201
9.5	The Ir	fluence of the Individual Variables	203
	9.5.1	Comparison of the Non-shoplifters, Past Shoplifters	
		and Recent Shoplifters	203
	9.5.2	Attitude and Moral Considerations	204

	9.5.3 The Outcomes of Shoplifting	205
	9.5.4 Social Influence and Shoplifting	209
	9.5.5 Factors which Facilitate or Inhibit Shoplifting	211
	9.5.6 The Impact of the Individual Variables on Intentions	215
	9.5.7 The Influence of Previous Experience	215
9.6	The Influence of Demographic Variables	216
СНА	PTER 10: DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS FROM THE CONSUM AND SCHOOL SURVEYS	ER
10.1	Introduction	217
10. 2	Shoplifting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour	219
	10.2.1 The Reliability and Validity of the Research Design	219
	10.2.1.1 The Assumptions Underlying the Study	219
	10.2.1.2 Consistency of the Theories of Reasoned Action	
	and Planned Behaviour	221
	10.2.2 Explaining Shoplifting Using the Theory of Planned Behaviour	224
	10.2.3 The Revised Model	225
	10.2.3.1 Perceived Control	227
	10.2.3.2 Shoplifting Beliefs	229
	10.2.4 Evaluation of the Theories of Reasoned Action and Planned	
	Behaviour	230
10.3	The Impact of Previous Shoplifting Experience	232
10.4	Attitudes and Moral Views	232
	10.4.1 The Impact of Attitudes and Moral Views on Intentions	233
	10.4.2 Attitudes, Morals and Previous Shoplifting Experience	234
	10.4.3 Attitudes, Morals and Beliefs About Shoplifting	235
10.5	Shoplifting and the Economic Factors	236
	10.5.1 Shoplifting and the Economic Beliefs	236
	10.5.2 Shoplifting and Economic Status	238
10.6	The Risks and Costs of Shoplifting	239
	10.6.1 Shoplifting and the Apprehension Factors	240
	10.6.2 The Risks and Costs of Apprehension	241
	10.6.3 Apprehension and Previous Experience	242
	10.6.4 Attitudes to the Police and Breaking the Law	244
	10.6.5 Apprehension Factors and Shoplifting Intentions	245
10.7	The Influence of Social Factors	246
	10.7.1 The Subjective Norm	246
	10.7.2 The Influence of Family and Friends	247
10.8	Is Shoplifting a Rational Crime?	249
10.9	Interesting But Less Major Findings	252
	10.9.1 The Impact of Retailers' Marketing Strategies	252
	10.9.2 The Effectiveness of Individual Security Measures	253
	10.9.3 Strategies to Control Shoplifting	254
	10.9.4 Evaluation of the Less Major Findings	254

CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION - DRAWING THE THREADS TOGETHER

11.1	Introduction	256
11.2	The Research Objectives	256
	11.2.1 Research Objective 1: The Consumer Behaviour Approach	257
	11.2.2 Research Objective 2: The Theory of Planned Behaviour	258
	11.2.3 Research Objective 3: Shoplifting Attitudes and Beliefs	259
	11.2.4 Research Objective 4: Factors which Inhibit or Encourage Custom	er
	Theft	261
11.3	Contribution to Shoplifting Knowledge	263
	11.3.1 Contribution to the Theory of Planned Behaviour	264
	11.3.2 Contribution to Shoplifting Research	264
	11.3.3 Contribution to Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Theory	266
11.4	Implications of the Findings for Shoplifting Prevention	267
11.5	Areas for Further Research	270
11.6	Conclusion	271

Appendix A	The Survey	275
Appendix B	Findings from the Elicitations	294
Appendix C	The Frequency Distributions for the Consumer Survey	295
Appendix D	Additional Statistical Analysis for the Consumer Survey	320
Appendix E	The Frequency Distributions for the School Survey	332
Appendix F	Additional Statistical Analysis for the School Survey	346
References .		361
Bibliography		402

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER TABLES

2.1	Summary of Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches	7
3.1	Comparative Data from the British Retail Crime Surveys	28
3.2	British Self-report Studies	34
3.3	USA Self-report Shoplifting Studies	34
7.1	Outcome and control beliefs	126
7.2	Application of the statistical procedures	135
8.1	Distribution and response by retail location	142
8.2	Distribution and response by age and gender	144
8.3	Characteristics of the sample	145
8.4	Comparison of the demographic characteristics of the consumer sample	
	and the population of Northampton	146
8.5	Shoplifting history	147
8.6	Respondents by age and shoplifting history	149
8.7	Percentage of each gender involved in shoplifting	149
8.8	Shoplifting and annual income	150
8.9	Shoplifting and employment	150
8.10	Frequency of using shops	151
8.11	Statistical significance of the sample characteristics	151
8.12	Shoplifting apprehensions	152
8.13	The deterrent effect of being caught	152
8.14	Shoplifting motivation, the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention, and the	
	control of shoplifting - comparison of mean scores	154
8.15	Alpha coefficients and correlation coefficients for the global measures	161
8.16	Summary of the regression analysis for intentions	163
8.17	Correlation between global measures and belief measures	164
8.18	Reliability coefficients and correlations - belief measures	164
8.19	Inclusion of the belief measures in the regression analysis	165
8.20	Factor Analysis for the Global Measures	166
8.21	Reliability coefficients and correlations for the revised global measures	166
8.22	Factor analysis for the belief-based measures	167
8.23	Reliability coefficients and correlations for the revised belief measures	167
8.24	Multiple regression based on the revised measures	168
8.25	Multiple regression analysis for intentions by category of respondent	169
8.26	Comparison of Pearson's and Spearman's correlations	173
8.27	Correlation between intentions and attitudes and the moral norm	175
8.28	Correlations between past behaviour and attitudes and moral concerns	175
8.29	Correlations between the outcome beliefs and attitude and moral norm	177
8.30	Correlations between outcome measures and the global variables	177
8.31	Correlations between intentions and the outcome belief measures	178
8.32	Correlations between subjective norm and the global variables	179

8.33	Significant correlations with police - recent shoplifters	180
8.34	Correlations between intentions, subjective norm and referent beliefs	181
8.35	Correlation between intentions and perceived control	182
8.36	Correlations between perceived control and attitudes and morals	182
8.37	Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables	184
8.38	Correlations between control variables and intentions	184
8.39	Correlations between control beliefs and attitude and perceived control	185
8.40	Correlations between intentions and the individual variables	185
9.1	Demographic characteristics of the School A sample	187
9.2	Demographic characteristics of the School B sample	188
9.3	Demographic characteristics of the combined school sample	189
9.4	Shoplifting history	190
9.5	Shoplifting by age	190
9.6	Involvement in shoplifting by age group	191
9.7	Shoplifting and gender	191
9.8	Shoplifting by age and gender	192
9.9	Shoplifting and money available to spend each week	192
9.10	Shoplifting and frequency of using the shops	192
9.11	Statistical significance of the sample characteristics	193
9.12	Frequency of shoplifting	193
9.13	Apprehension for shoplifting	194
9.14	The deterrent effect of apprehension	194
9.15	Reliability coefficients and correlations for the global measures	194
9.16	Summary of regression analysis for intentions	195
9.17	Reliability coefficients and correlations for the belief-based measures	196
9.18	Correlation between the global and belief measures	196
9.19	Summary of multiple regression - belief and global measures	197
9.20	Factor analysis for the global measures	197
9.21	Reliability coefficients and correlations for revised global measures	198
9.22	Multiple regression based on the revised measures	199
9.23	Multiple regression analysis for intentions by category of respondent	200
9.24	Correlations between past behaviour and global and belief measures	202
9.25	Correlation between intentions and the global and belief measures -	
	Pearson's and Spearman's correlations compared	204
9.26	Correlation between intentions and attitudes and the moral norm	205
9.27	Correlations between the economic beliefs and attitude and moral norm	207
9.28	Correlations between outcome variables and the global variables	208
9.29	Correlations between intentions and individual outcome beliefs	208
9.30	Correlations between intentions and apprehension belief likelihood	209
9.31	Correlations between subjective norm and the global variables	209
9.32	Significant correlations with police (evaluation) - recent shoplifters	210
9.33	Correlations between intentions, subjective norm and referent beliefs	211
9.34	Correlations between intentions and the perceived control variables	212

9.35	Correlations between perceived control and attitudes and morals	212
9.36	Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables	214
9.37	Correlations between intentions and individual control beliefs	214
9.38	Likelihood of security measures deterring shoplifting - mean scores	215
9.39	Correlations between intentions and the individual variables	215
9.40	Variables significantly correlated with previous shoplifting behaviour	216
10.1	Comparison of the respondents by shoplifting experience	220
10.2	Multiple regression analysis for intentions - consumers and students	222
10.3	Comparison with Beck and Ajzen's (1991) study	223
10.4	Multiple regression of the global and belief measures on intentions	224
10.5	Factor analysis for the global measures	225
10.6	Multiple regression based on the revised global and belief measures	227
10.7	Previous experience and revised attitude and perceived control	227
10.8	The control measures and attitude and perceived control	230
10.9	Attitudes and moral views	233
10.10	Correlations between intentions and attitudes and moral views	234
10.11	Correlations between past experience and the global variables	234
10.12	Correlations between belief measures and attitudes and moral views	235
10.13	Likelihood and evaluation of the economic factors	236
10.14	Correlations between economic beliefs and shoplifting intentions	237
10.15	Percentage of respondents classified as being on a low income	238
10.16	Likelihood and evaluation of the apprehension factors	240
10.17	The views of the apprehended shoplifters	243
10.18	Significant correlations between motivation to comply with the police and	
	the individual global and belief variables - recent shoplifters	244
10.19	Correlations between apprehension factors and shoplifting intentions	245
10.20	Likelihood and evaluation of the social factors	248
10.21	Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables	248
10.22	Correlations between intentions and the social variables	249
10.23	Intentions and the economic and apprehension beliefs	250
10.24	The six most significant global and belief variables	251

TABLES IN APPENDICES

B 1	Summary of the Elicitation Beliefs	294
C 1	People shoplift because they can't afford the things they need	296
C 2	People shoplift because they have psychological problems	296
C 3	People shoplift because they are under stress	296
C4	People shoplift because they think they won't get caught	296
C5	People shoplift because they think they won't get punished if they are caught	297
C6	People shoplift because they think the benefits from shoplifting are greater than the costs of being caught	297

C7	People shoplift because the retailers' promotional strategies encourage them to want things they can't afford	297
C8	People shoplift because they are tempted by the displays of goods in the shops	207
C 9	People shoplift because they think the prices charged by shops are too	277
C 10	nign	298
	People shopint because they think the shops can arrord the losses	298
	People shopint as a way of earning a living	298
C12	People shoplin to get money for drugs and alconol	298
	People shoplin because they like the reeling of beating the system	299
C14	People snoplin because they think it's exciting	299
CIS	People shoplin because they have easy access to the goods they want	200
016	to steal	299
C10	People shopin because their mends encourage them to	299
CI/	People weigh up the pros and cons of shoplifting before deciding to	200
010		300
C18	People decide to shoplift before they go into the shop	300
C19	People shoplift on the spur of the moment	300
C20	People shoplift because they have the opportunity to do so	300
C21	People don't realise they have shoplifted	301
C22	I would never steal from a small shop	302
C23	I would never steal from a shop where I knew the manager	302
C24	I would never steal from a shop where I had received good service	302
C25	I would never steal from a shop that had treated me fairly	302
C26	Likelihood of CCTV deterring people from shoplifting	303
C27	Likelihood of uniformed security guards deterring people from shoplifting	303
C28	Likelihood of store detectives deterring people from shoplifting	303
C29	Likelihood of electronic tags deterring people from shoplifting	303
C 30	Likelihood of ink tags deterring people from shoplifting	304
C31	Likelihood of alarms on articles deterring people from shoplifting	304
C32	Likelihood of friendly and helpful staff deterring people from shoplifting	304
C33	Likelihood of anti-shoplifting notices deterring people from shoplifting	304
C34	Likelihood of mirrors deterring people from shoplifting	305
C35	Likelihood of locked display cases deterring people from shoplifting	305
C36	Three most effective security measures for deterring shoplifters	305
C37	Three most effective measures for catching shoplifters	305
C38	% of respondents stating that the security measure would make them	
	feel apprehensive	306
C39	Have you ever not used a shop because of the security measures used by	
	retailers?	306
C4 0	Shoplifters should be treated more severely	307
C41	Retailers should report all shoplifters to the police	307
C42	All shoplifters should be prosecuted	307

C43	Shoplifters should be dealt with by the shop they have stolen from and not	
	the police	307
C44	The shops should be able to fine the shoplifters they catch	308
C45	Shoplifters should be banned from shops	308
C46	Anti-shoplifting campaigns in the media would help to reduce shoplifting	30 8
C47	If I saw someone shoplifting I would report them to the shop	308
C48	I intend to shoplift in the future	309
C49	I will shoplift if I have the opportunity	309
C50	Most people who are important to me would not approve of me shoplifting	309
C51	Most people who are important to me think that I should avoid shoplifting	309
C52	For me, shoplifting is good/bad	310
C53	For me, shoplifting is right/wrong	310
C54	For me, shoplifting is wise/foolish	310
C55	For me, shoplifting is rewarding/punishing	310
C56	For me, shoplifting is exciting/boring	311
C57	For me, shoplifting is honest/dishonest	311
C58	For me, shoplifting is easy/difficult	311
C59	There is plenty of opportunity for me to shoplift	311
C60	I can imagine times when I might shoplift even if I hadn't planned to	312
C61	Shoplifting is against my principles	312
C62	It would be morally wrong for me to shoplift	312
C63	I would feel guilty if I shoplifted	312
C64	If I shoplift I will be able to get goods without paying for them	313
C65	If I shoplift I will be able to save money	313
C66	If I shoplift the shops will pass on the costs of my shoplifting to consumers	313
C67	If I shoplift I will get caught by the retailers security measures	313
C68	If I shoplift I will be arrested for committing a crime	314
C69	Getting goods without paying for them is	314
C70	Saving money by shoplifting is	314
C71	Shops passing on the costs of shoplifting to consumers is	314
C72	Being caught by the retailers security measures is	315
C73	Being arrested for committing a crime is	315
C74	My family think I should avoid shoplifting	315
C75	My friends think I should avoid shoplifting	315
C76	The police think I should avoid shoplifting	316
C77	Doing what my family thinks I should do is	316
C78	Doing what my friends think I should do is	316
C79	Doing what the police think I should do is	316
C80	I could shoplift more easily if I thought there was little risk of being caught	317
C8 1	I could shoplift more easily if I thought that the security measures used by	
	retailers were ineffective	317
C82	I could shoplift more easily if I thought the penalties for being caught were	
	not severe	317

C83	I could shoplift more easily if I were short of money	317
C84	I could shoplift more easily if my friends encouraged me to	318
C85	I do think there is little risk of being caught	318
C 86	I do think that the security measures used by shops are ineffective	318
C87	I do think that the penalties for being caught shoplifting are not severe	318
C88	I am often short of money	319
C8 9	My friends often encourage me to shoplift	319
D1	Comparison of mean scores by age - motivation and shoplifting prevention	
	questions	321
D2	Comparison of mean scores by age - the Theory of Planned Behaviour	322
D3	Comparison of mean scores by gender - motivation and shoplifting	
	prevention questions	323
D4	Comparison of mean scores by gender - the Theory of Planned Behaviour	323
D5	Comparison of mean scores by economic status - motivation and shoplifting	g
	prevention questions	324
D .6	Comparison of mean scores by economic status - the Theory of Planned	
	Behaviour	324
D7	Factor Analysis for the Global Measures	326
D8	Factor Analysis for the Belief Measures	327
D9	Significant differences between the past shoplifters	328
D 10	Multiple regression for the two groups of past shoplifters	328
D11	Comparison of mean scores for attitude	329
D12	Comparison of mean scores for the subjective norm	329
D 13	Comparison of mean scores for perceived control	329
D14	Comparison of mean scores for the moral norm	330
D15	Likelihood and evaluation of the economic beliefs	330
D16	Likelihood and evaluation of apprehension beliefs	330
D17	Likelihood and evaluation of referent beliefs	331
D 18	Likelihood and evaluation of control beliefs	331
E .1	How likely is it that you will shoplift in the future?	333
E2	If I have the opportunity I will shoplift in the future	333
E3	Most people important to me think that I should avoid shoplifting	333
E4	Most people important to me would not approve of me shoplifting	333
E5	I think shoplifting is good/bad	334
E6	I think shoplifting is right/wrong	334
E7	I think shoplifting is honest/dishonest	334
E8	I think shoplifting is rewarding/punishing	334
E9	I think shoplifting is easy/difficult	335
E10	I think shoplifting is an exciting thing to do	335
E11	I think shoplifting is a stupid thing to do	335
E12	I think that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting	335
E13	It would be morally wrong for me to shoplift	336
E14	I would feel guilty if I shoplifted	336
E15	If I shoplift I will be able to get things without paying for them	337

E16	If I shoplift I will be able to save money	337
E17	If I shoplift the shops will put up the prices to consumers	337
E18	If I shoplift I will be breaking the law	337
E19	If I shoplift I will be arrested for committing a crime	338
E20	If I shoplift I will be caught	338
E21	Getting goods without paying is	338
E22	Saving money by shoplifting is	338
E23	Getting caught shoplifting	339
E24	Breaking the law is	339
E25	Shops putting up their prices because of shoplifting is	339
E26	Being arrested for committing a crime is	339
E27	My family think I should avoid shoplifting	340
E28	My friends think I should avoid shoplifting	340
E29	The police think I should avoid shoplifting	340
E30	Doing what my family think I should do is	340
E31	Doing what my friends think I should do is	341
E32	Doing what the police think I should do is	341
E33	I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought there was little risk of being	
	caught	341
E34	I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought the retailers' security measur	es
	were ineffective	341
E35	I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought I would not be punished	
	severely if caught	342
E36	I would be more likely to shoplift if I were short of money	342
E37	I would be more likely to shoplift if my friends encouraged me to	342
E38	I do think there is little risk of being caught	342
E39	I do think that security measures are good at catching shoplifters	343
E40	I do think that I will be severely punished	343
E41	I am often short of money	343
E42	My friends often encourage me to shoplift	343
E43	CCTV would stop people shoplifting	344
E44	Security guards would stop people shoplifting	344
E45	Electronic tags would stop people shoplifting	344
E46	Store detectives would stop people shoplifting	344
E47	Would any of these security measures make you feel worried?	345
E48	Have any of these measures ever stopped you from using a shop?	345
F 1	Demographic Variables	347
F2	Shoplifting History	347
F3	The Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures	347
F4	Global Measures	348
F5	Outcome Beliefs	348
F6	Referent Beliefs	349
F7	Control Beliefs	349

F8	Demographic Variables	350
F9	Shoplifting History	350
F10	Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures	350
F11	Global Measures	351
F12	Outcome Beliefs	351
F13	Referent Beliefs	352
F14	Control Beliefs	352
F15	Factor Analysis for the Global Measures	354
F16	Factor Analysis for the Belief Measures	355
F 17	Attitude	356
F18	Subjective norm	356
F19	Perceived control	356
F20	Moral norm	357
F21	Economic beliefs	357
F22	Apprehension beliefs	357
F23	Referent beliefs	358
F24	Control beliefs	358
F25	The influence of age	359
F26	The influence of gender	359
F27	The influence of economic status	360

LIST OF FIGURES

6.1	A Structural Model of the Aberrant Consumer Behaviour/Consumer		
	Behaviour Interface	82	
6.2	Motivation for Customer Theft	84	
6.3	The Theory of Planned Behaviour	89	
7.1	The Structure of the Research Design Chapter	98	
8.1	The Structure of the Analysis of the Consumer Findings	141	
9.1.	The Structure of the Analysis of the Student Findings	186	
10.1	The Structure of the Discussion of the Findings from the Consumer and		
	School Surveys	218	
D1	Scree Plot for the Initial Factor Analysis Solution - Global Measures	325	
D2	Scree Plot for the Initial Factor Analysis Solution - Belief Measures	326	
F1	Scree Plot for the Initial Factor Analysis Solution - Global Measures	353	
F2	Scree Plot for the Initial Factor Analysis Solution - Belief Measures	354	

PAPERS RESULTING FROM THE THESIS

The research findings resulting from this thesis have been the source for the following conference papers and publications:

Conference Papers

'The decision to shoplift' 16th Bi-annual Conference on Subjective Probability Utility and Decision Making, Leeds University, 18-21 August, 1997.

'Money for nothing: why retailers need to improve their communication strategies to inhibit customer theft' 3rd International Conference on Marketing and Corporate Communications, University of Strathclyde 20-21 April, 1998.

'Shoplifting as aberrant consumer behaviour' Doctoral Colloquium, Academy of Marketing Annual Conference, Sheffield Hallam University, 8-10 July 1998.

'Consumer misbehaviour: a study of shoplifting' 10th International Conference on Research in the Distributive Trades, Institute for Retail Studies, University of Stirling, 26-28 August 1999.

Joint paper with Professor Joshua Bamfield

'Understanding consumer behaviour: how shoplifters shop the store', 10th International Conference on Research in the Distributive Trades, Institute for Retail Studies, University of Stirling, 26-28 August 1999.

All the above conference papers were published in the Conference Proceedings.

Publications

Tonglet, M (1998) 'Consumers' perceptions of shoplifting and shoplifting behaviour', in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders Vol II, Perpetuity Press, Leicester

Tonglet, M and Bamfield, J (1997) 'Controlling shop crime in Britain: costs and trends', International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 25 (9) 293-300

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been accomplished through the help and support of numerous people. Specifically, I would like to thank my first supervisor, Professor Joshua Bamfield, for his continued support, guidance and advice throughout the period of my doctoral studies, and my supervisory team, Professor Reva Brown and Dr. David Smith. Together, they have made a project, which at times seemed unachievable achievable through their wit, humour, encouragement and patience. My thanks are also due to Professor Robert East, of Kingston Business School, who provided practical support and advice in the application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to shoplifting. I would also like to thank Chris Powis and his team at University College Northampton Library, for their help and patience. Many thanks are also due to Professor David Briggs and his team at the Nene Centre for Research, and members of the Faculty of Management and Business, University College Northampton. I am grateful to the authors, alive and dead, whose works have contributed to my understanding of the research area, and to the consumer and school respondents who took the time to complete my questionnaire. Special thanks are due to the retailers who allowed me to conduct my survey on their premises, and the staff and teachers who allowed me to conduct my survey in their schools. I would also like to express my gratitude to my colleagues at University College Northampton Business School, specifically, Zena Cumberpatch, Jill Dawes, Sally Laurie, Stephen Swailes, Dr. Jonathan Vickers and Graham Wilkinson, for their continued support and encouragement.

Finally, my thanks go to my parents, family and friends, who have endured without complaint, numerous conversations about shoplifting, and the process of my doctorate, and who have been an endless source of support, encouragement, help and advice.

CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview of the Research Problem

Crime is a major source of loss for many retailers in the UK. By 1995, retail crime losses were equivalent to 0.3% of the gross domestic product, and represented between 20% and 30% of net retail profits (Speed *et al*, 1995), and the retail crime surveys, conducted annually by the British Retail Consortium (BRC) since 1994 (Brooks and Cross, 1996; Burrows and Speed, 1994; Speed *et al*, 1995; Wells and Dryer, 1997, 1998), consistently report retail crime losses in excess of £1.8 billion per year. Although there is some debate as to whether customer theft or employee theft is the major source of retail crime losses, the most recent BRC survey (Wells and Dryer, 1998) reports that customer theft represented 44% of all retail crime losses during 1996/97, and that although retailers spent almost £450 million on crime prevention measures during the period, there were over four million incidents of customer theft, resulting in losses of £608 million from shoplifting. The focus of this study is, therefore, customer theft, or shoplifting as it is more popularly known, although other types of retail crime will be discussed where they provide insights into the problem of shoplifting.

Shoplifting not only threatens the profitability of retailers, but it also raises prices to the consumer, reduces taxation revenue to the government, and is placing an increasing burden on the criminal justice system (Elder, 1989a). Yet despite the enormity of the problem, crime in the retail sector is relatively under-explored (Beck and Willis, 1998). Traditionally, shoplifting researchers have focused on the criminological, sociological or psychological aspects of the crime, investigating the characteristics of shoplifters and the

causes of their behaviour. Much of this research has produced inconclusive findings, although it does suggest that a substantial proportion of customer thieves are adolescents, and that shoplifters come from all social backgrounds and have a variety of motivations for their behaviour. Although more recent shoplifting research has provided useful data about the effectiveness of individual security devices, little is still known about the shoplifters themselves, or about the factors which influence their behaviour. Very little attention has been paid to the factors which encourage or inhibit shoplifting, or to the beliefs, attitudes and perceptions which influence shoplifting behaviour. Such research is, therefore, a weak foundation on which to build measures designed to increase the risks for offenders.

To design effective anti-shoplifting strategies, a greater understanding of how shoplifters view the risks of offending and how they react to deterrence measures is required. As it could be argued that shoplifting shares certain similarities with "normal" shopping behaviour, this study applies a consumer behaviour approach to situational crime prevention theory, in order to provide some understanding of the factors which influence shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour, and of the factors which inhibit or encourage customer theft.

1.2 The Research Objectives

This study was undertaken with the aim of achieving the following research objectives:

- 1. To explore the utility of applying a consumer behaviour approach to situational crime prevention theory to provide a greater understanding of shoplifting.
- 2. To investigate the applicability of using the Theory of Planned Behaviour to understand and explain shoplifting behaviour.
- 3. To gain an understanding of attitudes to shoplifting and the beliefs underlying

shoplifting behaviour, and how these differ between non-shoplifters and shoplifters.

4. To identify the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft. This includes an investigation of shoplifting motivation, and the impact of retailers' shoplifting prevention measures and marketing strategies on shoplifting.

1.3 The Plan of the Thesis

The organisation of this thesis proved to be a difficult and complex task, both in terms of structuring the literature review, and in terms of organising and evaluating the findings. The plan of the thesis is, therefore, discussed in two sections.

The first section of the thesis (the first five chapters) relates to the theoretical concepts underlying criminal, shoplifting and consumer behaviour, and the literature which has explored these concepts. Chapter 2 considers the philosophical foundations on which this study is based. Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 contain the review of the shoplifting literature. Although there has been only limited academic interest in shoplifting, a number of disciplines, including criminology, economics, psychology and sociology, have contributed to shoplifting knowledge, with much of the research being completed as part of a wider investigation into more general areas such as labelling or deterrence. As a result, shoplifting research tends to be fragmented, with researchers examining the problem of shoplifting from diverse perspectives. In addition, the literature is distributed amongst a range of publications, including newspapers and magazines, professional and trade journals, security handbooks and academic publications, and is of varying quality depending on the source. In order to provide a framework from which the problem of shoplifting can be examined and analysed, the review of the shoplifting literature is categorised into four topic areas. Chapter 3 provides a context for the discussion of shoplifting, Chapter 4 considers the characteristics of shoplifters and the causes of their behaviour, and Chapter 5 examines shoplifting as a criminal decision. Chapter 6 discusses shoplifting as consumer behaviour, reviews the research conducted from this perspective, and discusses the theory of consumer behaviour used in this research study to understand and explain shoplifting behaviour.

The second section of the thesis (the final five chapters) relates to the design of the research study, the analysis and discussion of the findings and the conclusions which have been drawn. Chapter 7 is concerned with the research design, Chapters 8 and 9 report the findings from the consumer and the school questionnaires, and Chapter 10 contains the discussion of these findings. Chapter 11 draws the thesis to a conclusion. The chapter evaluates the approach taken by this study, considers the contribution made by this study to shoplifting knowledge, and discusses the implications of the findings for shoplifting prevention.

The references and bibliography are presented in the style of the Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, Pergamon, Elsevier Science Ltd. The approximate word count of this thesis is 99,000.

CHAPTER 2

THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THIS STUDY

2.1 Introduction

'The decision to study a topic in a particular way always involves some kind of philosophical choice about what is important' (Easterby-Smith *et al*, 1991, p 2). The aim of this chapter is to discuss how the approach taken by this study has been influenced by beliefs about knowledge, reality and human nature. Firstly, the underlying philosophical assumptions determining the predominant research paradigms in the social sciences are examined, and as shoplifting is criminal behaviour, this discussion is then related to the major paradigms in criminological research. This study investigates shoplifting as a form of consumer behaviour, thus, the methodological issues underpinning the selection of theories and methods to understand and explain consumer behaviour are also considered. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the philosophical assumptions which have determined the choice of research methods for this study, which attempts to link social science, criminological and consumer behaviour issues.

2.2 The Nature of Paradigms

Kuhn (1970, p 175) describes a paradigm as 'the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by members of a given community'. Thus, a paradigm represents a world view (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), and as discussed by Wagner and Berger (1985) is determined by philosophical assumptions about:

Ontology: the nature of reality and of human nature which influence the way in which the researcher perceives and interprets the world (Morgan, 1983b).

Epistemology: the nature, limits and grounds of knowledge; 'what constitutes legitimate inquiry and warrantable knowledge' (Henwood and Pidgeon, 1993, p 15).

Methodology: how this knowledge can be gained, how researchers 'go about finding whatever he or she believes can be known' (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p 108).

In her discussion of Kuhn's concept of the paradigm, Masterman (1970) notes that Kuhn used the concept of paradigm in at least 21 different ways, which can be grouped into three categories. Firstly, as a complete view of reality or way of seeing; this corresponds to the world view described above, and is used to organise the discussion between the positivist and interpretivist paradigms in the social sciences. Secondly, as the social organisation of science in terms of different schools of thought, and this view is used to discuss the major paradigms in criminology. Thirdly, as the specific use of instruments in the process of scientific puzzle-solving, and this is the basis for the discussion of the theory used in this study.

2.3 Research Paradigms in the Social Sciences

Research in the social sciences seeks knowledge about social reality (Schutz, 1954) and the behaviour and activities of human beings (Gill and Johnson, 1991), and is dominated by two opposing paradigms, positivism and interpretivism (Hughes, 1990; Williams and May, 1996). For the purpose of this discussion, positivism and interpretivism are used as "umbrella" terms to differentiate between the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions underlying each paradigm. It is recognised that within both paradigms there are a variety of approaches, and that within each of these approaches there are a variety of theories and methods.

2.3.1 The Positivist and Interpretivist Paradigms

The positivist and interpretivist paradigms are based on different underlying philosophical assumptions about 'the nature of reality, of social beings, and of what constitutes

knowledge' (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988, p 508). These philosophical assumptions are accepted as given, as there is no way of establishing whether they are true or false (Guba, 1990b; Wagner and Berger, 1985), and determine the choice of research methodology and evaluative criteria (Hirschman, 1986). The positivist and interpretivist approaches are summarised in Table 2.1.

Assumptions	Positivist There is a single, tangible, objective reality. As this consists of causally related facts, human behaviour can be objectively observed and measured.	Interpretivist Reality is socially constructed, subjective, complex and constantly changing, and thus can only be understood holistically.	
Ontological Nature of reality			
Nature of social beings	Deterministic, reactive.	Voluntaristic, proactive.	
Epistemological Overriding goal	Explanation, prediction and control.	Understanding, interpretation, focusing on meaning.	
Knowledge generated	Nomothetic, seeking general, abstract laws which can be generalised across time and context.	Idiographic, time-bound, context-dependent.	
View of causality	Real causes exist.	Multiple, simultaneous shaping.	
Research relationship	Legitimate knowledge is objective and value-free, thus the relationship between the researcher and the phenomenon should be totally independent.	As reality is based on the individual's perceptions, the individual becomes part of the research process, interacting with the researcher.	
Methodological Method of gaining knowledge	Rigid scientific process to infer causal relationships. Hypothetico-deductive based on quantitative measurement. Hypotheses are verified or falsified.	The research design is continually evolving and flexible, examining phenomena in a natural setting from the perspective of the actor.	
Criteria for judging quality of an inquiry	Rigour, internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity	Trustworthiness, credibility, transferability, confirmability	

 Table 2.1
 Summary of positivist and interpretivist approaches

The above table has been compiled from the following sources: Anderson (1983); Bryman (1988, 1989); Christensen (1997); Desphande (1983); Easterby-Smith et al (1991); Finch (1986); Geertz (1973); Guba (1990a, 1990b); Guba and Lincoln (1994); Hammersley (1993); Henwood and Pidgeon (1993); Hirschman (1985, 1986); Hudson and Ozanne (1988); Hughes (1990); Morgan (1983a); Peter and Olsen (1983); Popper (1957); Williams and May (1996). Thus, positivism is based on applying the principles of natural science to the study of people (Bryman, 1988; Hammersley, 1993), whereas the interpretivists reject the positivist approach, arguing that it is 'an inappropriate model for surveying people' (Bryman, 1988, p 3), and 'can only result in a limited understanding of the condition of man in society' (Giddens, 1976, p 14), and are instead concerned with 'how social experience is created and given meaning' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p 4).

2.3.2 Integration of the Interpretivist and Positivist Paradigms

Kuhn (1970) suggests that paradigms are incommensurable, and Anderson (1983), Burrell and Morgan (1979) and Morgan and Smircich (1980) maintain that as the positivist and interpretivist paradigms are based on fundamentally opposing ontological and epistemological assumptions about the nature of knowledge and how that knowledge can be obtained, they cannot be integrated or reconciled. There is, however, considerable disagreement within the social sciences about this issue (see for example, Firestone, 1990; Guba, 1990a; Hassard and Pym, 1990), and Easterby-Smith *et al* (1991, p 22), describe the positivist and interpretivist positions as 'stereotypes', arguing that researchers rarely subscribe 'to all aspects of one particular view'. Desphande (1983) agrees, suggesting that positivism and interpretivism could be viewed as being at either end of a philosophical continuum, with researchers being located somewhere between these two extremes.

The views of Desphande (1983) and Easterby-Smith *et al* (1991) have informed the approach taken by this research study. Although the study is conducted from a positivist perspective, consistent with the predominant paradigms in criminological and consumer research, it is recognised that an interpretivist approach, using qualitative methods, would have value for investigating shoplifting, and this is discussed further in Chapter 7.

2.4 Methodological Issues in Criminological Research

Criminological research is typified by a 'plurality and diversity of problems' and a 'plurality and diversity of approaches' (Jupp, 1989, p 16). Several disciplines, including economics, psychology, psychiatry, sociology and social administration, have contributed to the study of crime, which, as discussed by Jupp (1989), has a social, political and historical context. As in the social sciences, positivism has been the predominant paradigm in criminological research (Taylor *et al*, 1975; Young, 1994), and has had a major influence on the development of the discipline (Muncie *et al*, 1996). This section considers the influence of positivism on criminology and discusses the opposing paradigms which have challenged its dominance. The philosophical assumptions underlying these paradigms are implicit in their view of crime and criminality and the types of knowledge sought.

2.4.1 Positivism and Criminological Research

Positivism rose to predominance in the mid-nineteenth century, challenging the classical view of crime (Jupp, 1989). The classical approach, based on the ideas of the philosophers Beccaria (1738-1794) and Bentham (1748-1832), emphasised free will, rationality and choice, hypothesising that as crime is the outcome of voluntary actions, based on a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of law-breaking, it can be deterred by increasing the costs of criminal behaviour (Roshier, 1989; Vold and Bernard, 1986). Positivist criminology rejected the idea of free will; instead, it argued that crime is determined, either by some predisposition to crime within the individual, or by the society in which the individual lives (Muncie *et al*, 1996; Young, 1994), and thus could be prevented by correction of the influences that cause criminal behaviour, either through rehabilitation or social reform (Albanese, 1984).

Positivist criminology assumes that crime and criminality have an objective and independent existence (Durkheim, 1895), which can be explained by 'the determinate, law-governed nature of human action' (Taylor *et al*, 1975, p 11), and uses scientific, objective methods of data collection to isolate differences between criminals and non-criminals (Heathcote, 1981). Jupp (1989, p 1) contends

Crime and criminality were dependent variables to be explained, and the search was for explanatory or independent variables upon which crime and criminality could be said to be dependent.

Early positivist criminologists (Ferri, 1901; Lombroso, 1911) used scientific methods to determine the individual physiological characteristics which may be associated with criminality, whilst psychological positivism focused on the criminal personality (Eysenck, 1987) and socialisation and upbringing (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; West and Farrington, 1973). Sociological positivists were concerned with the influence of social structures and social processes on behaviour (Barlow, 1996), emphasising social interaction, social norms and group processes (Jeffery, 1971). This resulted in the sociological deviance theories of differential association (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966), anomie-strain (Merton, 1938), cultural deviance (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller, 1958), and control (Hirschi, 1969; Nye, 1958; Reiss, 1951).

2.4.2 Challenges to Positivism

Positivism has remained influential in criminological research due to its application of scientific, objective and quantifiable criteria to the study of crime (Jupp, 1989; Muncie *et al*, 1996). Although it has been challenged by the view that people have the free will to choose their actions, and Marxist critiques which view crime as resulting from social inequality (Bonger, 1916), it was not until the 1960s and 1970s that positivism was

seriously threatened by the opposing theoretical perspective of the new criminology (Muncie *et al*, 1996). Influenced by interactionism and labelling theorists (Becker, 1963; Erikson, 1962; Kitsuse, 1962), the new criminologists (Taylor *et al*, 1973; 1975) were concerned with social reaction to crime, the processes within the criminal justice system which resulted in people becoming labelled as criminal, and the subsequent effects of this labelling. These approaches were more interested 'in the role of social meanings and interactions in the social construction of crime' than 'deterministic or causal explanations' (Jupp, 1989, p 3).

During the same period, feminist criminologists (Klein, 1973; Smart, 1976) criticised positivist approaches for their failure to study female involvement in crime and for their assumptions that female criminality is biologically driven (Klein, 1973; Muncie *et al*, 1996). Feminist criminologists rejected scientific and quantitative methods, arguing that 'such research does not discover what the world is like, but rather imposes its own conceptual schema on to the social world' and is 'exploitative and oppressive' (Sapsford and Jupp, 1996, pp 336-337), in favour of interpretivist and qualitative approaches, which were perceived as being more sensitive to women's issues and experiences (Henwood and Pidgeon, 1993).

2.4.3 The "New" Criminological Paradigms

The failure of positivism to explain the extent and distribution of crime, and to control and rehabilitate criminals, resulted in the emergence of four competing criminological paradigms (Young, 1994). Left idealism developed from labelling and the new criminological perspectives (Taylor *et al*, 1973). Left idealists argue that working class crime is the inescapable result of poverty, and emphasise the role of the state and other

powerful institutions in shaping criminal laws and criminalising the activities of the less powerful (Box, 1983; Hall, 1980; Taylor *et al*, 1973; Young, 1986). Left realism is concerned with the social reality of crime, viewing crime as the result of relative deprivation. It proposes a holistic approach through the study of crime at both macro and micro levels, considering the victim, the offender, the public and the police and other agencies of social control (Matthews and Young, 1986; Young, 1986).

Both right realism and the new administrative criminology have evolved from classical approaches to crime. Right realism views criminal behaviour as voluntaristic, equating crime with economic choice, and argues that crime results from ineffective deterrents, lack of capable guardians, and perceptions of low risks of apprehension (Wilson, 1975). Right realists are concerned with the control of crime, aiming to reduce it through police intervention. The new administrative criminology, based on the work of Clarke and the Home Office, suggests that crime should be viewed 'not in dispositional terms, but as being the outcome of immediate choices and decisions made by the offender' (Clarke, 1980, p 138). Thus, crime is seen as being opportunistic rather than determined by causes, and the focus is on the prevention of criminal behaviour, either by reducing the opportunities for offending or increasing the chances of being caught (Clarke, 1980). This view of crime is exemplified by the Rational Choice Perspective (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a), which hypothesises that criminal behaviour results from the rational choices and decisions made by offenders. Although offenders are viewed as rational decision-makers, unlike the classical approach, it is not assumed that they maximise utility; instead it is recognised that they behave with limited rationality (Simon, 1978) using heuristics (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974) to simplify the decision-making process. This view of behaviour is consistent with research in social psychology and consumer behaviour (Tuck and Riley, 1986). As it suggests that 'normal behaviour and criminal behaviour are not *per se* distinguishable' (Young, 1994, p 92, original emphasis), there is some justification for viewing criminal choice as being similar to consumer choice. This is the approach taken by this study, and the next sections consider consumer research approaches and the research method selected for this research project.

2.5 The Methodologies of Consumer Research

There has been considerable ideological and intellectual debate as to how knowledge about consumer behaviour should be produced (Anderson, 1983; Arndt, 1985; Desphande, 1983; Hirschman 1985), and the 'appropriate philosophical and methodological foundations for consumer research' (Hunt, 1991, p 32). Although several alternative ways of knowing have been proposed, for example, critical relativism (Anderson,1986), relativism/constructionism (Peter and Olson, 1983), humanistic inquiry (Hirschman, 1986) and existential-phenomenological methods (Thompson *et al*, 1990), there is a general consensus that consumer research is 'dominated by "positivism" as a philosophy and "positivistic social science" as a methodology' (Hunt,1991, p 32). As in the social sciences, there are differing approaches within each paradigm, and the next section considers positivist cognitive approaches.

2.5.1 The Cognitivist Approach to Consumer Behaviour

The cognitivist approach to consumer behaviour is concerned with understanding how and why consumers make choices and decisions in the market place, and the factors which influence these choices and decisions (Tuck, 1976). Engel *et al* (1978, p 3) define consumer behaviour as those acts of individuals directly involved in obtaining and using economic goods and services, including the decision processes that precede and determine these acts.

The established position in cognitive consumer research is that consumers are reasonably rational decision makers, who act in accordance with their beliefs and attitudes to achieve their goals (Anderson, 1983; East, 1990, 1997; Engel *et al*, 1995). As discussed by East (1990), consumers make rational choices between alternatives, within the limits of their knowledge, and 'seek particular benefits and to avoid particular costs' (East, 1997, p 9). Although the cognitive world view of consumer behaviour is widely accepted (Engel *et al*, 1995; Foxall, 1992; Howard, 1994), Foxall (1992; 1993; 1995; 1998) argues that cognitive approaches should also recognise the impact of the environmental situation and the individual's learning history on consumer choice.

The cognitive approach has resulted in several positivist theories of consumer behaviour based on information processing and decision-making (for example, Bettmann, 1979; Engel *et al*, 1968, 1995; Howard, 1994; Howard and Sheth, 1967; Nicosia, 1966). The choice of theory is influenced by the researcher's paradigmatic assumptions (Desphande, 1983), and the appropriateness of the theory for investigating the research problem (Bryman, 1988). Engel *et al* (1995) hypothesise that consumer decision-making is influenced by individual differences (time, money, resources, personality, knowledge, attitudes and motivation), environmental influences (social and cultural values, pressures to conform with the norms and expectations of others, and the immediate circumstances of the situation) and psychological processes (learning, information processing, and attitude and behaviour change). As it was considered that these factors are also likely to influence criminal choices and decisions, it was decided that a positivist theory of consumer decision making which incorporated these constructs would be the most appropriate method of investigating shoplifting behaviour. Although the theories of Engel *et al* (1968; 1978), Howard and Sheth (1967) and Nicosia (1966) meet this condition, they have been criticised for being untestable, difficult to operationalise, and for failing to meet 'the criteria of a good science' (Tuck, 1976, p 27), and for failing to specify the relationships between constructs, and how the constructs should be defined and measured (Hunt, 1983; Moschis, 1987). One theory which is regarded by Tuck (1976) as overcoming these criticisms, and which accommodates the constructs identified by Engel *et al* (1995), is the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and its subsequent development, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1985; 1991). These theories were developed in the field of social psychology and have been widely used in consumer research (for example, Bagozzi and Warshaw, 1990; Bagozzi *et al*, 1992; Buttle, 1996; Buttle and Bok, 1995; East, 1992, 1993, 1996; Knox and de Chernatony, 1989; McQuarrie, 1988; Ryan and Bonfield, 1975; Thompson *et al*, 1994).

2.5.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour

The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1985; 1991), like the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) on which it is based, hypothesises that behaviour can be explained by a small number of concepts - beliefs, attitudes and intentions. This section focuses on the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions underlying the theory. The theory's development and operational issues are considered in Chapter 7.

Reasoned action and planned behaviour are cognitive theories which hypothesise that people make reasoned decisions about their behaviour, using the information available to them in a systematic and logical manner (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1980). The ontological
assumptions underlying the theories are positivist in nature, in that they assume a single, objective reality which can be accurately observed and measured. Based on the work of social and cognitive psychologists (Allport, Dulany, Gutman, Likert and Thurstone), it is assumed that beliefs, attitudes and intentions have a real existence (Arndt, 1985; Hunt, 1983; Peter and Olsen, 1983) and that researchers have access to individuals' cognitive states via survey research (Anderson, 1986). Human nature is viewed as that of

Cognitive man: A rational information processor who forms beliefs, attitudes, and intentions that are causally determinant of his behaviour. (Anderson 1986, p 160)

Although this appears to be in contradiction of the positivist view of human nature as being determined, Hudson and Ozanne (1988, p 510) contend that cognitivists 'reify internal subjective states and explain behaviour as being determined by these states'. Gross (1992, p 49) argues that determinism and free will are not incompatible:

Free will regards people as the cause of their own behaviour, so the two views are not opposed on the grounds of whether or not behaviour is caused, but rather in relation to the source and nature of the cause.

Williams (1991) agrees with this point of view. She argues that although positivist criminologists reject the idea of rational man and search instead for the underlying determinants of behaviour, 'the cause of behaviour makes the individual choose to act in a particular way, and so the cause becomes the choice' (Williams, 1991, p 355).

The theories aim to explain and predict behaviour through universal laws which can be generalised to a large number of behaviours, people and settings. Although it could be argued that neither theory is truly universal in nature (Anderson, 1986), and Ajzen and Fishbein (1980, p 245) admit that behaviours such as 'emotional outbursts' and 'the performance of well-learned skills' may not be explained by the theories, and that 'some

people may arrive at their decisions in different ways', Fishbein and Ajzen (1980, p 245) maintain that

the theory is useful for most individuals and with respect to most social behaviours. In our opinion, many behaviours which appear unplanned turn out, on closer examination, to be quite intentional.

As it is assumed that individuals are free to seek and evaluate information which influences their beliefs, attitudes and intentions toward a behaviour, the theories are concerned with generating knowledge about the causal relationships between these variables, using the hypothetico-deductive mode of inference to systematically identify the beliefs and attitudes which influence intentions, and thus, behaviour. As it is assumed that it is possible for researchers to be independent of the object of their inquiry, the objectivity essential for legitimate knowledge is achieved.

The theory adheres to a scientific protocol for operationalisation of the research design. Independent and dependent variables are identified, rules for sample selection and questionnaire design are determined, and procedures established for demonstrating the scientific rigour of the data. This process does not, however, preclude the 'use of pretests and pilot tests that allow the structure of the study to evolve' (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988, p 513) and thus accommodates Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) view that the beliefs salient for a behaviour should be elicited from a sample of the population to be surveyed.

2.6 The Methodological Stance Taken by this Study

The researcher's methodological stance will influence the research design, the type of knowledge generated, and how the findings of research are interpreted. The discussion in the first section of this chapter presented methodological choice as being between the competing paradigms of positivism and interpretivism. The methodological choice

underpinning this study was, however, neither as simple or straightforward as this. Although the philosophical assumptions underlying the positivist paradigm of the social sciences match this thesis's view about reality and the nature of knowledge, shoplifting is regarded as a crime, and therefore must also be considered in relation to the main paradigms of criminological research. This thesis takes the view that individuals are free to make choices and decisions about their involvement in crime, rather than being propelled into criminal behaviour by forces beyond their control. This approach is consistent with the rational choice perspective, which focuses on the decision-making process underlying criminal behaviour. This essentially cognitivist viewpoint leads to the presumption that the choice to engage in crime can be regarded as similar to other behavioural choices, in particular consumer choice. Positivist approaches within the cognitivist paradigm in consumer research assume that human behaviour is free and reasonably rational, whilst acknowledging that situational and personality variables may also influence behaviour. One such approach which appears to be particularly relevant to shoplifting is the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1985; 1991), and rational choice theorists (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a; Tuck and Riley, 1986) have suggested that this approach is appropriate for investigating criminal behaviour.

In summary, the approach developed by this study is based on the view that individuals make reasoned decisions considering the implications of their behaviour, and that factors which influence behaviour can be determined from the investigation of the beliefs and attitudes underlying that behaviour. Thus, the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions underlying the theory of planned behaviour are consistent with rational choice theories of crime and the cognitivist paradigm in consumer research.

CHAPTER 3

THE CONTEXT OF SHOPLIFTING

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a context for the discussion of shoplifting, firstly by discussing the crime of shoplifting and society's reaction to it, and secondly by considering the research conducted to establish the size, extent and costs of the shoplifting problem. The discussion is underpinned by an evaluation of the methods used to research shoplifting, considering the problems inherent in investigating shoplifting behaviour, and researchers' attempts to overcome these problems.

3.2 The Crime of Shoplifting

Shoplifting has received substantial publicity in recent years, due partly to its economic impact on retailers and the increasing incidence of professional shoplifting and violence against shop staff, and also from a growing public concern about law and order and the increasing social and legal costs of crime. Shoplifting, however, is neither a new crime, nor a new word to describe theft from shops (Murphy, 1986). The term shoplifting was first used, both colloquially and officially, in the seventeenth century (Walsh, 1978), and as documented by Cameron (1964), Farrell and Ferrara (1985) and Walsh (1978), theft by customers has been a legal and social issue since the introduction of the first market stalls and is intrinsically linked with developments in retailing. This has led to the suggestion that the increase in shop theft over the past thirty years is partly attributable to modern retailing practices such as open displays and self-service (Angenent, 1981; D'Alto, 1992; Dickenson, 1970; Merrick, 1970; Rosenblatt, 1981), although there is only limited empirical research to substantiate this. As the term shoplifting is widely used to

describe theft from shops by customers it is used throughout this study. Retailers, however, refer to shoplifting as "shop theft" or "customer theft", and there is no specific criminal offence of shoplifting in the UK (Adley, 1978). Shoplifters are prosecuted under the Theft Act 1968, Section 1 (1), which consolidates previous legislation relating to theft (including shop theft), stipulating the penalties for the crime, and states that a person is guilty of theft if he/she dishonestly appropriates property belonging to another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it (Home Office, 1968). Thus, to obtain a shoplifting conviction, it must be established that the offender has taken (*actus reus*) the shops' goods with the intention (*mens rea*) of stealing them (Smith, 1981).

3.2.1 Society's Reaction to Shoplifting

An important aspect of shoplifting is society's response to it, both in terms of how the crime is perceived, and in terms of reaction to the shoplifter. Andenaes (1966) argues that although some acts are illegal because the state defines them as such (i.e. drug use and traffic violations), others, for example murder or theft, are inherently criminal in that they violate the moral codes and norms of society, and deterrence theorists (Meier and Johnson, 1977; Silberman, 1976; Waldo and Chiricos, 1972) have demonstrated that this distinction influences perceptions as to the seriousness and deterability of criminal acts.

Although shoplifting is inherently criminal by Andenaes' definition, there is some suggestion in the shoplifting literature that it is not perceived as a serious crime (Elder, 1989b; Klemke, 1992). Brodsky *et al* (1981) and Kraut (1976) refer to shoplifting as a folk crime, which infers that it is not as criminal as other types of crime and implies that retailers are perceived as "fair game" as they can afford the losses inflicted by shoplifting.

Smigel (1956; 1970) contends that many people see little wrong in certain types of crime against large organisations, and attitudes to retailers have been identified as possible motivators of shoplifting behaviour (Ray, 1987; Strutton *et al*, 1995). The studies by Jensen *et al* (1978) and Warr (1989) suggest that shoplifting is not perceived as seriously as other types of property theft, and The Home Office (1983) maintain that the term shoplifting does not reflect the seriousness of the behaviour, or that it is a criminal offence. Sennewald and Christman (1992) agree, arguing that shoplifting is a euphemism for theft and Newburg (1968) reports that none of the store personnel in her Chicago supermarket study referred to shoplifting as stealing. Bamfield (1997a) argues that some retailers feel that the criminal justice system does not view shoplifting as an important crime, as it is given low priority, and the majority of shoplifters are cautioned rather than prosecuted.

Criminological research indicates that many crimes are not reported to the police by either the victims or the witnesses (Darley and Latane, 1968; Denner, 1968; Maguire, 1994), and Bamfield (1994a) reports that only 40% of the retailers in his survey referred apprehended shoplifters to the police. Low prosecution rates, failure of fines and penalties to act as a deterrent, the costs of prosecution and adverse publicity were among the reasons cited for non-referral. US researchers (Bickman and Helwig, 1979; Bickman and Rosenbaum, 1977; Derkte *et al*, 1974; Hartman *et al*, 1972; Klentz and Beaman, 1981; Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1977) investigated how customers in shops respond to the crime of shoplifting. Experimental conditions were used to stage shoplifting incidents, and to vary the sex and appearance of the apparent shoplifter. The studies indicate that the majority of respondents neither noticed, nor reported, the staged shoplifting incident (suggesting that customers are unlikely to play a significant role in deterring shoplifting). In addition, there was little consensus as to the impact of the shoplifter's age, gender, class or appearance on the respondents' reporting of shoplifting activity. The reliability of these studies is limited by the use of small, geographically unrepresentative samples, and although this is an interesting approach to investigating reactions to shoplifting, it is unlikely that a staged event can replicate "real life".

3.2.2 Labelling Theory and the Apprehension and Disposition of Shoplifters

Labelling theory hypothesises that the label of criminal can result in people making false or inaccurate assumptions about offenders, and that this stereotyping results in selffulfilling prophecy (Lilley *et al*, 1989; 1995). Although research into the effects of labelling has produced conflicting findings (Farrington, 1977; Matsueda, 1992; Wellford, 1975), labelling theory has been used to explain criminal "careers", the official crime figures, and why some individuals or groups are more likely to be apprehended and punished for criminal behaviour (Barlow, 1996).

Labelling theory implies that extra-legal factors, such as age, gender, race and class, are influential in determining who is apprehended and prosecuted (Williams, 1991). May (1978) concludes from his interviews of store detectives, that they have clear stereotypes of who is likely to shoplift, and focus on working-class customers and juveniles. Walsh (1978) reports that 41% of the shopkeepers in his study claimed that they could recognise a shoplifter. Murphy (1986) also suggests that store detectives tend to concentrate on certain types. This approach could, however, result in the perpetuation of the stereotype (Burrows and Lewis, 1987).

Retailers differ in their attitudes to the prosecution of shoplifters (Axelrod and Elkind,

1976; French *et al*, 1984; Munday, 1986). Although Bamfield (1994a) reports that 25% of UK retailers consider the age of the shoplifter, US studies indicate that retailers' referral and prosecution decisions are more likely to be related to the value of the merchandise stolen (Cohen and Stark, 1974; Feuerverger and Shearing, 1982; Hindelang, 1974), physical resistance to arrest (Davis *et al*, 1991) and the professionalism of the shoplifter (Lundman, 1978), than the characteristics of the individual shoplifter. Adams and Cutshall (1984) and Walsh (1978) report that the police decision to prosecute is influenced by prior criminal history and value of the stolen merchandise, rather than age, gender or race, although there is some suggestion that the elderly and the young are less likely to be prosecuted (Burrows and Lewis, 1987; Ekblom, 1986; Murphy and Iles, 1983). Although there is little evidence to suggest that "extra-legal" factors determine the prosecution of shoplifters, these factors may influence who is apprehended for shoplifting, and thus referred to the police and recorded in the official crime figures.

3.3 The Official Crime Figures and Shoplifting

A major problem in shoplifting, as in other types of criminological research, is establishing the extent of the problem. The usual starting point for the investigation of crime is the official crime figures (Wiles, 1971), and shoplifting is recorded in the Criminal Statistics for England and Wales under the category of theft and handling stolen goods. This category represented 47.1% of notifiable offences recorded by the police in 1997, with theft from shops accounting for 12.7% (274,000 offences) of offences in this category (Home Office, 1998). Thus, shoplifting accounted for 6% of all notifiable offences, and is characterised by a high "clear up" rate (74%), as the majority of offences only come to the attention of the police when an offender is caught (Burrows and Tarling, 1987).

3.3.1 The Limitations of the Official Figures

The reliability and accuracy of the official crime figures have been the subject of much debate (Bottomley and Coleman, 1980; Erickson and Empey, 1969; Skogan, 1977), and Maguire (1994) and Tarling (1993) suggest that the official crime figures are subject to the following limitations, all of which are problematic for shoplifting research.

Firstly, they are based on crimes known to the police. Skogan (1977) suggests that there are a large number of crimes which are not reported to, or recorded by, the police (the dark figure of crime). As shoplifting tends only to be reported to the police when an offender is apprehended, it is widely accepted that the official crime statistics reflect only a small percentage of shoplifters (Burrows and Lewis, 1987; Home Office, 1973; Murphy, 1986). In addition, the official figures relate only to known offenders and reveal nothing about offenders who are not caught. Bamfield (1994a) and Speed *et al* (1995) suggest the majority of shoplifters escape detection, thus apprehended shoplifters may not be representative of the general shoplifting population, particularly if their apprehension results from their inexperience or ineptitude (Klemke, 1992).

Kitsuse and Cicourel (1963) and Box (1983) argue that the official crime figures reveal more about the agencies operating within the criminal justice system, than of the behaviour of individual criminals. Thus, those apprehended and prosecuted for shoplifting may not be representative of shoplifters in general, but are rather an indication of the policies and biases of retailers, store detectives, the police and prosecutors (Burrows and Lewis, 1987; Murphy, 1986). In addition, the official figures provide little information about the costs of shoplifting, and attempts to identify trends in shoplifting are problematic due to changes in legislation and recording practices (Jupp, 1989; Maguire, 1994). The relevance of these limitations is supported by studies which attempt to evaluate trends in shoplifting by comparing the Home Office Statistics with data obtained from retailers (Bamfield, 1997a; Farrington and Burrows, 1993; Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997). These studies indicate that the official figures for shoplifting offences are substantially lower than the retailers' apprehension records suggest.

3.3.2 Store, Police and Court Apprehension Records

Records of apprehended shoplifters have been widely used to investigate the characteristics and motivations of shoplifters. These studies are subject to the problems of the official crime figures, and are further limited by the absence of comparative data on a control group of non-shoplifters (Cox *et al*, 1990; Murphy, 1986). In addition, each type of study presents specific problems. Studies of store apprehension records are specific to one store, or a small group of similar stores, in one geographical area, and are thus not necessarily generalisable to other stores or areas. For example, the type of goods sold by the store and its location will influence the demographic characteristics of the customers using the store, and of the shoplifters apprehended. Studies of police and court records are even more restrictive, in that as already discussed, not all apprehended shoplifters are reported to the police, and different police authorities may have varying attitudes to the disposition of the shoplifters. Thus, the official records of apprehended shoplifters may not be representative of the shoplifting population, and studies which utilise these figures have questionable reliability (Klemke, 1992; Murphy, 1986).

3.4 Victim and Retail Crime Surveys

In view of the problems of the official figures, criminologists have assessed the level of various types of crime by questioning random samples of the population about their

experiences as victims of these crimes (Sapsford and Jupp, 1996; Williams, 1991). Both national (Mayhew *et al*, 1992; 1994) and local surveys (Jones *et al*, 1986; Kinsey, 1986) consistently report a higher level of victimisation than that recorded by the police. Victim surveys are, however, subject to sampling error, and are dependent on the respondents' truthfulness, memory and understanding of what constitutes a crime (Sapsford and Jupp, 1996; Williams, 1991). In addition, crimes against commercial or corporate victims are excluded (Maguire, 1994).

Increasing concern about undetected retail crime has resulted in this type of survey being adapted for use with retailers. As with the victim surveys, retail crime surveys are subject to sampling and measurement problems. Although crimes such as burglary, arson and criminal damage are usually detected at the time of their occurrence, shoplifting losses are frequently only discovered at audit (Bamfield, 1994a). In view of the difficulty of measuring shoplifting directly, retailers calculate the shrinkage rate (the difference between the retail sales value for goods delivered to the stores and the actual amount realised on the sale of these goods, expressed as a percentage of sales volume) and apportion a percentage of this to shoplifting (Elder, 1989a). As this percentage is based on the perceptions of retail management, and organisations may measure shrinkage differently, the reliability of this data is questionable. In addition, different sizes and types of retailers in different geographic locations may vary in their experiences of retail crime, thus it is difficult to obtain a representative sample. This problem is further compounded by low response rates, as many retailers are reluctant to disclose their crime losses either through secrecy, or because they do not have reliable figures (Elder, 1989a).

Four national retail crime surveys were conducted in the UK during the 1970s and 1980s

(Home Office, 1973, 1986; Touche Ross, 1989; Elder, 1989a). These surveys were based on a fairly uncertain methodology (Bamfield, 1994a), and failed to provide accurate data about retail crime, other than to estimate that shrinkage represented between 1% and 1.5% of turnover, and that shoplifting probably accounted for about one-third of shrinkage losses. Consequently, recognition of the need for reliable data on the extent and costs of retail crime, which would enable changes to be monitored over time, resulted in three generically different surveys of UK retail crime being conducted during the 1990s, by Bamfield (1994a), the British Retail Consortium, henceforth referred to as the BRC (Burrows and Speed, 1994; Speed *et al*, 1995; Brooks and Cross, 1996; Wells and Dryer, 1997, 1998), and the Home Office (Mirrlees-Black and Ross, 1995).

The data from these surveys are summarised in Table 3.1. Although comparisons are problematic, due to the use of different research methods, the surveys provide some indication of the extent and costs of retail crime in the UK, and demonstrate the importance of shoplifting in comparison with other types of retail crime. These surveys are, however, subject to several limitations which restrict their reliability and generalisability. Firstly, it is uncertain how representative the outlets surveyed are of UK retailing. Small retailers, who may suffer disproportionately from the impact of retail crime, are under-represented in the BRC surveys (Wells and Dryer, 1998). Although Bamfield and the Home Office utilised stratified random sampling in an attempt to resolve this problem, the smaller sample sizes limit the generalisability of the findings. Response rates and reliability of the information present further problems. Although the Home Office study achieved a 67% response rate, the response rate for the Bamfield survey was only 15% and the response rates of shrinkage to compute shoplifting

27

Survey	Bamfield	BRC	Home Office	BRC	BRC	BRC
Survey year	1993	1993/4	1993	1994/5	1995/6	1996/97
Scope of survey	UK	GB	England & Wales	GB	GB	GB
Number of outlets	18,699	52,857	1,666	52,709	48,157	44,500
Annual retail sales £m	35,000	64,172	-	72,323	84,528	90,000
Percentage of market	24.7%	41%	-	44%	52%	51%
Retail crime losses £ million	£2,282	£2,151	£780	£1,490	£1,423	£1,380
Retail crime as a % of turnover	1.44%	1.36%	0.7%	0.91%	0.85%	0.81%
Shoplifting as a % of retail crime losses	43.3%	37.3%	26.0%	42.9%	45.6%	 6 44.1%
Total shoplifting losses £ million Losses directly attributable to	£981	£748.4	£203	£644	£653	£608
shoplifting Losses apportioned from	-	£201	£203	£213	£211	£ 220
shrinkage	£981	£547.4	-	£431	£442	£388

Table 3.1 Comparative Data from the British Retail Crime Surveys

Sources: Bamfield (1994a); Brooks and Cross (1996); Mirrlees-Black and Ross (1995); Speed et al (1995); Wells and Dryer (1997, 1998).

losses, although the BRC figures also include losses due to witnessed incidents of shoplifting. The Home Office study used telephone interviews rather than mail questionnaires to survey individual retail outlets, thus it may possibly provide more accurate data, as it does not rely on the perceptions of retail management, and individual outlets are more likely than head offices to have complete data on shoplifting incidents. Although use of the British Telecom Business Database and the high response rate suggest that Home Office survey may be more representative of retailing, the study is limited by its failure to consider the impact of undetected shoplifting.

Bamfield and Hollinger (1996) compared the UK surveys with the 1993 US National Retail Security Survey (Hollinger and Dabney, 1994), and estimate that shrinkage in the USA is 18.9% greater than in the UK. The UK studies suggest that customers are the main source of retail crime losses, whereas in the USA employee theft is considered to be more significant, with 42.1% of losses being attributed to employees, compared to 32.4% to customers (Bamfield and Hollinger, 1996). Bamfield (1997b; 1998) argues that measuring staff and customer theft separately may underestimate employee theft, as staff and customers may collaborate to steal from shops, and his study of security managers estimates that 40% of customer theft may be the result of collusion with shop staff.

Local surveys also provide some indication of the extent of shoplifting. In a study of 240 small asian shops in London, Ekblom *et al* (1988) found that 54% of the shopkeepers surveyed had been the victims of shoplifting, and Phillips and Cochrane (1988) report that 67% of the 100 tenants completing their survey of crime in a large Midlands shopping complex stated that shoplifting was a problem. USA studies report similar findings. Of the 670 retailers in 21 states surveyed by French *et al* (1984), 73% stated that they had a problem with shoplifting, and Lin *et al* (1994) report that shoplifting was a problem for 57% of the respondents in their survey of 158 clothing outlets in North Louisiana and North Texas. These studies suffer from similar limitations to national surveys, and are further restricted by smaller sample sizes, and the use of specific types of store in defined geographical areas. In addition, the UK studies have been conducted in inner city areas where crime is endemic, surveys of low crime areas may produce different findings.

The utility of national retail crime surveys is demonstrated by the ongoing use of this approach by the British Retail Consortium and the University of Florida, and their introduction into New Zealand (Guthrie, 1997). Despite their limitations, they provide a more accurate representation of the extent and costs of shoplifting than the official crime figures. The BRC surveys consistently report annual shoplifting losses in excess of

£600 million, and provide some indication of the extent of undetected and unreported shoplifting. For example, the 1996/97 survey (Wells and Dryer, 1998) indicates that less than 30% of shoplifters were apprehended, and that of those apprehended, only 69.8% were reported to the police. To provide more exact data on the incidence of shoplifting in individual stores, methods for measuring undetected shoplifting have been devised.

3.5 Systematic Counting Studies

US researchers McNees *et al* (1976; 1980) pioneered a technique of repeated systematic counting to accurately measure shoplifting losses in individual stores. This involves the tagging, counting and recording of sales for specified items, and daily inventory checks to infer the number of stolen items. Their method was replicated in Sweden by Carter *et al* (1979; 1988), in the USA by Thurber and Snow (1980), and in the UK by Buckle *et al* (1992), Farrington *et al* (1994) and Beck and Willis (1998).

Buckle *et al* (1992) used systematic counting to estimate shoplifting losses in twenty-nine branches of a UK electrical retailer. Of the specified items (tapes, headphones, films, small domestic appliances) leaving the stores, 10.9% were stolen as opposed to sold. As this figure correlated significantly with stock audit data, it was concluded that systematic counting is a valid method of measuring shoplifting losses. Farrington *et al* (1994) replicated this study in ten electrical retailing stores, and reported a similar shoplifting rate (10.5%). As the two studies were conducted over a short time period, in the same retail group, the extent to which these findings can be generalised throughout retailing is not known. In addition, this approach does not distinguish between customer and staff theft. Farrington *et al* (1994) assumed that staff theft during the period of study was unlikely, as the staff were aware of the daily inventory checks and the frequency of staff searches was increased. There is, however, no evidence to support this assumption.

Beck and Willis (1998) conducted a similar study of theft of easy-to-carry goods in ten branches of a national electrical retailer, and estimate that approximately 10% of stock of this type is likely to be stolen. Although this study is subject to the limitations already discussed, and systematic counting is labour-intensive and difficult to operationalise (Beck and Willis, 1998), the consistency of the findings from the three UK studies suggest that systematic counting is valid method of measuring shoplifting losses.

3.6 Observation or Following Studies

To investigate the incidence of shoplifting in individual stores, researchers have followed randomly selected customers from when they entered the store until they left (Astor, 1969, 1971; Marks, 1975). Although these studies indicate that between 4.4% and 11.8% of the customers followed were observed stealing, the use of security personnel rather than social scientists to conduct the surveys, and difficulties in substantiating that the shoppers had been selected randomly, restrict the reliability of the findings.

Buckle and Farrington (1984; 1994) conducted similar studies in two small department stores in Peterborough and in Bedford. In the Peterborough study, 9 (1.9%) of the 486 customers followed stole. In the Bedford study, 6 (1.2%) of the 502 customers followed stole. Although Buckle and Farrington attempted to resolve some of the criticisms made of previous observational research (two trained observers were used, and the sample was carefully selected at random), both studies were based on small samples, and it is unknown whether these results would be replicated in other stores, in other areas, and at other times of the year. In addition, it is difficult to ascertain whether the shoppers knew that they were being followed (awareness of being observed might have changed their behaviour), and observation of behaviour suggestive of shoplifting does not establish intention to steal (Burrows and Lewis, 1987; Murphy, 1986).

Buckle and Farrington (1984) attempted to generalise from the Peterborough sample to the population, with the result that they could be 95% certain that the shoplifting rate in the population is between 0.6% and 3%. In addition, they estimated that over 500 items per week were being stolen from the Peterborough store. Comparison of this figure with the number of shoplifting crimes for the area recorded by the police, suggested that the police were only recording between 1 in 100, and 1 in 1,000 shoplifting incidents. Although Buckle and Farrington's conclusions result from a sophisticated statistical analysis based on data subject to limitations, they provide some indication of the extent of shoplifting, and suggest that a substantial number of shoppers steal without detection, thus emphasising the importance of using alternative methods to the official figures.

3.7 Self-Report Studies

Self-report studies are based on small samples of the population, who are asked, either in an interview or by a self-completed questionnaire, about the extent to which they have committed various types of crime during a specified period of time (Jupp, 1989). The advantages of this type of study are summarised by Hood and Sparks (1970, p 13)

...they make possible an estimate of the number of people who commit deviant acts of various kinds, and the frequency with which they do it; they allow the comparison of official with unknown delinquents; they facilitate longitudinal surveys of the delinquent "careers" of individuals over time; and finally they are indispensable for any study that attempts to compare delinquents with a control group of supposedly innocent people.

Although self-report studies may overcome some of the problems associated with the official figures, they are subject to limitations. A major problem is the honesty of the respondents and their ability to recall accurately their past criminal behaviour (Nettler,

1978; Williams, 1991). Questions about sensitive matters such as crime are liable to distorted and untruthful answers, respondents may over-report criminal involvement wishing to be seen as delinquent, or under-report for fear of being seen as bad or criminal (Murphy, 1986). To overcome these problems, researchers have utilised indirect methods, for example, randomised response designs (Geurts *et al*, 1975-1976; Reinmuth *et al*, 1975), projective techniques (Lo, 1994; Prestwich, 1978) and scenario methods (Nagin and Paternoster, 1993; Strutton *et al*, 1994; Tibbetts, 1997). There is, however, little evidence to suggest that these methods result in more reliable data, although the card-sorting techniques employed by Belson (1975) and Farrington (1973) are likely to produce more reliable information in interview surveys.

The representativeness of the sample is also problematic, as this type of study tends to utilise small samples of specific segments of the population. Thus, the generalisability of the data is limited, and individuals likely to be engaged in criminal activity may be excluded. For example, the study by McCarthy and Hagan (1991) suggests substantial involvement in shoplifting by the homeless, and Williams (1991) argues that studies of schoolchildren or students are likely to exclude truants and drop-outs. Although selfreport surveys are subject to methodological limitations, they have consistently shown that minor offences are more common than the official crime figures suggest (Nettler, 1978; Williams, 1991), and several studies support their validity and reliability (Farrington, 1973; Hindelang *et al*, 1979; Huizinga and Elliott, 1986).

Shoplifting has been included in several British self-report studies of adolescent delinquency, and in addition, studies specific to shoplifting have been conducted in the USA. Although these studies, summarised in Tables 3.2 and 3.3, have produced largely

inconsistent findings, and are subject to the methodological limitations previously discussed, they indicate that a substantial proportion of the populations surveyed admit to shoplifting. In addition, as argued by Klemke (1992), self-report studies are often the only method of obtaining data on many aspects of shoplifting.

Researcher	Place of study	Sample Description	% admitting shoplifting	
Belson (1975)	London	1425 males aged 13-16. 85% response rate. Individual interview.	70%	
Farrington (1973)	London	405 males aged 14-15. 98.5% response rate. Individual interview.	19.3% large stores, 36.8% small shops	
Graham & Bowling(1995)	England & Wales	738 males, 910 females, aged 14-25. 64% response rate. Individual interview.	19.7% (23.9% males, 15.5% females)	
Mawby (1980)	Sheffield school	327 males, 264 females aged 13-15. 80% response rate. Classroom questionnaire.	53.6% of males and 38.6% of females in last year	
Riley & Shaw (1985)	England & Wales	378 males and 373 females aged 14-15. 71% response rate. Individual interview	9% in last year (12.4% males, 5.9% females)	

 Table 3.2
 British Self-report Studies

Sources: Belson (1975); Farrington (1973); Graham and Bowling (1995); Mawby (1980); Riley and Shaw (1985).

 Table 3.3
 USA Self-report Shoplifting Studies

Researcher	Place of study	Sample Description	% admitting shoplifting	
Cox et al (1990)	Georgia	871 males, 821 females, school grades 7-12. 97% response rate. Classroom questionnaire.	37% in last year	
Jolson (1974)	Maryland	105 male, 92 female adults. Response rate 68.2%. Random shoppers. Questionnaire.	43%	
Kallis & Vanier (1985)	Southern California	277 adults,155 males, 122 females. Response rate 27%. Mail questionnaire.	41.9% ever, 18% in last 12 months	
Klemke (1982)	Pacific North-west	1189 males and females under 16. 74.5% response rate. Classroom questionnaire.	63.2% ever	
Ray (1987)	Spokane, Washington	382 adults. Response rate 38%. Random shoppers. Questionnaire.	9% in last year	

Sources: Cox et al (1990); Jolson (1974); Kallis and Vanier (1985); Klemke (1982); Ray (1987).

3.8 Qualitative Methods

To obtain a more detailed understanding of shoplifting, researchers have employed qualitative methods. Murphy (1986) used the ethnographic approach to investigate shoplifting and the organisation of shop security in England, arguing that the meaning of shoplifting can only be understood by examining the social processes which inform the production and management of shoplifters. Researchers have also interviewed shoplifters to obtain information about their shoplifting experiences (Butler, 1994; Gill and Turbin, 1997; Tunnell, 1992). This approach is dependent on small, self-selected samples, who may have a hidden agenda for their participation, and as the representativeness of the samples is unknown, this imposes limits as to how far the results can be generalised. The limitations of qualitative studies are, however, compensated for by the detailed insights provided about shoplifting behaviour, data unobtainable from other sources.

3.9 Conclusion

The preceding discussion indicates that true extent of the shoplifting problem is not clear. There are no accurate data available on shoplifting, only estimates (Farrington, 1999). The official crime figures are an imperfect measure of criminality for all but the more serious types of crime, and their methodological limitations are exacerbated by the fact that the majority of shoplifting incidents are either undetected or unreported. Although researchers have developed alternative methods to overcome the problem of the "dark figure" of shoplifting, these methods also have limitations, which restrict the reliability and generalisability of their findings. Nevertheless, as discussed by Nettler (1978), when different methodologies indicate similar findings, then considerably more confidence can be placed in the results, and the studies evaluated in this chapter point to the same conclusion. The official crime figures grossly underestimate the extent of shoplifting, and shoplifting is not an isolated behaviour. Instead, it appears to be widespread, involving a substantial proportion of the population.

.

CHAPTER 4

WHO SHOPLIFTS AND WHY?

4.1 Introduction

As in criminological research, one of the major concerns of shoplifting research has been to identify the type of person who shoplifts and to provide some understanding of the causes and motivation of shoplifting behaviour. Although there have been numerous empirical studies investigating shoplifters' characteristics and motivations, there is no widely accepted method for researching shoplifting behaviour. The two methods most commonly employed are studies of apprehension records or self-report surveys, and as discussed in Chapter 3, the reliability of these studies is restricted by their methodological limitations. This chapter, therefore, compares the findings from alternative research methods in order to establish any commonalities in the characteristics of shoplifters and the causes and motivations of their behaviour, and, where appropriate, utilises more general criminological research to verify these findings.

4.2 The Characteristics of Shoplifters

Criminological research into property crime suggests the majority of offenders are male juveniles, and that participation in this type of crime is inversely related to age, peaking in the mid-teens (Farrington, 1992; Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983; Maguire, 1994). The relationship between crime and race or social class is less clear, with analyses of the official crime figures and self-report surveys producing conflicting findings (Braithwaite, 1981; Hindelang, 1978; Hindelang *et al*, 1979). The following discussion analyses whether these propositions apply to the crime of shoplifting and considers the utility of identifying the characteristics of the "typical" shoplifter.

4.2.1 Shoplifting and Age

It is commonly believed that the majority of shoplifters are adolescents (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1984), and in her analysis of the apprehension records of a Chicago department store, Cameron (1964) found shoplifting to be most prevalent in the under-20 age groups and that involvement in shoplifting declined progressively with age. Studies of store apprehension records (Brady and Mitchell, 1971; Klemke, 1992; Robin, 1963), police records (Fear, 1974; Griffin, 1970; Won and Yamamoto, 1968) and court records (Bennett, 1968; Gudjonsson, 1982; Murphy, 1986; Poyner and Woodall, 1987; Redding, 1976; Walsh, 1978) generally support Cameron's findings, although there is some disagreement as to the extent of juvenile involvement. Although the department store studies of Brady and Mitchell (1971) and Robin (1963) report that over 60% of apprehended shoplifters were under 19, the studies of supermarket and police records suggest a more even age distribution, and although a substantial percentage of the apprehended shoplifters in these studies are juveniles, they do not represent the majority.

Although Klemke (1992) argues that the high proportion of juvenile apprehended shoplifters could result from youth being being less proficient at shoplifting than adults, or being watched more carefully by store personnel, the British self-report studies reported in Chapter 3, Table 3.2, indicate that substantial numbers of adolescents admit to shoplifting behaviour. USA studies of schoolchildren and students also report high involvement in shoplifting by the under-20s, and confirm that involvement in shoplifting is inversely related to age. In Klemke's (1982) study, 63% of the students reported shoplifting involvement, and in the study by Cox *et al* (1990), 37% admitted to shoplifting in the previous 12 months. In both studies, shoplifting activity declined as the students

moved through the high school years. El-Dirghami (1974) reports that 51% of the high school students in his study had shoplifted compared to 40% of the college students, and in a national USA crime survey, which tracked high school seniors until the age of 23, Osgood *et al* (1989) found that for both males and females, shoplifting involvement declined progressively from the age of 17 to the age of 23.

Both apprehension and self-report studies are restricted by methodological limitations, and comparisons are problematic due to the use of different methods, age groups and time periods. The prevalence of juvenile shoplifting, and the pattern of shoplifting peaking in adolescence and subsequently declining with age is substantiated by criminological research into property crime (Farrington, 1992; Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983; Maguire, 1994). Although these studies are also subject to methodological limitations, the longitudinal studies by Farrington (1973; 1977; 1992), which investigate the "criminal careers" of a cohort of adolescents, utilise a rigorous methodology to overcome some of the limitations of self-report studies, and thus more confidence can be placed in the results. Although Farrington's studies suggest that involvement in crime peaks during the mid-teens, shoplifting studies indicate a slightly different pattern, with the studies by Bennett (1968), Gudjonsson (1982) and Klemke (1978b) indicating the under-15s to be the group most involved in shoplifting. This implies that shoplifting may precede involvement with other types of criminal behaviour. Such a conclusion would, however, be premature until further, more rigorous research is conducted in this area.

4.2.2 Shoplifting and Gender

Although criminological research (Hindelang et al, 1979; Maguire, 1994) indicates that females have a much lower rate of criminality than males, shoplifting has often been described as being a predominantly female crime (Abelson, 1989a, 1989b; O'Brien, 1983). Although the earlier studies (Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Robin, 1963) indicate that the majority of apprehended shoplifters were female, more recent studies (Klemke, 1992; Murphy, 1986) indicate increasing male involvement in shoplifting. Campbell (1981) and Buckle and Farrington (1994) analysed the Home Office Criminal Statistics for 1978 and 1989 respectively. They report that although shoplifting is the crime for which women are most frequently cautioned or convicted, more males than females are convicted for shoplifting, and Farrington (1999) reports 1.7 recorded male shoplifters for every female in his analysis of the 1996 official crime figures for England and Wales.

Analysis of the age distributions of the apprehended shoplifters suggests that females become involved in shoplifting at a later age than males, and indicates that in the under-20 age group, males are considerably more likely to be apprehended for shoplifting than females. The prevalence of adolescent male shoplifting is supported by the British selfreport studies, summarised in Chapter 3, Table 3.2, which consistently report that male adolescents are more likely to shoplift than females, and USA self-report studies (Gold, 1970; Klemke; 1982; Kraut, 1976; Moschis, 1985).

Mayhew (1977) and Buckle and Farrington (1994) argue that the apparent predominance of female shoplifting could be explained by opportunity, as the majority of shoppers are female. Mayhew (1977) analysed the "following" studies conducted by Astor, Group 4 Security and Marks, and reports that although two-thirds of the shoppers followed were female, the difference in proportion of male and female shoplifters was not statistically significant. The following studies of Buckle and Farrington (1984; 1994) indicate, however, that when men and women have equal opportunity to shoplift, males are far more likely to shoplift than females. Thus, comparisons from three different research approaches, supported by criminological findings, indicate that shoplifting is not a predominantly female crime as is commonly assumed, and the pattern of increasing male involvement in shoplifting possibly reflects the fact that increasing numbers of males are using the shops and therefore have more opportunity to shoplift.

4.2.3 Shoplifting and Socio-economic Group and Race

As in criminological studies, research into the relationship between shoplifting and social class and race has produced inconclusive findings. Both apprehension studies (Cameron, 1964; Won and Yamamoto, 1968) and self-report surveys (Bales, 1982; Cox *et al*, 1990; Gold, 1970; Jolson, 1974; Klemke, 1982; Ray, 1987) indicate that shoplifters are likely to come from all income groups and socio-economic classes. The relationship between shoplifting and race is unclear, with the studies by Bales (1982), Cameron (1964), Gold (1970) and Tittle (1980) reporting conflicting findings. The data available on both social class and race are of limited quality due to the problems inherent in measuring these variables (Klemke, 1992) and the methodological limitations of the type of studies used. The studies suggest, however, that shoplifting is not restricted to the lower classes, and both Sohier (1969) and Murphy (1986), have commented that shoplifting is an "ordinary" crime which involves all sections of society.

4.2.4 The Professional Shoplifter

Although professional thieves are thought to represent only a minority of shoplifters, it is likely that they contribute disproportionately to the shoplifting problem (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1984; Cleary, 1986). The term "professional" when applied to crime implies The pursuit of crime as a regular, day-by-day occupation, the development of skilled techniques and careful planning in that occupation, and status among criminals. (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970, p 274)

Murphy (1986) suggests that the store detectives in his study were classifying as professional any thief who behaved in a cool, calculating and deliberate manner, thus confusing professional with professionalism, and concludes that professional shoplifters in terms of Sutherland's definition are rare. Both Cameron (1964) and Francis (1980) suggest that only approximately 10% of shoplifters are professional thieves. The majority of apprehended shoplifters are regarded as amateur, due to the nature and the low value of the items stolen (Adley, 1978; Astor, 1971), and their lack of previous shoplifting convictions (Cameron, 1964). As most professional shoplifters are not caught due to their expertise and knowledge of store security (Harris, 1979; Kreppein, 1957), apprehension records provide little information about their activities. Qualitative research provides descriptions of shoplifting as part of a professional criminal career (Gamman, 1996; Shaw, 1930; Sutherland, 1937), and professional shoplifters have provided descriptive accounts of their shoplifting experiences and techniques (Klokis, 1985; Willis, 1991). Klokis (1985, p 17) estimates that he and his booster team were stealing \$1.2 million a year, and states, 'we would steal more in one day, money-wise, than 40, 50 or 100 amateurs would steal in two years.' Although Klokis's claims cannot be substantiated, and his criminal occupation throws doubt on his veracity, his proposition that professional shoplifters are responsible for a substantial proportion of customer theft is consistent with that of security professionals (Edwards, 1970; Farrell and Ferrara, 1985).

4.2.5 The Typical Shoplifter

Cameron (1964) and Sohier (1969) suggest that shoplifters are demographically

representative of the general populations from which they are drawn. Berlin (1992) and Cobb (1973b) maintain that there is no "typical" shoplifter, and Walsh (1978, p 75) argues

Today the shoplifter can be anyone, there are no features of dress, age, or sex or economic status that help us to identify him, and trying to do so leads quickly to stereotyping.

Burrows and Lewis (1987) agree with this view, and warn of the implications stereotyping, contending that it would result in security personnel concentrating their efforts on those believed to conform to the stereotype, and those not conforming would escape apprehension, thus

There is, in short, a danger that stereotypes of shoplifters - invalid or otherwise - operate in a vicious circle, making it more and more likely that they will be proved correct. (Burrows and Lewis, 1987, p 232)

Murphy (1986) reports that store detectives tend to focus on certain types, and security professionals have developed typologies of shoplifters, usually classifying them as amateurs, professionals, kleptomaniacs, drug addicts, housewives or juveniles (Boyd and Harrell, 1975; Sennewald and Christman, 1992). As shoplifters are usually undistinguishable from the general population (Walsh, 1978), perhaps a more useful approach to shoplifting is to identify the underlying causes of the behaviour.

4.3 Explanations of Shoplifting Behaviour

Shoplifting research suggests a diverse range of explanations for the behaviour which can be broadly categorised into psychological/psychiatric, economic, social influence, moral attitudes and the search for thrills or excitement. As there is no theory of shoplifting behaviour, in order to provide a theoretical basis for the analysis, each category and the research relating to it is discussed in relation to the appropriate criminological theory.

4.3.1 Psychiatric and Psychological Explanations of Shoplifting

Positivist criminologists locate the causes of crime within the individual, and there is continuing interest into how individual dispositions (biological and psychological factors, personality and intelligence) influence criminal behaviour. Although studies investigating the relationship between crime and biological and genetic factors have produced inconclusive findings (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Mednick *et al*, 1987), researchers are investigating the effect of brain and neural disorders on criminality (Farrington, 1994; Fishbein, 1990), and future research in this area may have implications for shoplifting. In addition, shoplifting has also been linked with eating disorders (Schwartz and Wood, 1991), alcohol or drug addiction (Lamontagne *et al*, 1994), dementia (Miller *et al*, 1997), psychosomatic complaints (Beck and McIntyre, 1977) and the use of prescription drugs (Mortimer, 1991a; Williams and Dalby, 1986).

Female shoplifting has been attributed to "women's nature" (Mayhew, 1977; Ray, 1987), and associated with kleptomania (discussed in the following section), physiological and hormonal changes in adolescence, pregnancy and menopause (Epps, 1961; Neustatter, 1954; Prince, 1980; Russell, 1973), mental or psychosomatic illness (Gibbens, 1962, 1963, 1981; Gibbens *et al*, 1971), and consistent with Freudian approaches, inner emotional conflicts related to unconscious motivations or sexual themes (Badonnel, 1968; Meyers, 1970; Rouke, 1957, 1960; Versele, 1969). The research into these areas is of extremely limited quality, relying on psychoanalytical interpretations of interviews with small numbers of female offenders referred for psychiatric evaluation. Feminist criminologists argue that women's experiences are integral to understanding female criminality (Carlen, 1988; Heidensohn, 1985, 1994; Klein, 1973; Smart, 1976), however, approaches which label women as pathologically "sick" ignore the fact that female involvement in crime may be an expression of dissatisfaction with their position and lifestyle (Campbell, 1981).

The term kleptomania has been used in connection with shoplifting since the beginning of the 19th century, and was originally used to explain the actions of middle-class females who regularly stole from department stores without an apparent motive (Abelson, 1989a, 1989b; O'Brien, 1983). Kleptomania is a compulsive behaviour which Sarasalo *et al* (1996, p 6) describe as:

the recurrent failure to resist impulses to steal items even though the items are not needed for personal use or for their monetary value.

Despite the publicity kleptomania has received, Gudjonsson (1990) suggests that less than 5% of apprehended shoplifters fulfill the medical criteria for the diagnosis of kleptomania, and this is supported by psychiatric studies of convicted shoplifters (Arboleda-Florez *et al*, 1977; Bradford and Balmaceda, 1983; Cupchick, 1992; Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Sarasolo *et al*, 1996, 1997). Sarasalo *et al* (1997) suggest that there are intermediate stages between kleptomania and shoplifting, and several studies have noted the compulsive nature of shop theft (Aust, 1987; Beaumont, 1984; Gauthier and Pellerin, 1982; Gudjonsson, 1987; Moore, 1983; Orbach, 1993; Ornstein *et al*, 1983).

Studies of shoplifters referred for psychiatric evaluation (Arboleda-Florez *et al*, 1977; Arieff and Bowie, 1947; Bradford and Balmaceda, 1983; Cupchik and Atcheson, 1983; Fugere *et al*, 1995; Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Ordway, 1977; Schlueter *et al*, 1989; Yates, 1986) indicate that depression or stress, resulting from personal or family difficulties or recent personal loss, are likely to contribute to shoplifting behaviour. Adult self-report studies attempting to assess the influence of stress on shoplifting report conflicting findings. Although Ray (1987) suggests that shoplifters are more likely to be under personal, social and family stress, and to be suffering from depression, isolation, loneliness and marital problems, McShane *et al* (1991) found little difference between non-shoplifters and shoplifters in levels of pyscho-social stress. Shoplifting has also been attributed to absent-mindedness (Bradford and Balmaceda, 1983; Mortimer, 1991b), there is, however, little empirical evidence to substantiate this (Reason and Lucas, 1984). Forgetfulness is a convenient excuse, and is difficult to prove (Cunningham, 1975), nevertheless, absent-mindedness together with other forms of psychiatric and psychological disorders are frequently used as a defence against shoplifting to prove that the offender did not have the intent to commit the crime (Craft and Spencer, 1984).

Research into the link between criminality and personality has produced largely inconclusive findings, although there is some support for assertiveness and resentment of authority being associated with criminal behaviour (Williams, 1991). To investigate whether shoplifters have a more deviant/criminal personality than non-shoplifters, Beck and McIntyre (1977) administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to a sample of 154 university students. Of these students, 34% were classified as chronic shoplifters, and the MMPI indicated that these shoplifters had psychopathic personalities and strong anti-establishment attitudes. These findings are not supported by Moore's (1983) study of convicted student shoplifters. Moore used the California Psychological Inventory to compare the personalities of convicted shoplifters with a control group of students, and found no meaningful personality differences between the groups. As only 22% of the shoplifters were classified as deviance-prone, Moore concludes there is little evidence to suggest shoplifters are psychopaths.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) and Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) have proposed integrated theories of crime which acknowledge the influence of individual personality factors, such as aggression, impulsiveness and inability to delay gratification, which they define as low control. Although there has been little research into this area, Farrington's methodologically rigorous, longitudinal Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (discussed in Farrington, 1999) suggests an association between the "anti-social" personality and apprehension for shoplifting.

The link between intelligence and criminality is not clear (Vold and Bernard, 1986; Williams, 1991), although Hirschi and Hindelang (1977) found low IQ to be as good a predictor of delinquent behaviour as social class and upbringing. As student studies (Ba-Yunus and Allen, 1979; Kraut, 1976) suggest high levels of shoplifting in these populations, and more general studies (Kallis and Vanier, 1985; Won and Yamamoto, 1968) indicate little difference in educational attainment between non-shoplifters and shoplifters, there is little evidence to suggest that shoplifting is related to low intelligence.

Although psychiatric and psychological studies provide some interesting insights into shoplifting, their methodological limitations severely restrict the confidence which can be placed in their findings, and general surveys (Cameron, 1964; Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Yates, 1986) indicate that only a small minority of shoplifters are suffering from psychiatric or psychological disorders.

4.3.2 Shoplifting and Economic Motivations

Shoplifting is usually perceived as an economic crime (Klemke, 1992; Yates, 1986), and although this implies that shoplifters are motivated by need, resulting from poor economic

conditions or unemployment, it also suggests that people shoplift as a way of earning a living, to obtain goods they couldn't otherwise afford, or to "get something for nothing" (Griffin, 1970; Kraut, 1976; Robin, 1964).

Anomie-strain theory (Merton, 1938) hypothesises that the motivation to commit a crime arises when there is pressure to succeed, but the legitimate means of achieving success are not available, resulting in a strain which drives the individual to criminal means of achieving their goals. Strain theory was originally formulated to explain lower class crime and implies that crime will be more prevalent among the economically disadvantaged. Although the studies by Ray and Briar (1988) and Moore (1984) indicate unemployment and economic need significantly contribute to shoplifting behaviour, as already discussed, shoplifters are likely to come from all income groups and social classes, and both Cameron (1964) and McShane and Noonan (1993) report that a substantial percentage of the apprehended shoplifters in their studies had sufficient money in their possession to pay for the stolen articles. This implies that some shoplifters either steal from greed or because there are products which are desirable but unaffordable.

Appelbaum and Klemmer (1974) and Rosenblatt (1981) argue that shoplifting results from society's emphasis on material possessions, and strain explanations of crime, defined by Agnew (1992, p 51) as the 'disjunction between aspirations and expectations' fit well with today's consumerist society, and can apply equally to all social classes. Ray and Briar (1988, p 179) contend that shoplifting may be the result of 'perceived deprivation' reporting that the shoplifters in their study placed a high value on possessions such as designer clothes and luxuries, and Campbell (1981), discussing the relationship between consumer materialism and shoplifting in adolescent females, suggests that they steal to keep up with the demands of fashion. Cox *et al* (1990) found that economically oriented shoplifters consistently stole the most expensive products, and Cameron (1964) also reports the frequent theft of luxury goods. Alternatively the theft of these items could reflect their high resale value or perceptions that they are over-priced (Ray, 1987).

Decision-making approaches (discussed in Chapter 5) imply that shoplifting results from an economic calculation of the costs and benefits of the crime, and there is considerable evidence from both self-report and apprehension studies that shoplifters steal for financial benefit and because they perceive the risks of apprehension to be low (Kraut, 1976; Schlueter *et al*, 1989; Yates, 1986), and Moore (1984, p 58), describing the behaviour of the amateur thieves in his study of convicted shoplifters, states 'the pattern of shoplifting was maintained by a realistic assessment of the relative risks and benefits'.

There are three identifiable groups of shoplifters whose behaviour is likely to be influenced by economic motivations: professional shoplifters (discussed in section 4.2.4), drug addicts and the homeless. Research into drug-related crime (Carpenter *et al*, 1988; Faupel, 1986; Jarvis and Parker, 1989; Parker and Newcombe, 1987) suggests that drug users finance their addiction by various criminal activities, and indicates significant involvement of respondents in shoplifting. For example, in a self-report study of 356 heroin users in Miami, Inciardi (1979) found that 59.4% of the males and 70% of the females had shoplifted, admitting to a total of 14,856 shoplifting offences between them. The studies by Snow *et al* (1989) and McCarthy and Hagan (1991) suggest that the homeless are also significantly involved in shoplifting, with 53% of respondents in the study by McCarthy and Hagan admitting to shoplifting items valued less than \$50.

The studies discussed in this section are restricted by methodological limitations, however, as they all indicate that a substantial proportion of shoplifting is financially motivated, a certain degree of confidence can be placed in their findings. Although juvenile self-report studies also identify financial motives (Dingle, 1977; Cox *et al*, 1990; Klemke, 1982), they also indicate that shoplifting is likely to be influenced by non-economic factors such as social influence, and the search for excitement or thrills.

4.3.3 Shoplifting and the Influence of Friends

Johnson (1979) and Richards *et al* (1979) suggest that peer influence is likely to play a motivating role in delinquent behaviour, and both cultural deviance theories (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller, 1958), and the Theory of Differential Association (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966) hypothesise that criminal behaviour results from associating with peer groups favourably disposed to crime. Sutherland maintains that the skills, motives and attitudes necessary for criminal behaviour are learned through interaction with others, and that

a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to the violation of the law over definitions unfavourable to violation of the law (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970, p 75).

Burgess and Akers (1966) and Akers *et al* (1979) revised Sutherland's theory to include social learning principles, suggesting that involvement in crime depends on the social reinforcements that reward criminal activity, and this approach has been used in programmes designed to change the behaviour of convicted shoplifters (Casey and Shuman, 1979; Glasscok *et al*, 1988; Kolman and Wasserman, 1991; Royse and Buck, 1991; Russell, 1978; Solomon and Ray, 1984). There is considerable evidence in the shoplifting literature that the shoplifting behaviour of adolescents is influenced by peer associations. Bales (1982), Cox *et al* (1990) and Kraut (1976) suggest that knowledge of successful shoplifting by friends may reduce perceptions of risk, and having friends who shoplift may result in the behaviour being seen as acceptable and provide a supportive climate for the behaviour. In addition, adolescents may feel pressure to shoplift to gain acceptance by social groups (Belson, 1976) or to obtain expensive or socially desirable products (Cox *et al* 1990; Johnson 1979). Both Belson (1975) and Klemke (1982) conclude that the shoplifting behaviour of the adolescents in their self-report studies is related to the proportion of their friends who also engage in the behaviour. Cox *et al* (1993) investigated the role of friends in the development of adolescent shoplifting. Their self-report study of 1534 school students indicates a strong relationship between shoplifting and peer influence, partially due, they suggest, to a weakening of moral objections about the behaviour.

Baumer and Rosenbaum (1984) suggest that adolescent shoplifting is a group activity, and this is supported by both apprehension and self-report studies. Robin (1963) reports that 75.3% of the juvenile shoplifters in his study were apprehended in groups, compared to 23.3% of the adults. Brady and Mitchell (1971) report similar findings in their study of apprehended shoplifters, 81.3% of the under 20s were accompanied, compared to 24% of the adults, and the UK self-report study of 54 boys aged 11 to 14 conducted by Shapland (1978) indicates that 63% of the shoplifting incidents from small shops, and 75.4% from large stores, involved groups.

These studies suggest that association with other shoplifters encourages shoplifting behaviour, and their findings are supported by qualitative research (Gamman, 1996;
Weiner, 1970) and anecdotal evidence in the press and in security publications about shoplifting gangs. Although the studies by Klemke (1982) and Kraut (1976) indicate that shoplifters are likely to know other shoplifters, when asked to identify the reasons for their shoplifting behaviour, the respondents were more likely to name experiential or economic factors rather than peer pressure. Cox *et al* (1990) report similar findings and suggest that the relationship between peer associations and shoplifting requires further investigation.

4.3.4 Shoplifting and Social Control

Social control theorists (Nye, 1958; Reckless, 1967; Reiss, 1951) are concerned with the factors that prevent deviance, and how society persuades its members to conform to its rules through social controls. Hirschi (1969) argues that individuals with weak social bonds are more likely to be involved in crime, and his self-report study of California youth indicates that law-abiding juveniles were more likely to have strong attachments to their parents and school, and to have negative beliefs about delinquent behaviour.

Although Wilkinson (1980) found that girls from single-parent families were more likely to shoplift than girls from an "intact" home, the difference was not statistically significant for boys, and neither Richards *et al* (1979) nor Bales (1982) found a significant relationship between shoplifting and current parental marital status in their studies of students. Cox *et al* (1993) report that youths with strong parental attachments were less likely to shoplift, and suggest that this is due to the fact that parents influence the moral beliefs of their children, and may also influence their choice of friends. Belson (1975) reports a strong relationship between truancy and stealing, and Klemke (1982) suggests that the students in his study who did not like school and were experiencing grade and attitude problems were more likely to shoplift.

4.3.5 Shoplifting and Moral Attitudes

Control theories imply that criminal behaviour is constrained by acceptance of society's rules and norms, and Kraut (1976) reports that the most important reasons for the non-shoplifting behaviour of the students in his study were their own honesty, and their belief that shoplifting was unacceptable behaviour. Although self-report studies indicate that shoplifters do not perceive shoplifting to be as serious or as wrong as non-shoplifters (El-Dirghami, 1974; Kraut, 1976; Kallis and Vanier, 1985), most of the amateur convicted shoplifters in Moore's (1984) study acknowledged that shoplifting is illegal and morally wrong. Cameron (1964), Strutton *et al* (1994) and Turner and Cashdan (1988) contend that many shoplifters are otherwise law-abiding citizens who accept the rules and norms of society, but if this is the case, why do they steal?

Sykes and Matza (1957) and Matza (1964) argue that individuals are not committed to criminality, but "drift" between law-abiding and criminal behaviour, justifying crime through techniques of neutralisation. Sykes and Matza (1957) list five justifications for criminal behaviour: denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties, and argue that the use of these neutralisations enables individuals to violate laws which they usually accept and obey. Thus, 'neutralising arguments excuse the actor and facilitate deviant behaviour.' (Landsheer *et al*, 1994, p 44)

Hollinger's (1991) study of deviance and theft in the work place provides support for neutralisation theory, particularly for older workers. Minor (1981; 1984) and Agnew and Peters (1986) also report limited support for neutralisation techniques in their self-report shoplifting studies of US students, although Agnew and Peters (1986) suggest that these techniques will only lead to shoplifting when the individual encounters situations where the neutralisations are applicable. In their mail survey of a random sample of residents of a south-eastern U.S. city, Strutton *et al* (1994; 1995) found that although the majority of respondents disapproved of shoplifting there was limited support for negative attitudes towards the retailer being responsible for the shoplifting behaviour of some consumers.

Cameron (1964) asserts that the majority of the apprehended shoplifters in her study did not think of themselves as thieves, and used a number of excuses to explain away their behaviour. Similarly, Moore (1984, p 59) comments that the semi-professional thieves in his study rationalised their shoplifting behaviour with the following beliefs: 'not a crime', 'everybody steals', 'it doesn't hurt anyone' and the 'store is ripping us off'. Kraut (1976) reports, however, that the shoplifters in his study did not rationalise their behaviour, but took responsibility for it, stating that they stole because they didn't want to pay and because they considered shoplifting to be acceptable. The limited research into neutralisation provides tentative support for the theory, and research which identifies "excuses" for shoplifting could provide insights into how shoplifting attitudes and behaviour could be changed (Solomon and Ray, 1984).

4.3.6 Shoplifting as Exciting or Thrill-seeking Behaviour

Appelbaum and Klemmer (1974), Brodt (1994) and Gold (1970) have likened shoplifting to a game or a competitive sport, and experiential motives for shoplifting have been identified by several researchers (El-Dirghami, 1974; Turner and Cashdan, 1988; Cox *et al*, 1990). Both Belson (1975) and Klemke (1982) suggest that the desire for fun and excitement is a major causal factor of theft, and Klemke (1982) reports that 42% of the adolescent students in his study identified sporting motivations (to see if they could get away with it, and for fun and excitement). Kallis and Vanier (1985) comment that the adult shoplifters in their study were likely to possess an orientation to thrill-seeking behaviour, and psychological studies of adult female shoplifters suggest that some may steal for sexual gratification (Coid, 1984; Rouke, 1957).

Katz (1988) criticises psychological and sociological explanations of crime, arguing that they ignore the factors which make crime an attractive and seductive behaviour. He takes a phenomenological approach, which explores the individual's 'lived experience of criminality' (Katz, 1988, p 3), to investigate the shoplifting behaviour of mainly female criminology students at the University of California. His study indicates that for these students, shoplifting is rather more than a way of obtaining material items, and his descriptive accounts of their behaviour suggest that they are seduced into taking items and feel excitement and sensual pleasure, both from the stolen items, and from getting away with the theft. Katz (1988, p 53) describes nonviolent property crime as a 'sneaky thrill' and identifies five types of experiences: a test of being able to conceal shoplifting from others, shoplifting as a type of game, or as a sexual or religious experience and shoplifting as a personal triumph.

4.4 Typologies of Shoplifters

Shoplifters steal from shops for a diversity of reasons, and it is likely that different types of shoplifters require different types of explanations (Farrington, 1999). Typologies provide a means of systematically reducing a complex behaviour such as shoplifting to a more manageable level, and thus enable insights into the causes of the crime and how the behaviour can be prevented (Clinard and Quinney, 1973; Klemke, 1992). Several shoplifting researchers have taken this approach. Cameron (1964) differentiated between

boosters (professionals) and snitches (amateurs), Arboleda-Florez *et al* (1977) classified shoplifters into snitches (frequent shoplifters), unusuals (no apparent motive) and psychotics (suffering from delusions), and Moore (1984) described the apprehended shoplifters in his survey as impulsive, episodic, amateur or semi-professional. Despite the apparent promise of this approach, no recent typologies of shoplifting behaviour have been developed.

4.5 Conclusion

Research into shoplifting characteristics and motivation is typified by data which is methodologically limited, and somewhat inconclusive findings. All that can be said with any degree of confidence is that a substantial proportion of shoplifters are likely to be adolescents, and that economic considerations, peer pressure or experiential factors appear to be important. Furthermore, deterministic approaches do not explain why others in a similar situation do not steal from shops, or why many shoplifters only steal on an occasional basis (Katz, 1988). Clarke (1980) argues that deterministic approaches tend to view a small number of criminals as being responsible for the majority of crimes (yet research indicates that shoplifting is widespread), and suggest interventions in areas where it is difficult to achieve any effects, for example, the pathology of the individual, or family, economic and social conditions. The failure of deterministic theories to explain the pervasiveness of shoplifting indicates that an alternative approach is required, and the next chapter evaluates whether theories which view shoplifting as being the result of the choices and decisions made by the offender provide a more comprehensive view of shoplifting motivation and more effective strategies for preventing the behaviour.

CHAPTER 5

SHOPLIFTING AS A CRIMINAL DECISION

5.1 Introduction

As the motives for shoplifting are as diverse and complex as the shoplifting population, an alternative approach is to focus on the crime itself, and investigate the immediate circumstances of shoplifting, both in terms of opportunity to commit the crime and of the decisions made by shoplifters. Clarke (1980) argues that this approach will indicate alternative strategies for preventing shoplifting, and this chapter examines how decisionmaking and criminal opportunity theories of crime have shaped current attitudes to shoplifting prevention, and evaluates the success (or failure) of this approach.

5.2 Shoplifting and Opportunity

Early deterministic theories tend to ignore the environment in which crime takes place (Briar and Piliavin, 1965; Cornish, 1994; Erez, 1979). Brantingham and Faust (1976) and Clarke (1984) argue that the physical and social environments provide opportunities for criminal behaviour, and more recent approaches (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990) acknowledge the influence of criminal opportunity. Environmental criminologists have investigated the spatial distribution of crime (Baldwin and Bottoms, 1976; Shaw and McKay, 1942), the impact of the environment on crime (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1991; Jeffery, 1971; Poyner, 1983; Tremblay, 1986) and the influence of lifestyle on criminal victimisation (Garofalo, 1987; Maxfield, 1987). Routine Activities Theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Felson, 1987, 1994) combines these approaches, hypothesising that a crime has three necessary components: a likely offender, a suitable target and the absence of capable guardians against crime.

The routine activities approach implies that shoplifting is an opportunistic crime, and several authors (Gibbons 1968; Glaser, 1978; Mayhew, 1977) have commented on the opportunistic nature of shoplifting. In his investigation of shoplifting in Exeter, which utilised both police records and interviews with a sample of 61 retailers, Walsh (1978) found that the greatest concentration of shoplifting (80%) was in the main shopping area, which contained the larger, more popular department and chain stores, and that counterservice shops had significantly less shoplifting than the self-service stores (although this could be due to the counter-service shops being smaller, or less desirable targets). Walsh also reports that peaks in the incidence of shoplifting coincided with high levels of shopping activity. Nelson et al (1996) used the police records of more than 2,000 recorded shoplifting incidents to investigate the spatial and temporal distribution of shoplifting in Cardiff. They report that the concentration of shoplifting is influenced by the opportunities provided by certain types of store, for example, variety, clothing, department and record stores, and that this is explained by their high level of shopping activity and location in the busiest areas of the city centre. Nelson et al (1996, p 412) conclude that shoplifting results from

the opportunities presented by stores offering small or easily-concealable, attractive goods in situations where high levels of shopper activity and low levels of apparent surveillance combine to reduce the likelihood of discovery.

In a self-report study which investigated the shoplifting attitudes of 204 Canadian students, Lo (1994, p 613) found that teenagers are more likely to shoplift small items from large stores that are neither too busy or too quiet, and concludes that 'the key in shoplifting behaviour was accessibility to opportunity'.

Although there has been little research into the opportunistic nature of shoplifting, and the

three studies discussed are subject to methodological limitations, it seems reasonable to surmise that the opportunities provided by easily accessible shops, with desirable goods openly displayed and low risks of detection, facilitate shoplifting. To understand the role played by the environment and the opportunities afforded by it, the logical next stage is to investigate the factors which influence shoplifters' decisions to steal. The classical approach to crime hypothesises that crime results from a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the behaviour (Jupp, 1989; Roshier, 1989). This approach is little concerned with the causes of crime, but rather with how crime can be prevented by increasing the costs of crime in relation to the benefits to the criminal (Jupp, 1989; Vold and Bernard, 1986), and is the basis for deterrence theory, economic theories of crime and rational choice models, all of which evaluate the choices made by potential offenders.

5.3. Deterrence Theory

Deterrence theory is concerned with how criminal behaviour can be prevented through the use or threat of legal sanctions (Meier and Johnson, 1977). Specific deterrence assumes that punishment controls the behaviour of those who receive it, whilst general deterrence assumes that the punishment of criminals will deter others who may be tempted into similar behaviour (Nettler, 1978). Deterrence theorists hypothesise an inverse relationship between the incidence of certain types of crime, and the celerity, certainty and severity of punishment for that crime (Gibbs, 1975), and Teevan (1976) argues that the individual's perception of the certainty and severity of punishment is more important than the actual conditions. Although perceptual deterrence researchers report varied findings there seems to be a general consensus that certainty of punishment is a more effective deterrent than severity of punishment (Anderson *et al*, 1977; Paternoster, 1989; Silberman, 1976), however, as argued by Grasmick and Bryjack (1980, p 473)

Whatever the perceived consequences of being caught, it is not a potential cost if people believe that they will not be caught.

5.3.1 Shoplifting and the Risks and Costs of Being Caught

Shoplifting has been included in several deterrence studies (Jensen et al, 1978; Minor, 1978; Montmarquette et al, 1985; Saltzman et al, 1982; Silberman, 1976; Teevan, 1976). Although these studies support the inverse relationship between shoplifting and certainty of punishment, they also indicate that shoplifting is not perceived as a "high risk" crime, particularly by those who engage in the behaviour, and Saltzman et al (1982) conclude that those who get away with criminal acts tend to lower their perceptions of the risks involved. This view is supported by shoplifting studies. Kraut (1976) reports that the shoplifters in his self-report study stole because they perceived low risks of apprehension, and that the students who shoplifted more frequently anticipated less serious sanctions. Moore (1984) found that the semi-professionals and amateurs in his study of convicted shoplifters viewed the risks of detection and prosecution as insignificant, and Cole (1989) reports that the potential and persistent shoplifters in her self-report study of 156 students perceived low risks of being caught. Perceptions of the low risks of apprehension are supported by the UK Retail Crime Surveys (Bamfield, 1994a; Speed et al, 1995) which suggest that the majority of shoplifters escape detection, Astor's (1969) study which reports that none of the shoppers observed stealing were "spotted" by store detectives, and the study by Blankenburg (1976). To assess the risks of shoplifting, Blankenburg and a team of researchers committed 40 acts of shoplifting in a German supermarket (with the consent of the management), none of the incidents were detected.

5.3.2 The Deterrent Effects of Apprehension on Shoplifting Behaviour

Legal sanctions may have differential deterrent effects on novice offenders and those who regularly engage in the behaviour (Chamblis, 1967; Farrington, 1977). Cameron (1964) reports that although the professional shoplifters in her study invariably had a record of shoplifting arrests, amateur shoplifters appeared to be deterred from further shoplifting by their apprehension experience, and studies of apprehended shoplifters (Cohen and Stark, 1974; Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Walsh, 1978) indicate prior shoplifting involvement for only a small percentage of offenders. The low recidivism of shoplifting offenders is supported by Deng's (1997) study of the court records of 3,974 first-time apprehended shoplifters, 90% of these apprehended shoplifters did not reoffend.

These studies are based on records of apprehended shoplifters and are thus subject to an under-reporting bias, as many apprehended shoplifters may continue to shoplift without being caught. To overcome this Klemke (1978a) conducted a self-report study of 1,189 American school students to investigate the relationship between being arrested for shoplifting and subsequent shoplifting activity. Klemke found that respondents who had been apprehended for shoplifting reported more subsequent shoplifting activity than those who had not been apprehended, and interprets his findings as support for the labelling perspective (apprehension for deviance will amplify future deviance, Thorsell and Klemke, 1972). An alternative explanation is that the costs of being caught were not sufficient to deter future shoplifting activity, and this is especially relevant for juveniles who are more likely to be referred for treatment or care than punished (Paternoster, 1989). There is little data available on professional shoplifters (as defined in Chapter 4, section 4.2.4). Chambliss (1967), Katz (1988) and Lemert (1969) suggest that professional criminals

view legal sanctions as part of the costs of their trade, and anecdotal accounts (Gammon, 1996; Klokis, 1985; Taylor, 1982; Willis, 1991) suggest that as professional shoplifters are rarely caught, they are unlikely to be deterred by the threat of legal sanctions.

Although deterrence studies are restricted by the methodological limitations of self-report surveys, they suggest that potential shoplifters do not appear to be deterred by the threat of legal sanctions, either because they perceive low probability of being apprehended, or because they do not view the punishment as "costly". The failure of punishment to control crime has been the subject of much debate (Sherman, 1993; Stafford and Warr, 1993) and sanctions for shoplifting have been developed which present an alternative to cautions, fines and imprisonment. Excluding apprehended shoplifters from stores is becoming a conventional practice with many large retailers (Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997) and Bamfield (1994a) reports that 44.5% of apprehended UK shoplifters were banned from stores during 1993/94. Civil recovery, retailers' use of civil law to sanction shop thieves, is common in the USA. Hollinger *et al* (1996) report that US retailers placed civil demands on 15.3% of staff thieves and 24.8% of shoplifters during 1995, and Bamfield (1997a) is arguing for the introduction of this approach into the UK.

5.4 Economic Theories of Crime

Economists view people as rational decision-makers who seek to maximise the utility of their decisions by calculating the costs and benefits of alternative forms of action (Becker, 1962; Block and Heineke, 1975; Sjoquist, 1973). Economic theories of crime hypothesise that criminal behaviour can be altered by changing the expected utilities, either reducing the benefits or increasing the costs, or a combination of both. Becker (1968, p 176)

suggests that some people become criminal 'not because their motivations differ from that of other persons, but because their benefits and costs differ'. Cobb (1973a) utilised this approach to conduct a cost/benefit analysis of retailers' anti-shoplifting strategies and to investigate shoplifting from the offender's perspective. He used a variety of measures to calculate shrinkage and to assess the costs and benefits of shoplifting, and his findings imply that the costs of apprehending shoplifters are greater than the potential savings, and that for shoplifters, stealing from shops is a profitable activity. His methodology is, however, imprecise and ambiguous, and as his results are based on estimates and perceptions, and uncertain sampling methods, their reliability and validity is questionable.

Economic approaches have been criticised for their assumption that offenders have a realistic perception of the risks and costs of apprehension (Jacob, 1979; Tunnell, 1992), for their failure to include perceptual variables (Williams and Hawkins, 1986), for paying little attention to individual differences in information-processing (Cook, 1980) and for ignoring "psychological" rewards and the opportunistic nature of crime (Clarke, 1995).

5.5 Rational Choice Models

As discussed by Cooke (1980) and Trasler (1986), rational choice models (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a; Piliavin *et al*, 1986) are based on economic theory and hypothesise that

criminals can be viewed as rational decision makers intent on furthering their personal welfare in an environment that provides crime opportunities coupled with sanction threats. (Cooke, 1980, pp 218-219)

Unlike economic approaches, rational choice theories do not assume full rationality on the part of the offender, instead they recognise that individuals have limited capacity to acquire and process information, and thus behave with "limited" or "bounded" rationality (Carroll, 1978; Simon, 1978), using heuristics to simplify decision-making (Johnson and Payne, 1986; Tversky and Kahneman, 1974). From this perspective, offenders are regarded as rational, in that they make reasoned choices and decisions based on the information available to them (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a). In addition, offenders are assumed to be in a state of readiness to engage in criminal behaviour (Goldkamp, 1987).

5.5.1 The North American Approach to Rational Choice

Following the deterrence tradition, US researchers have investigated the variables which influence intentions to become involved in crime, using either self-report or scenario methods to survey large populations about two or more types of deviant behaviour. Meier (1978) and Piliavin *et al* (1986) argue that legal sanctions are only one part of the "criminal calculus", and the earlier rational choice studies (Carroll, 1978; Piliavin *et al*, 1986) included both legal sanctions and financial rewards in their models, finding the latter to be more significant. Bachman *et al* (1992) argue, however, that the utility-based costs and benefits model of rational choice may not provide a complete understanding of the decision making process of potential offenders, and some researchers have included additional variables within their rational choice models.

Several deterrence studies suggest that the perceived risk of extra-legal sanctions, for example, social disapproval, informal sanctions by family or friends, or moral commitment, are more significant than legal sanctions (Green, 1989; Jensen and Erickson, 1978; Meier and Johnson, 1977; Paternoster *et al*, 1983). Grasmick and Bursik (1990, p 839) hypothesise that conscience and significant others (friends and family) 'potentially influence criminality by decreasing the expected utility of crime', and suggest that shame or guilt for violating the law can be considered as a type of self-

imposed punishment. This is consistent with Braithwaite's (1989, p72) concept of reintegrative shaming which suggests that

conscience delivers an anxiety response to each and every involvement in crime a more systematic punishment than haphazard enforcement by the police. For most of us, punishment by our own conscience is therefore a much more potent threat than punishment by the criminal justice system.

Grasmick and Bursik (1990) interviewed a random sample of 360 adults, and found shame to have a greater effect than either formal or informal sanctions for the offenses of tax cheating, drunk driving or theft. Contrary to expectations, the threat of embarrassment (conceptualised as loss of respect from significant others) was not significant. Grasmick and Bursik suggest that this could be due to the variable being inaccurately measured.

Consistent with the theories of Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) and Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), Nagin and Paternoster (1993) argue that low self control, demonstrated by a weak conscience, impulsiveness (inability to plan for the future or defer gratification) and a willlingness to take risks, is significantly associated with criminal intentions. They contend that rational choice models should also examine the influence of individual differences in self-control, and used a complex research design, which manipulated three scenarios of drunk-driving, theft and sexual assault, to test their proposition on a sample of 699 university students. Although the study is subject to methodological limitations and several interpretations (Nagin and Paternoster, 1993), it indicates that perceptions of informal and legal sanctions and shame controlled intentions. Respondents with low selfcontrol were more likely to report that they would commit each offense and to perceive the benefits of crime to exceed the costs, and were less likely to have a conscience about the offence. Nagin and Paternoster conclude that to understand crime, both individual characteristics and the immediate situation must be considered. Tibbets and Herz (1996) and Tibbets (1997) utilised the rational choice framework to investigate shoplifting in a convenience sample of 604 university students, using the scenario method to explore the effects of shame, low self-control, perceived external sanctions, moral beliefs and perceptions of the costs and benefits of crime. They also included a further variable, perceived pleasure. Katz (1988) argues that the thrills and pleasures provided by crime seduce individuals into engaging in the behaviour, and both Piliavin *et al* (1986) and Nagin and Paternoster (1993) found that perceived pleasure influenced intentions to deviate. The model formulated by Tibbetts, explained 37% of the variance in intentions, with shame and moral beliefs (negative), and personal pleasure (positive) being the variables most highly associated with shoplifting.

Although these studies are subject to methodological limitations, they provide support for rational choice models. They also indicate that the experiential/emotional aspects of shoplifting should be considered, in addition to the impact of legal sanctions (deterrence theory) and the more utilitarian financial cost/benefit appraisal suggested by economists.

5.5.2 The UK Approach to Rational Choice

The Rational Choice Perspective, formalised by Cornish and Clarke (1986a), hypothesises that offenders make strategic choices and decisions, based on the information available to them, and integrates rational choice and criminal opportunity theories into a framework from which the decision to offend can be analysed. This approach suggests that criminal behaviour results from the coincidence of a motivated offender, attractive goods and criminal opportunities, and is thus compatible with social control theory (Hirschi, 1986) and routine activities theory (Clarke and Felson, 1993). Cornish and Clarke (1986a; 1986b) argue that analysis of criminal behaviour should be crime-specific, investigating both the situational factors which have influenced the criminal event and the factors which govern the offender's involvement in crime.

The rational choice framework has been utilised in several criminological studies, using interviews with known offenders to establish their decision-making processes (Bennett, 1986a, 1986b; Cusson and Pinsoneault, 1986; Feeney, 1986; Harding, 1993; Walsh, 1986). Two studies specifically relate to shoplifting. Weaver and Carroll (1985) and Carroll and Weaver (1986) investigated the thought processes of 34 experienced and novice shoplifters in an actual shoplifting situation, by asking the subjects to verbalise their thoughts into a dictaphone whilst walking round the store. Analysis of the verbal protocols indicated that although the expert shoplifters devised strategies to overcome the shoplifting deterrents and to minimise the risk of being caught, few considered the consequences of being caught shoplifting (arrest, imprisonment, fines). The novice shoplifters, however, were deterred by any sign of risk, experienced guilt and fear, and spent time considering the implications of being caught.

Butler (1994) explored shoplifters' views of retail security by asking 15 ex-shoplifters to role-play stealing a video recorder from a store of their choice. Butler comments that the subjects appeared to be confident that they could steal any item they wanted and evade being caught. The subjects also perceived security guards as the greatest threat to their shoplifting activities, and considered notices informing customers that all shoplifters will be prosecuted to have little deterrent value.

Although these studies were conducted on small, self-selected samples, unlikely to be representative of the general shoplifting population, they provide valuable insights into shoplifters' perceptions of the risks of shoplifting, and indicate that shoplifters have strategies to overcome retail security systems, and view shoplifting as a low risk crime. The studies suggest that shoplifting is rational behaviour, in that the majority of shoplifters interviewed weighed the benefits of shoplifting against the risks of being caught.

5.6 Situational Crime Prevention

Situational crime prevention is concerned with manipulating the environment to prevent crime, rather than trying to change criminal motivation (Cornish, 1994), and was pioneered in the UK by Clarke and the Home Office Crime Prevention Unit. It is based on the assumption that offenders make rational choices and decisions in response to the immediate situation and circumstances of the proposed crime (Clarke, 1980; Cornish and Clarke, 1986a). Clarke (1983, p 225) defines situational crime prevention as

comprising measures directed at highly specific forms of crime that involve the management, design or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic and permanent way as possible so as to reduce the opportunities for crime and increase its risks as perceived by a wide range of offenders.

As discussed by Bennett (1986a), situational approaches developed as a result of the apparent failure of treatment, policing and sentencing to effectively control crime (Clarke and Cornish, 1983; Gilling, 1994; Hough *et al*, 1980), and new criminological perspectives which suggested a focus on the offender's view and on the environment in which crime takes place (Clarke and Cornish, 1985). For example, although Box (1983), Clarke and Cornish (1985) and Taylor *et al* (1973) differ in their approaches to crime, they agree that much criminal behaviour is commonplace, opportunistic and rational. Clarke and Cornish (1985, p 147) argue that

it is useful to see criminal behaviour not as the result of psychologically and socially determined dispositions to offend, but as the outcomes of the offenders' broadly rational choices and decisions.

For situational measures to operate with maximum effect, information is required as to how potential offenders perceive the opportunities, risks and rewards of crime (Cornish, 1994; Cornish and Clarke, 1986b), and the rational choice perspective is the basis of current situational crime prevention approaches (Heal and Laycock, 1986; Trasler, 1986).

Situational measures have been criticised for being mechanistic and barren (Clarke, 1980; Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997) and for ignoring the social environment (Bottoms, 1990; Currie, 1989). The major criticism of this approach is that by reducing the opportunities for crime or by increasing the risks of being caught, criminal activity will be displaced spatially, temporally, tactically, in type of target, or in type of crime (Barr and Pease, 1990; Bottoms, 1990; Matthews and Young, 1992). Research indicates only limited support for displacement effects (Gabor, 1981, 1990; Reppetto, 1976), and Hesseling (1994, p 219), in her review of 55 published crime prevention articles, concludes

Displacement is a possible, but not inevitable, consequence of crime prevention. Further if displacement does occur, it will be limited in size and scope.

Clarke and Weisburd (1994) report that the impact of situational measures can extend beyond the offences targeted, resulting in more general crime reduction, and benign displacement effects have been reported by Barr and Pease (1990), Scherdin (1986) and Sherman (1990). Displacement research is inconclusive and limited methodologically, and this is a weak area of academic discussion which requires further research in view of the potential impact of displacement on those not employing crime prevention measures.

5.6.1 The Prevention of Shoplifting

Traditionally the main concern of retail security has been the detection and apprehension of thieves. The prosecution of shoplifters is, however, a costly process which appears to have little impact on shoplifting rates (Burrows, 1988; Ekblom, 1986), and situational approaches, which attempt to prevent or deter crime by reducing the opportunities for crime or increasing the risks of discovery/apprehension, are currently the focus of much security activity (Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997). Situational measures include; target hardening (increasing the physical security of goods by the use of locks, alarms and display cabinets, or reducing the risks of them being stolen through store redesign, electronic tags and ink tags), increased surveillance (CCTV, security guards, store detectives, mirrors, employees), trained staff to greet and interact with customers and information/education approaches.

Retailers' acceptance of responsibility for crime prevention (Burrows, 1991; Ekblom, 1988; Leaver, 1993) has resulted in increasing expenditure on theft prevention measures, and Wells and Dryer (1998) report that UK retailers spent £449.9 million on crime prevention during 1996/97. Retailers are, however, faced with the problem of balancing the needs of security with their overall objectives of increasing sales and profitability, and ensuring that crime prevention measures are cost-effective, providing a reasonable return on investment (Ekblom, 1986; Bamfield, 1988; Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997). There are several prevention options available to retailers, and selection of the most appropriate and cost-effective involves the analysis of the retail environment, and evaluation of the effectiveness of individual measures (Burrows, 1988).

5.6.2 Crime Analysis

Crime analysis proposes that prevention measures should be based on a systematic and rigorous analysis of the retail environment and assumes patterns in theft activity which can be used to generate cost-effective preventive measures (Burrows, 1991; Ekblom, 1988;

Home Office, 1986; Hope, 1991). Crime analysis has been used successfully in several diverse situations (Burrows, 1988; Honess and Charman, 1992; Tilley, 1993a, 1993b). Ekblom (1986) utilised this approach to investigate shoplifting at a London music retailer. He concluded that the main contribution of crime analysis was

in assembling the right information to guide selection of the short list of preventive options most suitable for the circumstance of this store, and especially in identifying where preventive effort should be focused. (Ekblom, 1986, p 15)

Ekblom (1986; 1988) and Shapland (1995) argue that store design and layout significantly influence the risks of crime and are integral to the design of effective shoplifting prevention strategies. There are generally accepted methods of using store layout to reduce customer theft (Edwards, 1970; Sennewald and Christman, 1992), and although little empirical research has been conducted in this area, two of the systematic measurement studies described in Chapter 3, section 3.5 investigated the impact of store design and layout on customer theft. In their study of theft of easily portable items from electrical retailers, Beck and Willis (1998) report that 41% of the items were stolen from the counter, and 22% from displays. In a similar study, which used a pretest and posttest design, Farrington *et al* (1994) found that although redesigning the store layout resulted in a significant decrease in shoplifting in the short term, the posttest (six weeks later) indicated that this decrease was not maintained in the long term.

5.6.3 Evaluation of Shoplifting Prevention Measures

Crime prevention represents a major area of retail investment, yet few companies have systems in place either to measure crime, or to evaluate investment in retail security (Burrows, 1991: Gill, 1994), and there is little collaboration with researchers to provide useful data for publication. Consequently, there is little published research on the effectiveness of retail security although several articles provide general descriptions of security measures (Caplan, 1988; DiLonardo, 1993; Espinosa, 1989; Faria, 1977; Klein, 1991; Litwak, 1991; Premuroso, 1988).

Although retailers continue to invest in CCTV, Electronic Article Surveillance (EAS) and Ink Tag Systems (Hollinger et al, 1996; Wells and Dryer, 1998), research into the effectiveness of these measures has produced conflicting findings. In their investigation of the attitudes of 117 Dundee retailers to shoplifting prevention, Pretious et al (1995) report that although over 25% had invested in CCTV and EAS, overall, the retailers perceived human security measures (security guards and store detectives) to be more effective than security technology. Although Handford's (1994) study of EAS systems in four branches of a UK retailer suggests that these systems are not currently cost effective, Bamfield's (1994b) case study of EAS installation in four branches of a UK variety chain reports overall financial savings. Burrows (1991) reports that the security system installed by a major UK grocery chain, the main component of which was CCTV, reduced unknown losses by over one half, and DiLonardo and Clarke (1996) found that shrinkage levels in a US retail chain were reduced after the introduction of ink tags. In their systematic measurement study, Farrington et al (1994) compared the effectiveness of electronic tagging and a uniformed security guard. Although the uniformed guard had no effect, electronic tagging effectively prevented shoplifting. They conclude that

the amount saved by electronic tagging probably exceeds its long-term costs. However, it is not clear whether its effectiveness will wear off as customers devise ways of beating the system. (Farrington *et al*, 1994, p 115)

Dawson (1993) investigated customer attitudes to EAS, and reports that although the majority of the 250 respondents interviewed by telephone felt EAS to be effective, almost

half of the respondents had accidently set off an EAS alarm, and 16% felt that a shopper who had accidently triggered an EAS alarm would not use the store in the future. Retailers, therefore, must not only consider the costs of installing and maintaining EAS, but also the potential costs of lost patronage.

The studies by Beck and Willis (1995), French (1996), Honess and Charman (1992) and Jones *et al* (1997) indicate that the general public view CCTV as being effective in both preventing and detecting crime, and Beck and Willis (1991) report similar findings in their study of 586 customers using 52 branch stores of two UK electrical retailers. Over 75% of the respondents thought CCTV was effective, and overall, technology was viewed as being more effective than human security (attentive staff and uniformed security guards). In a later study of a major UK retailer, Beck and Willis (1994) report that only 30% of the 370 customers interviewed, and 40% of the employees, felt that CCTV was effective in both deterring and detecting shoplifters. Both customers and staff agreed that security technology was more effective for deterring shoplifters whereas human security was more effective for detecting shoplifters.

Research indicates that consumers have few concerns about security measures (Beck and Willis, 1991, 1994; Gill and Turbin, 1997; Hastings, 1980), and Beck and Willis (1991) and Gill and Turbin (1997) report that the customers in their studies were relatively unaware of the shoplifting prevention measures being used in the stores. Awareness of security measures is integral to the success of shoplifting prevention strategies, and is particularly important for deterring opportunistic thieves. Ekblom (1986) argues that as the primary use of deterrent measures such as CCTV and store detectives should be to dissuade people from shoplifting rather than to apprehend thieves, notices warning that

security systems are operating should be prominently placed. Ekblom also suggests that due to their visibility, uniformed security guards are more likely than store detectives to heighten offenders' perceptions of the degree of risk. Burrows (1988) agrees with this view, concluding that store detectives are likely to have a limited impact on shoplifting.

Studies of shoplifters provide little support for the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention measures. As part of their evaluation of CCTV in two retail clothing outlets Gill and Turbin (1997) interviewed 38 shoplifters, the majority of whom were not deterred by CCTV, or anti-shoplifting notices. Carolin (1992) reports that 19% of the apprehended shoplifters in his study were undeterrable, and Butler (1994, p 71) suggests that although the shoplifters in his study were more likely to be deterred by people than systems,

even security guards were not considered a deterrent by most of the sample unless they followed respondents around the store.

Although these studies are subject to methodological limitations, and the small samples of either retailers or consumers restrict the generalisbality of the findings, they suggest that retailers have invested in technological security systems on the basis of very limited empirical evidence, undoubtedly influenced by concerns about displacement of shoplifting activity. As discussed by Gill (1994) and Groombridge and Murji (1994), further research is required into the effectiveness of technological systems such as CCTV, including before/after measurements of effectiveness, and evaluation of displacement effects. As shoplifters quickly learn how to circumvent new systems and procedures, the most effective loss prevention strategy is likely to be based on defence in depth, combining several prevention approaches (Tonglet and Bamfield, 1997).

5.6.4 Shoplifting Prevention Communications

The systematic measurement studies were initially designed to measure the effectiveness of anti-shoplifting signs. McNees *et al* (1976) found that although general antishoplifting signs reduced shoplifting, when individual items were specifically identified as being at risk from shoplifting, theft of these items was virtually eliminated. Carter *et al* (1979; 1992) report similar findings in their Swedish department store studies. US researchers Thurber and Snow (1980) found, however, that publicly identifying cigarettes as being at risk from shoplifting resulted in an increase in theft, and in their study of a sales promotion campaign in a Swedish grocery store, Carter (1995) and Carter *et al* (1995) report that theft of the products being promoted increased during the promotional period. Thus, although anti-shoplifting signs may reduce opportunistic shoplifting, an unintended side-effect may be to increase awareness of shoplifting opportunities.

Although campaigns to increase public awareness of the seriousness of shoplifting and its negative consequences have been widely used in the USA (Klemke, 1992; Rosenblatt, 1981), only limited research has been conducted into their effectiveness. Hiew (1981, p 66) evaluated the effectiveness of Canadian community programme concluding that it 'effectively reduced shoplifting rates'. His assessment is based, however, on a decrease in shoplifting apprehensions and retailers' perceptions of shrinkage reductions, these could have been affected by factors external to the campaign. Sacco (1985) suggests that the evaluation of such campaigns is problematic, concluding that although anti-shoplifting campaigns may modify attitudes, they are unlikely to change behaviour due to their superficiality, impersonality and the short time periods involved, and Klemke (1992) argues that this approach may stimulate shoplifting by bringing it to the public's attention.

5.7 Conclusion

Rational choice theories of crime provide a more realistic approach to shoplifting prevention than the dispositional theories discussed in Chapter 4. Research into the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention measures based on this approach is, however, inconclusive. Retail security systems are rarely evaluated, and although Cornish and Clarke (1986a) argue that the offenders' perceptions of the opportunities, risks and rewards of crime are integral to the design of effective situational measures, UK studies tend to ignore the central component of every shoplifting incident, the offender. Rational choice theories assume that under the right circumstances the offender will commit the offense, and it is likely that the majority of shoplifters steal because they have the opportunity to do so. The US rational choice studies indicate, however, that crime is rather more than the rational calculation of the costs and benefits, and suggest that social, family and experiential or emotional factors are also likely to influence criminal behaviour.

Gill (1994) argues that effective crime prevention is dependent on understanding why people offend. Studies of known offenders (Butler, 1994; Gill and Turbin, 1997) rely, however, on small samples of experienced shoplifters, possibly atypical of the general shoplifting population. As it is difficult to obtain a cross-section of shoplifters, an alternative approach is to survey the general public, using self-report measures to differentiate between non-shoplifters and shoplifters. In this way, shoplifters' perceptions of the risks, opportunities and rewards of the crime, experiential aspects of shoplifting (guilt or excitement), the influence of referent groups (family and friends) and the beliefs and attitudes which underlie the behaviour can be explored and compared with those of non-shoplifters.

76

CHAPTER 6

SHOPLIFTING AS CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

6.1 Introduction

The previous three chapters have considered the relevance of criminological theories for the explanation of shoplifting. Although the discussion indicates that the variables hypothesised to explain criminal behaviour have some applicability for shoplifting, with the exception of rational choice studies (for example, Tibbetts, 1997), little attempt has been made to systematically evaluate the factors which inhibit or encourage customer theft. An alternative approach is to view the shoplifter as a consumer rather than a distinct criminal type. Fullerton and Punj (1997a, p 336) argue that shoplifting is 'part of people's conduct in their role as consumers' and this chapter considers shoplifting as consumer behaviour, albeit deviant or aberrant consumer behaviour.

6.2 Shoplifting as Consumer Behaviour

Rational choice theories of crime (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a) imply that criminal choice is similar to other behavioural choice (Young, 1994), and it could be argued that shoplifting behaviour shares certain similarities with "normal" consumer behaviour, in that it results from the coincidence of three factors: a motivated consumer (or in the case of customer theft, shoplifter), desirable products and opportunity (availability of the goods or perceptions of low risks of apprehension). This suggests that shoplifting results from decisions made in the retail environment, and could, therefore, be viewed as being similar to other consumer decisions. There is some justification in the literature for this approach. Firstly, the majority of shoplifters appear to be "ordinary" consumers rather than stereotypical criminals. Secondly, the retail environment has been identified as playing an important role in shoplifting behaviour.

6.2.1 The Shoplifter as an "Ordinary" Consumer

In their discussion of the pervasiveness of shoplifting, Cox *et al* (1990, p 149) take the view that shoplifting could be considered as a form of consumer behaviour, arguing that

shoplifting is not limited to a small criminal subculture; instead it is a startlingly common method of consumer product acquisition

and there is considerable support for this view in the shoplifting literature. Shoplifting behaviour appears to be widespread. Wells and Dryer (1997) report five million incidents of customer theft in the UK during 1995/96, self-report studies in the UK and the USA (Graham and Bowling, 1995; Kallis and Vanier, 1985; Ray, 1987) indicate that a substantial proportion of the populations surveyed admitted to involvement in shoplifting, and UK following studies suggest that between 1% and 3% of customers steal whilst they are using shops (Buckle and Farrington, 1984; 1994). Murphy (1986, p 58) contends that shoplifting is an 'everyday activity' and several authors have commented that shoplifters appear to be otherwise "ordinary" consumers (Robin, 1964; Sohier, 1969; Strutton *et al*, 1995). Klemke (1992, p 78) describes shoplifters as the 'consummate frugal customer' and Kraut (1976, p 365) argues that 'the motivation is commonplace, and is indeed the same as for normal shopping: the acquisition of goods at minimum cost'.

There is evidence that apprehended shoplifters are "ordinary" consumers rather than professional thieves (although it could be argued that professionals are less likely to be caught due to their knowledge and skill). Apprehension studies indicate that the majority of apprehended shoplifters do not have prior criminal records (Cohen and Stark, 1974; Gibbens and Prince, 1962; Walsh, 1978), and Cameron (1964) reports that 90% of the apprehended shoplifters in her study were amateur thieves who stole for their own use rather than for resale. Cameron (1964, p 118) argues that most shoplifters

are "respectable" people. For the most part they are people who lack the kinds of prior criminal experience which would indicate extensive association with a criminal subculture. They accept the dominant social values with regard to law-abiding behaviour even though they deviate from them.

6.2.2 The Retail Environment

Increases in shoplifting behaviour have been attributed to modern retailing practices, for example, self-service and self-selection, open displays and reductions in staff numbers (D'Alto, 1992; Dickens, 1969; Normandeau, 1971). The studies by Lo (1994), Nelson *et al* (1996) and Walsh (1978) indicate that the opportunities provided by the retail environment are likely to facilitate shoplifting behaviour, and both Ekblom (1986) and Shapland (1995) argue that the design and layout of the store significantly influence the risks of crime. Thomas (1980) comments that retailers are faced with conflicting objectives, in that easier access to goods and more attractive displays will not only increase sales but also increase the amount of theft, and D'Alto (1992, p 49) argues

Retailers consider greater access to goods the best way to increase sales. In fact, some marketers consider the level of shoplifting an indication of the success of a shop's marketing activity.

Bannister (1979, p 16) suggests that certain stores are willing to tolerate some level of shoplifting in view of the cost of security systems, the time and expense involved in detecting and prosecuting shoplifters, and the potential cost of lost sales 'arising from the departure of honest customers with an aversion to security measures that assume universal guilt'. Thus, retailers are faced with a paradox. Their marketing strategies,

directed at encouraging consumers into their stores to purchase their products, are also attracting consumers who steal. As any increase in security measures may deter honest consumers (Bannister, 1979; Beck and Willis, 1998), the need for more effective security has to be balanced against sales and profitability objectives. Thus, a more detailed understanding is required of how consumers' shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour is influenced by retailers' marketing and security strategies.

6.3 The Consumer Behaviour Approach

Consumer behaviour is concerned with understanding 'the processes of consumer choice' (Tuck, 1979, p 44) and 'how and why consumers behave the way they do' (Sheth, 1979, p 418). As discussed in Chapter 2, section 2.5.1, the predominant approach is essentially cognitive, viewing individuals as a reasonably rational decision-makers (East, 1990), and researchers are concerned with identifying and understanding the factors which influence the consumer decision-making process (East, 1997; Tuck, 1976, 1979).

Although there is a considerable body of knowledge about consumer shopping behaviour, for example, impulsive buying (Bellenger *et al*, 1978; Kollatt, 1967; Stern, 1962), the influence of situational (Belk, 1974; 1975) and environmental variables (Bitner, 1992; Gagnon and Osterhause, 1985; Hui and Bateson, 1991), shopping motives (Buttle, 1995; Buttle and Coates, 1995; Dawson *et al*, 1990; Stone, 1954; Tauber, 1972), experiential or hedonic aspects (Ahtola, 1985; Babin *et al*, 1994; Elliott, 1998; Gardner, 1985; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982) and consumer ethics (Babin and Darden, 1995; Fullerton *et al*, 1996), deviant or undesirable consumer behaviour has been relatively ignored (Babin and Babin, 1996; Fullerton and Punj, 1993; Moschis, 1987).

6.3.1 Deviant or Aberrant Consumer Behaviour

Sheth (1979) argues that more attention should be focused on deviant consumption and although researchers have investigated the potential harm consumers do to themselves through, for example, compulsive consumption (Faber and O'Guinn, 1988; Nataraajan and Goff, 1991; O'Guinn and Faber, 1989) and addictive consumption (Elliott *et al*, 1996; Hirschman, 1992), and have also studied other facets of shopping behaviour, for example, compensatory consumption (Woodruffe, 1996), little attention has been paid to the misbehaviour of consumers in retail settings (Fullerton and Punj, 1997b). Aberrant or deviant consumer behaviour includes, but is not limited to, shoplifting, credit card fraud, abusive behaviour to other consumers or retail employees, price tag switching and fraudulent return of merchandise (Budden and Griffin, 1996; Fullerton and Punj, 1997a) and is defined by Fullerton and Punj (1993, p 336) as

behaviour in exchange settings which violates the generally accepted norms of conduct in such settings and which is therefore held in disrepute by marketers and most consumers.

Fullerton and Punj (1993, pp 575-577) argue that aberrant consumer behaviour (ACB) results from the interaction between the attributes and predispositions of the consumer and the characteristics of the retail setting. They suggest that the following factors are likely to be influential:

- 1. The demographic and personality characteristics of the consumer, including level of moral development, unfulfilled aspirations, propensity for thrill-seeking, psychological problems and mood/anxiety level (antecedent state).
- 2. Social and group influences.
- 3. The retail environment products sold, physical environment, antecendent state (overcrowding, etc.), security, conduct of retail employees and image of store.
- 4. Calculating opportunism based on a rational evaluation of the risks and rewards.

Fullerton and Punj (1993) developed a structural model of aberrant consumer behaviour based on these variables (shown in Figure 6.1). Although this model has not, as yet, been applied to aberrant consumer behaviour research, it includes the variables identified in the literature as being likely to influence to shoplifting behaviour (consumer traits and predispostions), and suggests that aberrant consumer behaviour results from the interaction of these variables with the retail environment.

Figure 6.1 A Structural Model of the Aberrant Consumer Behaviour/Consumer Behaviour Interface



Adapted from Fullerton and Punj (1993, p 571)

Fullerton and Punj (1997b) used the variables identified in this model to consider how consumer misbehaviour could be controlled by deterrence or education. They concluded that the individual variables respond differentially to education and deterrence and that

we can differentiate consumer misbehaviours based on the dominant reason for their misconduct. This will in turn determine the likelihood in each group will be constrained from consumer misbehaviour. (Fullerton and Punj, 1997b, p 341)

6.3.2 Shoplifting as Deviant Consumer Behaviour

Although several studies have investigated fraudulent behaviour by consumers (Dodge et al. 1996; Fullerton et al. 1996; Giges, 1984; Jolson, 1974; Johnson et al. 1985; Steiner et al. 1976; Wilkes, 1978; Zabriskie, 1972), few studies have focused specifically on shoplifting, despite the impact of the crime on the shopping experiences of all consumers in terms of increased prices and restrictive security measures (Babin et al, 1994; Fullerton and Puni, 1997b). Cox et al (1990) were perhaps the first researchers to argue that shoplifting should be considered as consumer behaviour. They focused on the influence of social, economic and experiential factors on adolescent shoplifting and concluded that shoplifting is facilitated by 'temptation, ease of rationalisation and perceived low risk of apprehension' (Cox et al, 1990, p 152). Babin et al (1994), Babin and Griffin (1995) and Babin and Babin (1996) investigated the influence of consumer ethics and moral cognitions on shoplifting intentions, using a shoplifting scenario to investigate the attitudes of 168 consumers (both adults and adolescents). The studies indicate that shoplifting intentions were influenced by economic value, risk and moral equity. Although the adults were influenced by their moral beliefs, adolescents were more influenced by emotions (excitement, fear and power). Babin and Babin (1996, p 798) conclude that 'different decision calculi may underlie consumers' shoplifting behaviours at different age groups'.

Hoyer and MacInnis (1997) argue that shoplifting can be explained by two factors: the temptation to steal, and the ability to rationalise theft behaviour, and propose the model illustrated in Figure 6.2 to explain shoplifting motivation. Although both the Hoyer and MacInnis (1997) and the Fullerton and Punj (1993) models provide explanations of shoplifting which are consistent with the shoplifting literature, neither models have been operationalised and applied to shoplifting research.





Adapted from Hoyer and MacInnis (1997, p 531)

6.4 The Approach Taken by this Study

The models proposed by Fullerton and Punj (1993) and Hoyer and MacInnnis (1997) suggest that shoplifting is influenced by both the individual and the retail environment. Both models are consistent with consumer behaviour approaches which hypothesise that consumer behaviour is likely to be influenced by both individual and situational variables, and can be both utilitarian and hedonic (Engel *et al*, 1995), and the cognitive rational choice models of crime discussed in Chapter 5, sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2. Tuck (1979) contends, however, that although rational choice models suggest that situational variables will increase or reduce criminal behaviour, little is known about how these variables interact with the beliefs, norms, attitudes and perceptions of the individual. Tuck (1979, p 47) argues that understanding is required of

the set of belief-structures, the balances of reward and punishment, of enjoyment and deterrence, which underly the decisions to engage in particular types of criminal behaviour.

and suggests that a consumer behaviour methodology, concerned with understanding the beliefs and attitudes underlying behaviour, would be complementary to situational approaches. One such methodology is the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), which provides a theoretical framework for systematically investigating the determinants of behaviour. The theory hypothesises that behaviour can be traced, through a series of intervening concepts, to the beliefs underlying that behaviour, and that the identification of these beliefs, and how they combine to produce behaviour, will enable both the understanding and prediction of behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour was developed from the earlier theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980), and as discussed by East (1993) both theories apply to situations involving a choice of behaviour, where reasons can be given for the choice made.

6.4.1 The Theory of Reasoned Action

The theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) hypothesises that as most behaviour is under volitional control, the immediate antecedent of behaviour is the individual's intention to perform, or not to perform that behaviour (behavioural intention). Behavioural intention is, in turn, determined by two factors: the individual's favourable or unfavourable evaluation of the behaviour (attitude toward the behaviour), and the individual's perception of social pressures to perform or not to perform the behaviour (subjective norm). These two factors are assumed jointly to determine behavioural intention, and the relative importance of each is determined by multiple regression.

Underlying these two factors are sets of beliefs. Attitude toward the behaviour is seen as being determined by the individual's beliefs about the consequences of performing the behaviour (outcome beliefs), weighted by his/her evaluation of these consequences (outcome evaluations). The subjective norm is seen as being determined by the individual's beliefs that specific individuals or groups think that he/she should, or should not perform the behaviour (referent beliefs), weighted by his/her motivation to comply with these individuals or groups (motivation to comply).

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) contend that the only determinants of behavioural intentions are attitude to the behaviour and the subjective norm. Although Ajzen and Fishbein recognise the importance of factors such as demographic variables, personality characteristics and attitudes toward targets, they consider these variables to be external to the model and suggest their influence is mediated through the beliefs an individual holds or the relative importance he/she attaches to attitudinal or normative considerations. Since its introduction in 1967, the theory of reasoned action has been developed and tested in a number of applied and laboratory settings (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and 'has generally fared well when the terms of the model were carefully operationalised' (Eagly and Chaiken, 1992, p 175). The model has been applied successfully to a number of diverse behaviours including: choosing alternatives in the prisoners dilemma game (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970), voting for the presidential candidate (Fishbein and Coombes, 1974), donating blood (Pomazel and Jaccard, 1976), having an abortion (Smetana and Adler, 1980), purchasing various consumer products (Warshaw, 1980), mothers' infant feeding practices (Manstead *et al*, 1983) and attendance at an employee training session (Fishbein and Stasson, 1990). In their meta-analysis of the theory of reasoned action, Sheppard *et al* (1988) examined eighty-seven applications of the theory. The average correlation for the intention-behaviour relationship was 0.53. For the prediction of intention from attitude and the subjective norm, the average correlation was 0.66. Sheppard *et al* (1988, p 325) conclude

Not only does the model appear to predict consumer intentions and behaviour quite well, it also provides a relatively simple basis for identifying where and how to target consumers' behavioural change attempts.

6.4.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour

The theory of reasoned action assumes that most behaviour is under volitional control (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) in that the individual can decide at will whether or not to perform the behaviour. Liska (1984, p 71) disagrees with this view arguing that

People frequently do not do what they intend to do, but are constrained by a lack of resources and opportunities.

As discussed by Smith (1982) and Sarver (1983), a positive attitude and subjective norm
toward a behaviour do not necessarily result in an intention to perform the behaviour, neither does intention necessarily result in action. If the performance of the behaviour is dependent on the presence of appropriate opportunities or on the possession of adequate resources (for example, time, money, skills, the cooperation of other people), then theory of reasoned action provides an inadequate framework for the understanding and prediction of human behaviour (Liska, 1984).

Ajzen (1985; 1987; 1988; 1991) and Ajzen and Madden (1986) recognised the limitations imposed by volitional control on the theory of reasoned action, and proposed an additional component to the model, perceived behavioural control. They suggest that behavioural control should be regarded as a continuum, with all behaviours falling within the two extremes of complete control and relatively little control. They propose that achievement of behaviour could be inhibited by internal factors (for example, individual differences, information, skills and abilities, will power, emotions and compulsions) and external factors (for example, time, opportunity and dependence on others), and that any of these factors could not only influence intention to perform the behaviour, but also have a direct effect on behaviour not mediated by intentions. For those behaviours over which individuals have limited control, some estimate of this control must be obtained. As it is difficult to assess whether individuals possess the required resources, and whether the appropriate opportunities will present themselves, perceived behavioural control is usually measured (Ajzen and Madden, 1986). This represents the individual's belief as to how easy or difficult the performance of the behaviour is likely to be, and is similar to the concept of self-efficacy, 'the conviction that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the outcomes' (Bandura, 1977, p 193). Perceived behavioural

control is seen as being determined by the individual's perception that he/she has the required resources, opportunities and skill to perform the behaviour (control beliefs), weighted by the power of the control belief to facilitate or inhibit performance of the behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour is illustrated in Figure 6.3.





Adapted from Fishbein and Ajzen (1980, p 57) and Ajzen (1991, p 182)

Ajzen (1991) suggests that the theory of planned behaviour will accurately predict behaviour providing the following conditions are met:

- 1. To ensure correspondence between beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behaviour, they should be evaluated using identical levels of generality or specificity in regard to the action, the target, the time and the context (Ajzen, 1988).
- 2. As intentions are not always stable, and will only predict behaviour if the intention does not change before the behaviour is measured, the time interval between the measurement of intentions and behaviour should be minimal (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970; 1974; 1977).
- 3. Perceptions of behavioural control should realistically reflect actual control over behaviour (Ajzen, 1991).

There is considerable empirical support for the utility of the theory of planned behaviour in understanding and predicting behaviour. Ajzen (1991) reviewed twelve studies of the application of the theory to a variety of activities (including cheating, shoplifting and lying, playing video games and leisure choice) and found that both intentions and perceived behavioural control contributed significantly to the prediction of behaviour. The multiple correlations ranged from 0.20 to 0.78, with an average of 0.51. Ajzen (1991) also reviewed sixteen studies assessing the prediction of intentions from attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. He found that these three predictors accounted for a considerable proportion of the variance in intentions, the multiple correlations ranged from 0.43 to 0.94, with an average of 0.71. The addition of perceived behavioural control significantly improved the prediction of intentions in all the studies.

Several researchers have directly compared the predictive utility of both theories. Madden *et al* (1992), studying nine behaviours in students, found that for all the behaviours the theory of planned behaviour explained significantly more variation in intentions than the theory of reasoned action, and in addition, for those behaviours low in control, perceived

behavioural control had a significant effect on behaviour not mediated by intentions. Netemeyer *et al* (1991), Kimiecik (1992) and Giles and Cairns (1995) report similar findings, and in their study of driving violations, Parker *et al* (1992) found that perceived behavioural control was the most important single predictor of intentions for two of the violations studied. These findings, however, were not replicated by Fishbein and Stasson (1990) in their study of training session attendance. Fishbein and Stasson report that the inclusion of perceived behavioural control did not improve the prediction of intentions or behaviour over and above that of the theory of reasoned action.

6.4.3. Criticisms of the Theories

There are several operational issues relating to the theory of planned behaviour. As these concern questionnaire construction, the measurement of the variables and the analysis of the data, they are discussed in Chapter 7 (the research design). The main criticisms of both the theories relate to the structural relationships proposed by the theories, and their assumption that other variables only influence behaviour through their impact on the components of the model (Eagly and Chaiken, 1992).

6.4.3.1 Structural Relationships

In his critical evaluation of the theory of reasoned action, Liska (1984) questions the structural assumptions of the model, arguing that the research of Miniard and Cohen (1981) suggests that attitude and subjective norm are not causally independent as they seem to be based on similar beliefs and may influence each other. Liska (1984) also contends that attitudes may have an independent effect on behaviour, and although Bentler and Speckart (1979; 1981), Zuckerman and Reis (1978) and Manstead *et al* (1983) report that attitudes may have a direct influence on behaviour not mediated by

intentions, the studies by Bagozzi (1981) and Fredericks and Dossett (1983) did not replicate these findings. Despite this ambiguity, it seems reasonable to suggest that people may sometimes act impulsively or spontaneously on their attitudes, without forming an explicit intention (Eagly and Chaiken, 1992), a concept which could have implications for a behaviour such as shoplifting, which may be a "spur of the moment" act.

Ajzen (1985; 1987; 1988; 1991) hypothesises that perceived behavioural control will have a direct effect on both intentions and behaviour, and although the empirical research discussed previously generally supports the first of these propositions, research on the second is inconclusive. In addition, Eagly and Chaiken (1992) argue that the assumption of a causal link between perceived behavioural control and intentions could suggest that individuals intend to perform a behaviour purely because they have control over their performance. This could have implications for shoplifting behaviour.

6.4.3.2 Additional Variables

Although several researchers (Bentler and Speckart, 1979; Pomazal and Jaccard, 1976; Songer-Nocks, 1976) have argued for the inclusion of "other variables" in the theory, Fishbein and Ajzen maintained their position that variables external to the model only effect intentions indirectly, either through their influence on attitude or subjective norm or on the relative weights of these two components (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Unlike the theory of reasoned action, the theory of planned behaviour

is in principle, open to the inclusion of additional predictors if it can be shown that they capture a significant proportion of the variance in intention or behaviour after the theory's current variables have been taken into account. (Ajzen, 1991, p 199)

Schwartz and Tessler (1972) found that the inclusion of personal normative beliefs (an

individual's personal beliefs about what is right and wrong) made a significant contribution to the explanation of variance in intentions in their study of organ transplants. Personal morality had been included in the original Fishbein model, but was subsequently replaced by the subjective norm, as it was felt that personal beliefs served mainly as an alternative measure of behavioural intentions (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970). Inclusion of a moral factor has, however, significantly improved the prediction of intention in several studies (Gorusch and Ortberg, 1983; Pomazal and Jaccard, 1976; Zuckerman and Reis, 1978), and in their study of cheating, lying and shoplifting in college students, Beck and Ajzen (1991) report that perceived moral obligation improved the explanation of variance by between 3% and 6%. Although East (1997) suggests that the moral norm may be covered by other measures, there is strong support for including a measure of moral norm or moral obligation for those behaviours which involve moral issues (Kurland, 1995; Parker, 1995; Randall and Gibson, 1991).

Bagozzi (1981), Bentler and Speckart (1979) and Fredericks and Dossett (1983) found that previous experience of the behaviour had a direct effect on intention not mediated by attitude or subjective norm, and also had a direct effect on behaviour not mediated by intention. Ajzen (1991) argues that experience with a behaviour contributes to the formation of attitude, subjective norm and perceived control, and is therefore not an additional variable to the model. He suggests that if past experience has a significant effect beyond the predictor variables, this would indicate either that these variables have been poorly measured or that additional variables, not accounted for by the model, are influencing intention.

93

6.4.4 Reasoned Action, Planned Behaviour and Rational Choice

Rational choice theories of crime (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a) hypothesise that offenders choose to engage in criminal behaviour, basing their decision on a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the crime. Both the theory of reasoned action, and its subsequent development, the theory of planned behaviour, assume that people have a rational basis for their behaviour in that they consider the implications of their actions (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Applied to criminal behaviour, this suggests that

people engage in criminal behaviour because they intend to do so, and they intend to do so because they think this behaviour is of personal benefit. (Eagly and Chaiken, 1992, p 173)

Thus, rational choice, reasoned action and planned behaviour are all theories of decisionmaking which are based on the assumption that people make rational choices between alternatives, within the limits of their knowledge. Rational choice theories, however, have been criticised by Tuck and Riley (1986) for their emphasis on the utilitarian calculation of the costs and benefits of crime. They argue that such theories are unlikely to provide an adequate explanation of criminal behaviour and contend that

any adequate model of criminal decision making should be capable of covering those situational, social learning, and normative factors we know to be related to criminal behaviour. (Tuck and Riley, 1986, p 160)

The theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour provide such a model. Although the theory of reasoned action hypothesises that intentions (and thus, by implication, behaviour) are determined by two, and only two variables, attitude and the subjective norm, the theory of planned behaviour hypothesises that for behaviour which is not under the control of the individual, some estimate of this control and its impact on behaviour is required. Thus, the theory of planned behaviour extends the theory of reasoned action to included perceived control, and also allows for the inclusion of any additional variables which are found to contribute to the explanation of intentions.

Thus, the theoretical basis of the theory of planned behaviour is consistent with rational choice theories of crime, and in addition, provides a more comprehensive framework than rational choice models for systematically investigating the factors identified as being relevant to criminal behaviour, and the interaction between these factors.

6.4.5 Relevance of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Shoplifting Research

The more recent theories of crime (Agnew, 1992; Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Wilson and Hernnstein, 1985) propose an integrated approach, which investigates the effect of multiple variables on criminal behaviour, and the literature indicates that shoplifting is likely to be motivated by a number of factors including: economic considerations, the perceived risks and costs of being caught, social influence, moral views and opportunities to commit the crime. In order to understand shoplifting behaviour, and to devise strategies to effectively prevent the crime, it is neccesary to understand the relative influence of each of these factors on shoplifting.

The theory of planned behaviour provides a framework for systematically identifying and investigating these factors. Inclusion of the subjective norm acknowledges the role of social and family influences on behaviour and their likely importance to the decision to offend (Tuck and Riley, 1986). Situational and opportunity theories (Clarke, 1980; Cohen and Felson, 1979) hypothesise that the immediate environment is likely to influence shoplifting behaviour, and perceived control investigates the factors which are likely to encourage or discourage shoplifting, including the availability of opportunities and potential obstacles. The theory also allows for the inclusion of additional variables. As

discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.3.5, moral views are likely to have an important influence on shoplifting, and several applications of the theory of planned behaviour have included a moral component (Beck and Ajzen, 1991; Kurland, 1995). Past behaviour is also likely to be influential. For example, Montmarquette *et al* (1985) and Saltzman *et al* (1982) report that those who have shoplifted in the past without being caught are likely to have low perceptions of the risks and costs of shoplifting, and as suggested by social learning theories (Akers *et al*, 1979) successful shoplifting experiences are likely to reinforce future shoplifting activity. In addition, although rational choice theories of crime imply that offenders behave rationally, it is recognised that this rationality is likely to be limited, and that offenders consider only a few aspects of the alternatives available to them (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a; Johnson and Payne, 1986). Through the elicitation of salient beliefs, the theory of planned behaviour enables the identification of the factors which are likely to determine shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour.

Despite its apparent suitability for investigating criminal behaviour, only one application of the theory to theft could be traced. Beck and Ajzen (1991) used the theory to investigate cheating, lying and shoplifting in a sample of American college students. The theory explained 79% of the variance in shoplifting intentions and 48% of the variance in shoplifting behaviour. Although Eagly and Chaiken (1992) argue that the theory ignores the majority of variables traditionally considered important to the explanation of criminal behaviour, Clarke (1980) contends that investigation of the choices and decisions made by offenders provides a more realistic approach to crime prevention than traditional deterministic approaches, and as the preceding discussion indicates, the theory of planned behaviour can accommodate the factors identified as influencing shoplifting behaviour.

6.5 Conclusion

Although the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 suggests that rational choice theories of crime provide a more realistic approach to shoplifting prevention than deterministic approaches, research conducted from this perspective has, with a few exceptions, tended to ignore perceptions of the risks, opportunities and rewards of shoplifting. This chapter argues that shoplifting could be appropriately viewed as a form of consumer behaviour, and although USA consumer researchers have become increasingly interested in this approach, as yet, they have not attempted to apply a theory of consumer behaviour to shoplifting. As cognitive theories of consumer decision-making are compatible with the rational choice perspective on which situational crime prevention approaches are based, this study applies one such theory, the theory of planned behaviour, to shoplifting, in order to understand and explain the behaviour and to identify the factors which inhibit or facilitate encourage customer theft.

CHAPTER 7

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

7.1 Introduction

The design of this research study consisted of three stages. Firstly, consideration of the most appropriate method for providing information about the research problem. Secondly how the research method selected could be operationalised for shoplifting research. Thirdly, the design of the research instruments and the selection of appropriate procedures for data analysis. In view of the complexity of the research design, the structure of this chapter is presented diagrammatically in Figure 7.1.





7.2 Preliminary Research Steps

A number of preliminary steps were undertaken prior to the design of the research study.

7.2.1 Research Assumptions

The review of the shoplifting, consumer and planned behaviour literature, and a series of

informal discussions with retail security personnel and members of the general public

(both non-shoplifters and shoplifters) resulted in the following assumptions being made

about shoplifting behaviour, and what it was possible to achieve in this research project:

- 1. Shoplifting results from the coincidence of a motivated offender, attractive goods, and opportunities to commit the crime, and thus shares certain similarities with "normal" shopping behaviour.
- 2. Shoplifters and non-shoplifters hold different beliefs and attitudes about shoplifting and shoplifting prevention, and identification of these differences will provide an understanding of why some individuals shoplift and others do not.
- 3. It is possible to describe shoplifting attitudes and beliefs and to measure them at the level of the individual.
- 4. Respondents will be prepared to disclose their shoplifting experiences, and their beliefs and attitudes about the behaviour, provided that anonymity and confidentiality is guaranteed.
- 5. As shoplifting behaviour is widespread a sample of the general population is likely to provide a substantial proportion of shoplifters.

7.2.2 The Research Objectives

This study was undertaken with the aim of achieving the following research objectives:

- 1. To explore the utility of applying a consumer behaviour approach to situational crime prevention theory to provide a greater understanding of shoplifting.
- 2. To investigate the applicability of using the Theory of Planned Behaviour to understand and explain shoplifting behaviour.
- 3. To gain an understanding of attitudes toward shoplifting and the beliefs underlying shoplifting behaviour, and how these differ between non-shoplifters and shoplifters.

4. To identify the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft. This includes an investigation of shoplifting motivation, and the impact of retailers' shoplifting prevention measures and marketing strategies on shoplifting.

7.2.3 Research Hypotheses

As this thesis is a preliminary study to explore the utility of applying a consumer behaviour theory to situational crime prevention approaches, and it was considered important that the analysis of the data should not be constrained by preconceived ideas about what the research findings would be, it would not have been meaningful to develop testable hypotheses from the theory of planned behaviour and shoplifting literature. Instead, the findings are evaluated against the research assumptions and the research objectives.

7.2.4 Setting the Research Boundaries

The review of the literature indicates that: shoplifting is a widespread behaviour which involves a substantial proportion of the population; the majority of shoplifters escape detection; and a large percentage of apprehended shoplifters are ordinary consumers rather than professional thieves. Thus, a study of the general population, which enabled the views of shoplifters to be compared with those of non-shoplifters, was considered to be the most appropriate method of achieving the research objectives. As a full national survey was outside the financial limits of the research project, it was decided to restrict the research to a medium-sized city considered to be fairly representative of the UK. Thus, this study is delimited to Northampton and its surrounding area (see section 7.4.2).

7.2.5 Pilot Testing

Pilot testing was considered an essential and major part of the research design, and the pilot tests conducted at each stage of the study are discussed in the appropriate sections.

7.3 The Research Methodology

Although the philosophical assumptions underlying methodological choice were a major consideration in the selection of methods to research shoplifting behaviour, two additional factors were also considered to be important. Firstly, the problems inherent in researching a criminal behaviour in a reliable, acceptable and ethical manner. Secondly, what it was feasible to achieve given the constraints of time and resources.

7.3.1 The Problems of Researching Shoplifting

Shoplifting research is problematic. As the majority of shoplifters escape detection (Bamfield, 1994a; Murphy, 1986), the shoplifting population is not known, and there is no widely accepted method of researching shoplifting, as all the methods utilised in shoplifting research have limitations which restrict the validity and reliability of their findings. These problems are exacerbated by the fact that shoplifting is a socially unacceptable and criminal behaviour, and thus respondents may evade or falsify answers either through fear of arrest, or concerns about loss of respect (Geurts *et al*, 1975-6).

7.3.2 Potential Options for Researching Shoplifting

The customary methods for investigating shoplifters' attitudes and opinions are studies of apprehension records, self-report surveys and interviews. A study of apprehended shoplifters was considered to be inappropriate for two reasons. Firstly, as the majority of shoplifters escape detection, apprehended shoplifters are unlikely to be representative of the shoplifting population (see Chapter 3, section 3.3). Secondly, the research objectives necessitate comparing the views of a group of shoplifters with those of a group of non-shoplifters. Thus, the two options open for this research project were a quantitative self-report study or qualitative interviews with non-shoplifters and shoplifters.

7.3.3 Choosing between Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Choosing the most appropriate methods to collect, interpret and evaluate the data is a problematic issue (Downey and Ireland, 1983). As quantitative methods are usually associated with positivist paradigms, and qualitative methods with interpretivist paradigms, the two methods tend to produce different types of data (Mintzberg, 1983), and there is considerable debate as to which is the most valid research method, and whether the two approaches can be combined in a single research design (Bryman, 1988).

7.3.3.1 Quantitative Methods

Quantitative methods use systematic data collection procedures to test, prove and verify hypotheses (Glaser and Strauss, 1968). As quantitative surveys are suitable for investigating the opinions of large populations (Sieber, 1973), for testing the validity of theories and establishing cause and effect relationships (Bryman, 1988), and for questioning respondents about their own behaviour and their attitudes and perceptions (Bryman, 1989), they were considered to be the most appropriate method for collecting the data required to achieve the research objectives. Quantitative surveys, however, have a number of disadvantages including: their failure to provide detailed insights into human behaviour and the inapplicability of generalising data to individual cases (Guba and Lincoln, 1994); and their focus on social structure rather than social process, their failure to consider the context of behaviour, and the over-simplification of their subject matter (Van Maanen, 1983).

7.3.3.2 Qualitative Methods

Qualitative research is concerned with viewing events and actions from the perspective of those being studied (Bryman, 1988). It seeks to provide meaningful insights by

examining in greater depth social processes and experiences, and is characterised as being 'thick' (Geertz, 1973, p 10), 'deep' and 'rich' (Sieber, 1973, p 1335). Qualitative research has been criticised, however, for its reliance on empathetic understanding and focus on the individual rather than society (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988), and for 'problems of criteria and objectivity' and 'the problem of inquirer authority and privilege' (Schwandt, 1994, p 130).

7.3.3.3 Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Quantitative and qualitative approaches are often presented as mutually exclusive, with the suggestion being that the two methods cannot be used in tandem due to their ontological and epistemological differences (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). There is, however, considerable support for the integration of both methods within the research design to counteract their inherent strengths and weaknesses (Bryman, 1989; Filstead, 1979; Sieber, 1973; Van Maanen, 1983). Reichardt and Cook (1979, p 19) disagree with the quantitative-qualitative dichotomy and argue that the methods chosen should be appropriate to the research problem 'regardless of the methods' traditional affiliations' and this view has informed the design of this research study.

7.3.4 The Research Methods Used in this Study

Consistent with the philosophical assumptions underlying the positivist cognitive paradigm, the approach taken by this study is that of applying the principles of natural science to the study of people, using a quantitative survey. Quantitative surveys, however, have several weakness, and in an attempt to overcome these it was decided to conduct qualitative interviews and thus achieve triangulation between methods as recommended by Denzin (1989). Desphande (1983) argues that this approach allows the

strengths of qualitative methods to compensate for the weaknesses of quantitative methods and vice versa. Thus, as discussed by Jick (1983), if both methods reach the same conclusion, then more confidence can be placed in the findings.

7.3.4.1 Interviews

It was initially intended to validate and explore further the findings from the quantitative survey by interviewing a number of shoplifters and non-shoplifters. It was recognised that respondents who volunteered to be interviewed about their shoplifting behaviour would, in all probability, be an unrepresentative sample, possibly motivated by a hidden agenda. In practice, however, the use of interviews presented two additional problems. Firstly, an initial group of six "known" shoplifters had been identified and contacted. When approached to arrange the interview, one of the shoplifters was serving a prison sentence, two could not be traced, and two had decided not to participate, although they had initially agreed to be interviewed. Secondly, pretest interviews were conducted with two non-shoplifters (one female aged 38, one male aged 15). Although both interviews lasted for 45 minutes, very little useful information was obtained about shoplifting behaviour, other than that both participants felt shoplifting to be wrong and stated that they would not engage in the behaviour under any circumstances. In view of these problems, and the expertise required for interviewing subjects about sensitive topics, it was decided that an additional quantitative survey would be a more appropriate method of achieving the research objectives. As the literature indicates a high degree of involvement in shoplifting by those under the age of nineteen, it was decided to investigate further the shoplifting behaviour of this age group by administering the self-report questionnaire to a sample of school students. Denzin (1989) refers to the collection of data from two or

more different sources as data triangulation, and argues that this approach enables the investigation of similarities and differences across settings.

7.3.4.2 The Quantitative Survey

The major problem in any study of shoplifting is how to obtain accurate and reliable data about a behaviour which is both socially undesirable and criminal. Self-report surveys have been extensively used in both criminological and shoplifting research and several studies support their validity and reliability (Farrington, 1973; Hindelang *et al*, 1979; Huizinga and Elliott, 1986). Self-report surveys are particularly useful in studies which require the comparison of a group of criminals with a control group of non-criminals (Hood and Sparks, 1970), and as argued by Klemke (1992), are often the only method of obtaining data on many aspects of shoplifting. The major problem with this type of study is the respondent's honesty, as questions about a sensitive and socially undesirable behaviour may be liable to distorted and untruthful answers (Nettler, 1978; Williams, 1991). Researchers such as Barnett (1998), Blair *et al* (1977) and Sudman and Bradburn (1982) have proposed a number of strategies to limit the bias resulting from threatening or sensitive questions, and Sudman and Bradburn (1974, pp 142-3) suggest

The best and most widely used method for reducing response effects from threatening questions is the use of self-administered questionnaires, which in some cases insure anonymity, and which remove the threat of direct disclosure to another person of what may be considered socially unacceptable behaviour.

As self-report surveys have been used with considerable success in shoplifting research (Cox *et al*, 1990; Ray, 1987), and Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) recommend the use of this method to investigate behaviours which are not directly accessible to the observer, it was decided that a self-administered questionnaire would be the most appropriate method of

obtaining information about shoplifting. Although Beck and Ajzen (1991) argue that there is evidence to suggest that self-reports of dishonest behaviour can be quite accurate, behaviours such as shoplifting are potentially subject to dishonest reporting due to social desirability concerns. There are scales available to assess social desirability bias, for example, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964). These scales typically contain a number of questions to assess respondents' tendencies either to deny or exaggerate socially undesirable attitudes and behaviour. Inclusion of questions which enable the specific assessment of social desirability bias would, however, have increased the length of an already long questionnaire.

Initial discussions with a group of fourteen students indicated that these students would be prepared to answer direct questions about their involvement in shoplifting, provided that complete anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed. It was therefore decided to follow the strategy recommended by Sudman and Bradburn (1974). The respondents in both the consumer and school surveys were required to self-complete the questionnaire and were guaranteed that the questionnaire was totally anonymous and confidential. It is recognised, however, that dishonest reporting may have biased the results, and this is discussed further in Chapter 10, section 10.2.1.1.

7.3.5 Ethical Issues

As this research study entails asking respondents to admit to a behaviour which is criminal and thus punishable by law, it was considered that ethical issues were of the utmost importance. All stages of the research design comply with the ethical guidelines of the British Psychology Society (as discussed by Gross, 1995), and the ethics committee of University College Northampton. The ethical issues underlying the research design relate to deception, consent, the right to withdraw and confidentiality. Each of these issues are discussed below and apply to both the consumer and the school surveys. The additional measures taken to protect the rights of the school students are discussed in section 7.8.2. **Deception:** All respondents were advised of the purpose of survey, and that the survey contained questions of a personal nature about previous and future shoplifting behaviour. **Consent:** The questionnaire was given only to those respondents who agreed to take part in the survey, and it was made clear that participants had the **right to withdraw** at any point. In addition, all respondents under the age of 16 were asked to obtain their parent's consent for completion of the questionnaire.

Confidentiality: All respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, and were not required to provide their names on the questionnaire.

7.3.6 Evaluation of the Research Method

An underlying concern in the selection of the research method for this study was that it should meet the criteria of reliability, acceptability and feasibility, and that ethical concerns should be paramount in order to protect the rights of the participants. Although every effort has been made to meet these criteria, there are some concerns about the reliability and validity of the method used. Although self-report surveys are widely used, both in shoplifting research and in applications of the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour, this type of study has a number of weaknesses. It was originally proposed to compensate for these by the use of qualitative interviews. In practice this proved to be problematic, and thus the research design consists of two quantitative surveys. As these surveys are conducted on different populations, it is hoped that the findings will increase confidence in the reliability and validity of the research design.

7.4 Sample Selection

In order to decide on the appropriate sampling method the following publications were consulted: Chisnall (1992); Churchill (1995); Kinnear and Taylor (1991); Sudman (1994).

7.4.1. Sampling Method for the Consumer Survey

For the results of a research project to be generalisable to the population, a sample representative of that population should be selected, using probability/random sampling, i.e. every member of the population has a known and non-zero chance of being selected (Chisnall, 1992). To achieve this, a sampling frame of the total population to be surveyed is determined, and the sample randomly chosen from this. Selection of a sampling frame appropriate for shoplifting proved to be problematic. Use of the electoral roll would exclude the under-18s, a section of the population identified in the literature as being extensively involved in shoplifting. Use of telephone directories would similarly exclude adolescents, and also those who do not have a telephone, or have an ex-directory number.

As a necessary condition for shoplifting is presence in shops, the sampling frame for this study is people who use shops. The discussion in Chapter 3 indicates that shoplifting is widespread and that a substantial proportion of consumers steal. Thus, although it is not possible either to identify, or to locate the population of shoplifters, it is likely that a sample of consumers using the shops over a period of time will contain a fairly typical proportion of shoplifters. It would, however, be impossible to utilise a probability sampling technique, for example, stratified random sampling, cluster sampling or multistage sampling, with this type of sampling frame, due to the lack of a comprehensive list of the population to be studied. Thus, convenience sampling in a shopping centre was the only alternative available. Although the use of convenience sampling limits the extent

to which the results can be generalised to other populations, and the statistical reliability of the findings as sampling error cannot be measured, it was considered to be the most appropriate method for this study. Sudman (1994) argues that shopping centre sampling could be viewed as a form of cluster sampling, and that the potential biases arising from sample selection can be partially controlled for. The measures taken to limit potential sample bias are discussed in the following sections.

7.4.2 Selection of the Shopping "Site"

Ideally, a sampling frame of all shopping centres in the UK would have been drawn up, and a random sample of these selected for the administration of the consumer survey. Due to the constraints of time and resources, a nationwide survey of shoppers was not feasible. There is nothing in the shoplifting literature to suggest that the prevalence of shoplifting may be greater in certain geographical areas of the UK, although retail crime surveys (for example, Bamfield, 1994a; Speed *et al*, 1995) indicate that the incidence of shoplifting may vary between type and size of retailer and retail outlet. Therefore, it was decided to select a medium-sized shopping area with a good mix of independent and multiple retailers in both town centre and out-of-town locations for the administration of the questionnaire. Northampton, a medium-sized town located in the East Midlands, was felt to be typical of such a shopping area (in terms of size, location, demographics and spending patterns) for the following reasons:

- 1. Northampton has a population of 180,567 (Official Population Censuses and Surveys, 1992) and is ranked approximately midway in the list of Unitary Councils and District Council Towns (Marsden, 1998).
- 2. Northampton is not regionally isolated. Although it is centrally located, with access to the motorway network, it is not an obvious "port-of-call" for shoplifting gangs, nor is it a regional shopping centre, unlike for example, Milton Keynes, Nottingham or Leicester.

3. The age and employment profile of Northampton is in line with national figures, as is the total spent annually on convenience goods. Spending on personal and home goods is slightly above average, whilst spending on leisure goods is slightly below average (Retail Week, 1999).

7.4.3 Selection of the Location

Northampton is served by a central shopping district, several suburban shopping centres, and out-of-town multiple retailers and retail parks. To ensure that the sample was representative of shopping activity, the survey was conducted in all three types of location, with each questionnaire being coded according to the location of its distribution. The central shopping area of Northampton consists of a pedestrianised thoroughfare and two enclosed shopping malls. In view of the difficulty in obtaining permission to conduct surveys in enclosed shopping malls, it was decided to conduct the town centre survey outside the shops in the pedestrianised area. This area contained a good selection of major retailers, and the main entrances to the enclosed shopping centres, thus enabling shoppers using these centres to be included in the sample. A sampling frame of the shops in this area was compiled, and from this shops representing different types of retailer were selected. 750 questionnaires were distributed in the town centre.

Northampton contains several suburban shopping centres which cater for the daily needs of local shoppers. As this type of shopping centre accounts for a substantial proportion of local shopping, it was decided to include a centre of this type in the sample. The suburb of Kingsthorpe was chosen, in view of its selection of shops, and its proximity to University College Northampton (thus enabling students to be included in the sample). Kingsthorpe shopping centre contains a number of small local retailers plus Boots, and two large supermarkets, Safeways and Waitrose (which are located next to each other and share the main shoppers' car park in Kingsthorpe). Questionnaires were distributed between the car park and the bus stops outside Safeways and Waitrose. This enabled carborne shoppers, shoppers using public transport and shoppers on foot to be included in the sample. 200 questionnaires were administered in Kingsthorpe.

In view of the increasing significance of out-of-town retailing (Guy, 1994; Department of the Environment, 1994), it was considered important that the sample contained shoppers using this type of retail facility. As investigation of the main out-of-town retail park in Northampton indicated that shopper flow in this area is light, and as it is difficult to obtain permission to conduct a survey in a retail park, two out-of-town superstores were approached. Permission was obtained from the Head Offices of J Sainsbury and Homebase to conduct the survey outside their out-of-town grocery and DIY stores. 150 questionnaires were distributed outside J Sainsbury and 100 outside Homebase. The questionnaires for Homebase were distributed on a Sunday, in view of the increasing importance of Sunday shopping since the relaxation of the Sunday trading laws.

7.4.4 Selection of the Respondents

Previous studies of shoplifting using samples of consumers have experienced response rates of between 30% to 35% (Kallis and Vanier, 1985; Ray, 1987), with more than 30% of the respondents surveyed admitting to shoplifting. It was considered that a sample of 100 shoplifters would be sufficient to achieve the research objectives. It was therefore decided to distribute 1,200 questionnaires, with a target response rate of 30% (360 questionnaires), in the expectation that this would yield a sample of 108 shoplifters.

Although Sudman (1994) suggests that sample bias resulting from respondents refusal to

be interviewed can be partially offset by controlling for age and gender, this was felt to be inappropriate as research indicates that shoplifters are likely to be demographically representative of the population from which they are drawn (Sohier, 1969; Murphy, 1986). Thus, it was decided to distribute the questionnaire to every fourth shopper leaving the shops selected to be representative of shopping activity in Northampton.

7.4.5 Timing of the Survey

As discussed by Sudman (1994) the characteristics of consumers using the shops can vary by time of day and day of week, and he suggests that a two-week study will give an fairly accurate representation of shopping behaviour. Thus, to ensure that the sample was representative of differing shopping patterns in Northampton, the survey was conducted over a two-week period, including weekends, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. There does not appear to be a late shopping night in Northampton. The survey commenced on Monday, 24th March 1997. This period was chosen because the local schools broke up for Easter on Wednesday, 26th March, and the Easter Bank Holiday fell on the middle weekend of the survey. It was felt that first week would provide a representative sample of shopping in the town centre of Northampton, as Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday would provide a sample of people who normally used the shops during the week, whilst Thursday, Friday and Saturday would include schoolchildren and people who were normally working during the week. The second week of the survey was used to conduct the questionnaire at the out of town and suburban locations.

7.4.6 Sampling Method for the School Survey

Rather than conduct a further survey of Northampton shoppers, targeting those under the age of nineteen, it was decided to survey students in Northampton schools. It was initially

hoped to obtain a sample of school students between the ages of eleven and sixteen. Discussions with school teachers indicated, however, that it was unlikely that permission would be given to survey children as young as eleven, in view of the sensitive nature of the proposed questions. Therefore, it was decided to limit the sample to school students between the ages of thirteen and eighteen.

7.4.7 Selection of the Schools

A list of schools in the Northampton area was obtained. It was decided to restrict the sample to schools that were co-educational and similar in structure. Letters were sent to six schools requesting permission to conduct the survey (see Appendix A). Two schools agreed to co-operate in the survey, and as both schools were guaranteed confidentiality they are referred to throughout as School A and School B. School A was located in a suburban area, approximately two miles from Northampton town centre; School B was located in a rural area approximately five miles from Northampton.

7.4.8 Selection of the Respondents

The target sample size was 200 students from each school. Ideally stratified random sampling, using the school roll, would have been used to select an equal number of students from each year, this, however, proved to be logistically problematic. After consultations with the teachers in the two schools, it was decided to include a number of classes from each school year in the sample. These classes were selected by the teachers according to the demands of the school timetable. The demographic composition of the population of each school was provided, so that the demographic characteristics of the sample could be compared with the general population of the school.

7.5 Operationalising the Theory of Planned Behaviour

The theory of planned behaviour, and the theory of reasoned action on which it is based, advocate specific procedures for measurement of the components of the theories and the collection and analysis of the data (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 1991). The operational issues relating to the theory of planned behaviour are discussed in this section, the design of the consumer and school surveys are considered in sections 7.6 and 7.7.

7.5.1 How the Theory "Works"

The theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour provide a theoretical framework for systematically identifying and evaluating the factors which influence behaviour. The theory assumes that immediate determinant of behaviour is the individual's intention to perform, or not to perform, the behaviour. As discussed by Ajzen (1991, p181) 'intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behaviour'. Intentions are determined by the individual's attitude, subjective norm and perceived control; these are referred to as global measures. As it was considered likely that moral considerations and previous experience of shoplifting would influence shoplifting behaviour (see the discussion in Chapter 6), these two variables were incorporated into the model. These five global measures, each weighted for their relative importance, are assumed jointly to determine behavioural intention. The theory can be expressed algebraically in terms of a multiple regression model.

$$B \sim BI = [A_{act}]w_0 + [SN]w_1 + [PC]w_2 + [MN]w_3 + [PE]w_4$$

Where B = behaviour, BI = behavioural intention, A_{act} = attitude to the act, SN = subjective norm, PC = perceived control, MN = moral norm and PE = previous experience. $w_0 w_1 w_2 w_3 w_4$ are the empirically determined weights of each variable.

The theory of planned behaviour traces the causes of behaviour to an individual's beliefs about that behaviour (Ajzen, 1985). These beliefs usually relate to the consequences of performing the behaviour (outcome beliefs), the views of people important to the individual (referent beliefs), and factors which may control performance of the behaviour (control beliefs). From these beliefs an understanding of the informational basis of an individual's attitude, subjective norm and perceived control can be gained (Ajzen, 1987). Miller (1956) argues that although individuals may have many beliefs about a behaviour, they can only consider a relatively small number at any given time, and Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) maintain that it is these salient beliefs are elicited from a sample of the population to be surveyed. The beliefs mentioned most frequently are described as the modal set of salient beliefs and are used to construct the belief-based questions.

In accordance with expectancy-value models (Edwards, 1954, 1961; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975), the likelihood of each outcome belief is multiplied by its evaluation (the individual's opinion of whether the outcome is good or bad) and the resulting products are summed over the number of salient beliefs. Thus, as shown in the equation below, the likelihood of each salient belief (b) is combined with its subjective evaluation (e).

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathsf{act}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{b}_{1} \mathbf{e}_{1}$$

The referent and control beliefs influencing subjective norm and perceived control are also based on salient beliefs and are calculated in a similar manner. Referent beliefs are based on whether referent individuals or groups think that the individual should perform the behaviour, and are measured by the likelihood that the referent holds the belief (n) and the individuals' motivation to comply with the referent (m).

$$SN = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n_{i} m_{i}$$

Control beliefs refer to the factors which are perceived to increase or reduce the difficulty of performing the behaviour, and are measured by the power of the belief to facilitate or inhibit performance of the behaviour (p), and the individual's assessment of the belief (c).

$$PC = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{1} p_{i}$$

Ajzen (1991) argues that if the expectancy-value models are a valid representation of attitude, subjective norm and perceived control, then they will correlate well with their corresponding global measures, and empirical research generally supports this proposition (Ajzen, 1974; Fishbein, 1963; Jaccard and Davidson, 1972). Ajzen (1991) suggests that when the salient beliefs are obtained from the respondents themselves, or from a pilot study of a representative sample of the population, the correlations tend to be higher than when they are estimated on arbitrarily selected set of beliefs. It is argued that users and non-users may have different salient beliefs (East, 1997; Elliot *et al*, 1995), and the studies by Eiser and van der Plight (1979) and Elliott and Jobber (1995) indicate that the correlations between the belief-based measures and the global measures are improved when a measure of personal belief salience is used.

7.5.2 Measuring the Variables

In order to reduce measurement error, multiple items are used to assess the global measures of intention, attitude, perceived control and the subjective and moral norm (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). The multiple items are then summed to form a scale for each of the global measures. As recommended by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), seven-point

rating scales are used for variable measurement, with semantic differential scales being used for the attitude variables. This technique, developed by Osgood *et al* (1957), uses seven-point scales with opposite terms at each end of the scale, for example, *good-bad*. There has been considerable discussion (East, 1993, 1997; Valiquette *et al*, 1988) as to whether the scales should be bipolar (scaled -3 to +3, with a midpoint of 0) or unipolar (scaled 1 to 7), Ajzen (1991) contends that both types of scoring are equally justified. A similar procedure is used for the belief measures. Each of the salient beliefs is measured by two items, one to assess the likelihood of the belief, one to assess the respondent's evaluation of the belief. Calculation of the belief measures is described in section 7.5.1.

7.5.3 Reliability and Validity

A major concern in quantitative surveys is the reliability and validity of the measuring instrument, this section considers overall issues of reliability and validity, the next section focuses on issues of reliability and validity in scale development.

Reliability refers to the consistency with which the instrument measures the concept in question and has two dimensions. External reliability refers to the consistency of the measure over time, and is usually checked by a test-retest procedure, administering the measure twice to the same group of respondents with a time interval between the two tests (Rust and Golombok, 1989). In view of the sampling methods used for the consumer and school surveys, and the guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality given to the respondents, it would have been impossible to conduct a test-retest to check for changes in responses over time. Thus, examination of the external reliability of the questionnaire could not be undertaken. Internal reliability refers to the internal consistency of a multi-item scale, and is concerned with establishing the consistency of the response

patterns. Cronbach's Alpha is used to test internal reliability. This is the most widely used measure of scale reliability (Peterson, 1994), and 'provides an estimate of the correlation of the set of test items with another set of similar items from the same universe of items' (Kline, 1993, p10). The recommended figure for acceptable reliability is an alpha coefficient of 0.7 or above (Nunnally, 1978; Peterson, 1994).

Validity refers to whether the measuring instrument actually measures what it is supposed to measure. External validity concerns the extent to which the findings can be generalised to the population, internal validity refers to whether factors other than the independent variables are the causes of the observed outcomes (Sternthal *et al*, 1994). The external validity of this study is unknown due to the sampling procedures used. Thus, in an attempt to increase external validity, two large-scale surveys of different populations were conducted. If the two surveys produce similar findings, then it could be argued that a degree of external validity has been achieved. The internal validity of this study is strengthened by the use of the theory of planned behaviour, a theory which has been tested, refined and validated over a number of research settings and applications.

7.5.4 Scale Development and Reliability and Validity

For this study to be a stringent test of the utility of applying planned behaviour theory to shoplifting, it was considered essential that the procedures for the development of the scales for the global and belief measures, advocated by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Ajzen (1991), were rigorously adhered to, rather than follow an acknowledged approach to scale development such as that proposed by Churchill (1979). Churchill argues that to develop multi-item scales which have desirable reliability and validity an eight-stage process should be followed (see Churchill, 1979, p 66). This study followed the first four

stages of this process. The domain of the construct was specified from the literature (stage 1), the items to assess the global and belief measures were generated from the review of the shoplifting and planned behaviour literature and the salient belief elicitation (stage 2), the data based on these items were collected (stage 3), and the measures were purified using coefficient alpha and factor analysis (stage 4). It was not, however, possible to follow the final four stages of this process detailed below:

Stage 5: collect new data based on the purified measures

Stage 6: assess the reliability of this data using coefficient alpha or split-half reliability

Stage 7: assess construct validity by (a) determining the extent to which the measure correlates with other measures designed to measure the same thing, and (b) whether the measure behaves as expected

Stage 8: develop norms by averaging and summarising the distribution of the scores

As this is an exploratory study, it was considered important that the consumer and school questionnaires should be as similar as possible. Therefore, the same multi-item measures and purification process were used in both studies, in order that direct comparisons could be made between the two sets of data. In addition, due to the difficulties of measuring the global and belief measures by an alternative method, and constraints of space on the questionnaire, it was not possible to measure convergent validity. To achieve construct validity (stage 7), both convergent and discriminant validity are required. Convergent validity is achieved when two methods are used to measure the same construct, and both methods produce results which are highly correlated. Discriminant validity is achieved when two is are reported between the multi-item scale, and other multi-item scales for

the global and belief measures can be said to have face or content reliability, as stages 1 to 4 have been completed, the extent to which these scales have achieved construct validity cannot be assessed. Nevertheless, rigorous adherence to procedures whose validity and reliability have been confirmed in a number of applications (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 1991) increases confidence in the construct validity of these scales.

The reliability of the multi-item scales is established by coefficient alpha and by submitting the measures to a new sample of respondents. Both these procedures were accomplished. The reliability of the multi-item scales is reported in Chapter 8, sections 8.7.1, 8.7.2 and 8.7.4, and Chapter 9, sections 9.4.1, 9.4.3 and 9.4.4. The comparison of the consumer and schools surveys is reported in Chapter 10, section 10.2.1.2.

7.6 The Consumer Survey

The theory of planned behaviour utilises a three-stage research design: an elicitation of beliefs, a questionnaire, and a follow-up survey.

7.6.1 Stage 1: The Elicitation

The interview guide for the elicitation of salient beliefs is shown in Appendix A. A freeresponse format was used to obtain information on shoplifting attitudes, the costs/benefits and advantages/disadvantages of shoplifting, individuals or groups of people who would approve or disapprove of shoplifting, and factors which would encourage or discourage shoplifting. For example, the respondent was asked what he/she considered the costs of shoplifting to be, the responses were recorded, and the respondent was then asked "anything else?" In addition biographic details were requested. The results from the elicitations are recorded in Appendix B.

7.6.2 Stage 2: The Questionnaire

A number of publications on questionnaire design were consulted for the wording and ordering of questions (Bagozzi, 1994b; Chisnall, 1992; Converse and Presser, 1986; Kinnear and Taylor, 1991; Sudman and Bradburn, 1974, 1982). As the survey contained questions of a threatening nature, the questionnaire commenced with general questions about shoplifting, before personal questions about shoplifting were introduced. The questions relating to the theory of planned behaviour used seven-point scales, and this format was used wherever possible to preserve consistency. To maintain the respondents' interest, the layout of the questions varied by section. Each section was preceded by instructions on how to complete the questions. To achieve the research objectives, data on the following areas were required: shoplifting motivation; attitudes to shoplifting and the beliefs underlying the behaviour; factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft, including retailers' marketing and anti-shoplifting strategies; previous shoplifting behaviour and future shoplifting intentions. The questionnaire contained six sections.

Shoplifting Motivation: This section included questions on shoplifting motivation, attitudes to retailers and the shoplifting decision. The questions were phrased indirectly, as recommended by Sudman and Bradburn (1982), and asked the respondent's opinion as to why he/she thought people shoplifted, what sort of things shoplifters considered when making the decision to shoplift, and shoplifters' attitudes towards shops.

Shoplifting Experience: Behavioural self-reports of shoplifting were obtained by asking respondents to indicate when they had last shoplifted (never, over 5 years ago, 1 to 5 years ago, within the last 12 months) and how many times they had shoplifted (never, once, twice, four times, more than four times). The respondents were also asked if they

had ever been caught, and whether this would deter them from future shoplifting.

The Theory of Planned Behaviour: There has been some argument as to whether intentions should be measured by behavioural intention or behavioural expectation (Sheppard *et al*, 1988; Warshaw and Davis, 1985). In view of the likelihood of shoplifting behaviour being restricted by opportunity, shoplifting intentions were measured by two scales, 'I intend to shoplift in the future' *likely-unlikely* and 'If I have the opportunity, I will shoplift in the future' *likely-unlikely*. The global measures (attitude, the subjective norm, perceived control and the moral norm) were measured using seven-point scales. Six semantic differential scales were used to measure attitude, subjective norm was assessed by two items, perceived control and moral norm were measured by three items. The items used to assess the global measures were adapted from Beck and Ajzen's (1991) application of the theory of planned behaviour to dishonest behaviours, from Osgood *et al's* (1957) lists of polar opposites, and from data obtained in the elicitation (see Appendix B).

The beliefs identified in the elicitation as being salient to shoplifting were used to construct the belief-based questions. The questionnaire contained five outcome beliefs, three referent beliefs and five control beliefs. The likelihood and evaluation of the outcome and normative beliefs were measured by two seven-point scales, *likely/unlikely* and *good/bad*, two seven-point scales *likely/unlikely* and *agree/disagree* were used for the control beliefs. Although Elliott and Jobber (1995) recommend using a measure of personal belief salience, it was felt that asking respondents to indicate which beliefs they consider relevant to shoplifting would result in a questionnaire which was too complex and too long. It was therefore decided that an answer of "neither" was an indication that

122

the respondent did not consider the belief to be salient.

Shoplifting Prevention: The respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood of ten frequently used shoplifting prevention measures deterring people from shoplifting, and to identify which three measures were the most effective in deterring shoplifting and catching shoplifters. The respondents were then asked whether the presence of any of these measures had made them feel apprehensive or had prevented them from using a shop.

Attitudes to the Control of Shoplifting: This section contained eight questions relating to the respondents' opinions as to how shoplifting could be controlled

Biographic Data: This section contained questions relating to age, gender, employment, income and frequency of using shops. The questionnaire concluded with a request for comments on shoplifting and shoplifting prevention.

7.6.3 The Cover Letter

A covering letter was attached to the questionnaire (see Appendix A). This explained the purpose of the questionnaire and its value for shoplifting research, and assured the respondents of complete confidentiality and anonymity. Instructions for completing the questionnaire were contained in the cover letter.

7.6.4 Stage Three: The Follow-up Survey

It had originally been intended to assess whether the respondents had behaved in accordance with their intentions by conducting a follow-up survey. This proved to be problematic in view of the guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality given to the respondents. To test the viability of a follow-up survey, a pilot study was conducted on
a group of 122 Business Studies students, using the respondent's mother's maiden name as an identifier. Of the 122 follow-up surveys distributed to the students who had completed the questionnaire, only 65 were returned, and only 28 could be matched with the questionnaire. It was therefore decided not to proceed with the follow-up survey, due to the complexity of the procedure and the logistical problems of administering it to the consumer sample.

7.6.5 Pretesting the Consumer Questionnaire

The pilot test is a pretest of the questionnaire on a sample of the population to be surveyed and is 'used to refine the questionnaire design and identify errors' (Reynolds *et al*, 1993, p 171). The first pilot test for this study had three purposes:

- 1. To test whether a self-report survey using the theory of planned behaviour was an appropriate method of researching shoplifting behaviour.
- 2. To test the scaling of the questions and the statistical procedures.

3. To test reaction to question content, wording, and the layout of the questionnaire. The belief-based questions were constructed using the salient shoplifting beliefs elicited from a group of 12 first year Business Studies students. The questionnaire was then administered to a group of 49 first year Business Studies students, 15 of whom provided feedback on the questionnaire content and layout. All the students fully completed the questionnaire, with 33% admitting to shoplifting. Analysis of the findings indicated significant differences between non-shoplifters and shoplifters. Planned behaviour theory explained 66% of the variance in intentions, and the alpha coefficients indicated accepted reliability for the multi-item scales. It was concluded that although the research method had considerable utility for shoplifting research, several modifications would be required. Consultations with the students who had completed the questionnaire, colleagues at University College Northampton and Professor East of Kingston Business School resulted in several changes to the questionnaire. As the analysis of the belief-based questions produced disappointing findings, these questions were redesigned. Questions felt to be ambiguous were reworded, and the layout of the questionnaire was changed. The questions relating to the theory of planned behaviour had initially been randomised, with the scales being reversed on alternate questions as recommended by Sudman and Bradburn (1982). As the students indicated that they found this to be irritating, and Professor East advised against the procedure, the questions were not randomised.

A further elicitation was conducted (see Appendix B for the results of the elicitations) and the revised questionnaire was administered to a further group of 122 Business Studies students, 38% of whom admitted to shoplifting. The amendments made to the questionnaire proved to be effective. The results from the belief-based questions improved, although the correlations between the belief-based measures and the global measures were still low. On the advice of Professor East, the scales were changed from bipolar to unipolar. This overcame the problems resulting from the multiplication of two negative values, and further analysis resulted in improved correlations. Feedback indicated that the students had understood and were able to answer all the questions and were satisfied that the questionnaire was completely confidential and anonymous.

7.6.6 The Final Version of the Consumer Questionnaire

Two weeks prior to the administration of the consumer questionnaire, the salient beliefs underlying shoplifting were elicited from a sample of 25 consumers using the shopping centre of Northampton, using the elicitation schedule shown in Appendix A. The results

Table 7.1	Outcome	and control	beliefs
-----------	---------	-------------	---------

Outcome beliefs	Control beliefs
I will get goods without paying for them	Little risk of being caught
I will be able to save money	Ineffective security measures
Shops will pass on the costs to customers	Penalties for being caught not severe
I will get caught by retail security measures	Short of money
I will be arrested for committing a crime	Encouragement by friends

are reported in Appendix B. The outcome and control beliefs are shown in Table 7.1, the referent groups were identified as being family, friends and the police. The results from the elicitation were used in the construction of the consumer questionnaire, the final version of which is shown in Appendix A. To ascertain the likely response rate, a pilot test was conducted in Kingsthorpe. Twenty-five shoppers were approached, all of whom agreed to complete the questionnaire at home and return it to University College Northampton in the stamped addressed envelope provided, together with any comments they felt appropriate. Eight completed questionnaires were returned (a response rate of 32%). The only adverse comments related to the questionnaire's length. The questionnaire was considered ready to be distributed to the consumer sample, and it was decided to communicate to the selected consumers that the questionnaire contained personal and sensitive questions and would take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

7.7 The School Survey

Both participating schools required the survey to be conducted with the minimum of disruption to school activities, therefore it was decided not to administer the elicitation to the school students. As the three previous elicitations had produced consistent beliefs across the populations surveyed (see Appendix B), the beliefs identified as being salient to consumers were utilised for the school questionnaire.

After consultation with a panel of parents and school teachers, and the ethics committee of University College Northampton, several amendments were made to the consumer questionnaire before it was administered to the school sample. To reduce the length of the questionnaire, the sections relating to shoplifting motivation, attitudes to retailers, the decision to shoplift and the control of shoplifting were deleted, and the section on shoplifting prevention was reduced to four security measures. Several questions in the section on the theory of planned behaviour were reworded, and the biographic section was moved to the beginning of the questionnaire. The section on previous shoplifting behaviour was only completed by those students who had shoplifted in the past. As with the consumer questionnaire, a covering letter was attached (shown in Appendix A) explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and providing instructions for its completion.

The amended questionnaire was pilot-tested on a group of twelve schoolchildren aged ten to sixteen (six male, six female). The schoolchildren were asked if the questionnaire made them feel upset or uncomfortable, and whether they had any difficulties in understanding and answering the questions. As there were no adverse reactions to the questionnaire, it was presented to the ethics committee of University College Northampton for final approval. The final version is shown in Appendix A.

7.8 Data Collection Procedures

This section describes the procedures used to collect the data for the two surveys.

7.8.1 The Consumer Survey

The questionnaire was distributed to a convenience sample of Northampton shoppers during the last week of March and the first week of April 1997. Every fourth consumer leaving the selected shops was approached, if the consumer declined to stop, then the next consumer leaving the shop was selected. The purpose of the survey was explained to all the potential respondents, and it was emphasised that the questionnaire contained questions of a personal and sensitive nature, and that it was completely confidential and anonymous. Those willing to participate were asked to complete the questionnaire at home and return it in the stamped addressed envelope provided. 1,200 questionnaires were distributed and 417 completed questionnaires returned, a response rate of 35%.

The age and sex of all the consumers who agreed to take part in the survey were recorded and those under the age of sixteen were asked to obtain their parents' permission before completing the questionnaire. It is estimated that approximately between 15% and 20% of the consumers approached declined to stop, presumably because of their antagonism to street surveys. Of those consumers who did stop, less than 1% refused to participate in the survey. Initially it was intended to record the age and sex of those who refused to stop when approached, or refused to participate in the survey, in practice, however, this proved to be impossible, as only estimations of age could be made.

7.8.2 The School Survey

The parents of the students selected to participate in the school survey were sent a letter explaining the purpose of the survey and asking permission for their child to take part (see Appendix A). None of the parents refused their permission. The survey was conducted in a classroom setting. The teachers explained the purpose of the survey and emphasised that participation was voluntary. Instructions for completing the questionnaire were included with the questionnaire, were given verbally by the researcher and were displayed on a slide. The students were assured that the survey was completely anonymous and confidential and were specifically asked not to put their name on the questionnaire. The students were asked to return the questionnaires in the envelope provided. The sealed envelopes were collected from the students using a black bin liner, which was shaken at frequent intervals to ensure that the envelopes were not in any sort of order. At the end of the administration of the survey to the first groups of students, sixteen of these students were asked as to whether they were satisfied that the survey was completely anonymous and confidential. The students all agreed that there was no way that questionnaires could be associated with individual students. 445 questionnaires were distributed and 444 returned a response rate over of 99%.

7.9 Data Analysis Procedures

The data from the surveys were analysed using a number of statistical procedures available on SPSS for Windows, release 6.0. A brief description of these procedures is given in section 7.9.2. Before these statistical procedures are discussed, the next section considers the factors determining the selection of the statistical tests used.

7.9.1 Selection of the Methods of Analysis

The major consideration in the selection of the methods of analysis is the appropriateness of the statistical test for the data. The choice is between parametric tests (for example, Pearson's correlation, multiple regression) or the less powerful non-parametric tests (for example, Spearman' correlation, Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance). Diamantopoulos and Schlegelmilch (1997) specify four factors which affect the choice of the appropriate statistical test: the type of analysis required, the distributional assumptions made about the population, the level of measurement and the power of the test. To achieve the research objectives, the respondents were categorised into non-shoplifters, past shoplifters (shoplifted over 12 months ago) and recent shoplifters (shoplifted in the last 12 months). The purpose of this was to enable the comparison of the views of the three groups of respondents, and to determine the factors which influenced their shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour. The former was to be achieved by using one-way analysis of variance, and the latter by multiple regression and correlation analysis.

Although parametric tests provide a more powerful or statistically discerning alternative to non-parametric tests, they require more stringent assumptions to be made about the nature of the population from which the sample data are drawn, and the level of data measurement (Anderson *et al*, 1993). Parametric tests require the following:

- 1. The sample data are drawn from a normally distributed population, and that the samples come from populations with equal variances.
- 2. The data should be measured at the interval or ratio level.

3. The sample should contain at least 30 observations per variable/group.

Although it had been previously decided that the parametric tests of one-way analysis of variance, multiple regression and correlation would be the most appropriate methods of analysis, the data did not comply with the requirements of parametric techniques. Firstly, a one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, used to test the normality of the data, indicated that some of the data violated the normality assumption. Secondly, Likert, semantic differential and itemised rating scales are not, strictly speaking, interval scales, although most social researchers take a pragmatic view and treat them as approximating interval scales (Bagozzi, 1994a; Sapsford and Jupp, 1996). Diamantopolous and Schlegelmilch (1997) suggest that if the response alternatives are appropriately numbered, this communicates to the respondent that the intervals between the scale points are

intended to be of equal distance. Although this procedure was followed in the design of the questionnaire, it could be argued that the scales used in this study to assess the global and belief measures (in particular previous experience) are not true interval scales.

Although Diamantopoulos and Schlegelmilch (1997) argue that violations of the normality assumptions do not necessarily invalidate the results of parametric tests if the sample is large enough (i.e. over 30), it was decided to use non-parametric tests in conjunction with parametric tests wherever possible. Non-parametric tests are suitable for use with ordinal and interval data, and do not require the assumptions of normality and equal variances required by parametric tests. It is hoped that by using the two types of tests in tandem, that more confidence can be placed in the reliability of the findings.

7.9.2 The Statistical Procedures

The statistical procedures used to analyse the data are detailed briefly in the following section, which concludes with a summary table of how these procedures have been applied to this study. More detailed descriptions of these procedures can be found in the following books which were consulted throughout the research design and analysis process: Achen (1982); Anderson *et al*, (1993); Bagozzi (1994a); Berry and Feldman (1985); Bowers (1991); Coolican, (1994); Diamantopoulos and Schlegelmilch (1997); Everitt (1980); Hair *et al* (1998); Hedderson and Fisher (1993); Iverson and Norpoth (1987); Jain (1994); Kinnear and Gray (1994); Kline (1993); Norusis (1988; 1992); Sapsford and Jupp (1996); Tacq (1997). For ease of presentation the figures in the regression analyses (with the exception of statistical significance) were rounded to two decimal places, as suggested by Ehrenberg (1986). Due to computer rounding, the frequency distributions may not equal 100%.

One-way analysis of variance: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests the null hypothesis that two or more samples drawn from the same population will have equal means. The procedure is based on the F-test which compares the between-groups variance with the within-groups variance, the larger the value of F, the more likely that the differences between groups are statistically significant. Where the p-value of F is less than .05, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis, that at least one group is statistically different from the others, is accepted. To identify between which groups the differences exist Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test is used. As it seemed possible that the data collected for this study violated the assumptions required for the use of one-way analysis of variance, its non-parametric equivalent, the Kruskal-Wallis test was also used. This test focuses on the median as a measure of central tendency, and is based on rank scores. As both tests produced virtually identical results for the majority of the planned behaviour questions, it is assumed that the violations of the assumptions are not major and that the results are reliable. In the analysis, the results of the one-way analysis of variance are reported in full, as this test (using Tukey's HSD) enables the differences between the groups to be pin-pointed, for the Kruskal-Wallis test only the significance of the result is reported.

Correlation: Correlation measures the degree of association between two or more interval level variables, and the statistical significance of this association. It is assumed that a linear relationship exists between the variables, which can be expressed graphically as a scatter diagram, or mathematically in terms of the Pearson correlation coefficient (r). The higher the value of the coefficient, the stronger the association between the variables. Pearson correlation is a parametric technique, and in view of the possible unsuitability of the data for use with this type of test, the non-parametric equivalent, Spearman's rank order correlation, was also used. Spearman's correlation is based on rank-ordered data, and can be used to measure the strength of association between two variables.

Multiple regression: Multiple regression analysis examines the relationship between the dependent variable and a number of explanatory or independent variables and allows the investigation of the combined and separate effects of these variables. The coefficient of determination (\mathbb{R}^2) measures the proportion of the total variance in the dependent variable which can be explained by the independent variables. The adjusted \mathbb{R}^2 represents the adjusted coefficient of determination, corrected for the number of cases relative to the number of variables. The regression coefficients (beta weights) indicate the relative importance of each of the independent variables. The following assumptions must be met for multiple regression to produce reliable results: the data must be interval scaled; there must be a linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables, the residuals (the difference between the actual value of the dependent variable and its value predicted by the regression equation) should be normally distributed.

Structural Equation Modelling: Although Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) recommend the use of multiple regression, several researchers (Bentler and Speckart, 1979, 1981; Knox and Walker, 1996) have used structural equation modelling to investigate the relationships between the components of the theories. A structural equation model 'specifies the key variables in any theory as latent constructs and represents the hypotheses among variables in a network of causal or functional paths' (Bagozzi 1994c, p 317). As initial attempts at structural equation modelling produced inconclusive findings, and Bagozzi (1994c) recommends that for data which are not normally distributed, "distribution-free" methods

should be used, it was decided not to continue with this approach.

Factor Analysis: Factor analysis is a data reduction technique for condensing a large number of variables into a few underlying constructs. The technique examines the variables to ascertain whether there are a small number of factors, representing underlying dimensions, which account for their intercorrelation. Each factor is independent and represents some underlying dimension of the construct being measured. Although the factors are identified by the computer program, interpretation of their meaning, and their naming is a subjective operation. Kinnear and Taylor (1991, pp 608-14) describe the three stages of factor analysis as follows. Firstly a correlation matrix for all combinations of variables is generated. From this correlation matrix, the initial factors are extracted. Those variables which are highly correlated are combined to form one factor, and the computer searches for the principal factor which forms a linear combination that explains more variance in the correlation matrix than any other set of factors. This is subtracted from the matrix and the process is repeated to select further principle factors until there is little of the variance left to be explained. The factors extracted are uncorrelated with each other (orthogonal). In order to interpret the initial factors, the grouped factors are rotated using varimax rotation to identify the variables which correlate highly, whilst maintaining the initial factors as uncorrelated with each other.

Cluster Analysis: Cluster analysis is an exploratory data classification technique which is used to group the respondents by some characteristic. By comparing the similarities and differences in scores on the variables of interest, each object is grouped with others having similar scores. Each cluster represents mutually exclusive groupings, with the objects in each cluster being more similar to each other than they are to the objects in other clusters. The use of this technique is problematic. Everitt (1980) contends that there is no accepted method of determining the number of clusters to be used, and that the interpretation of the results is dependent on the subjective judgement of the user. Hair *et al* (1998, p 474) argue that cluster analysis presents the following problems:

The solutions are not unique, as the cluster membership for any number of solutions is dependent on many elements of the procedure, and many different solutions can be obtained by varying one or more of the elements. Moreover, cluster analysis will always create clusters, regardless of the "true" existence of any such structure in the data.

Although a cluster analysis was attempted, the results neither informed the research question, nor added to the interpretation of the data, in view of the problems described above. This statistical approach was abandoned and instead, the clustering used was derived from the respondents' self-classification of their shoplifting experience, obtained from the survey questions relating to their previous shoplifting behaviour.

 Table 7.2
 Application of the statistical procedures

Statistical procedure	Application
Frequencies	Used to provide a general overview of the data and to assess its suitability for use in parametric techniques. Percentages were used to support the more sophisticated statistical analyses.
Crosstabulations	Used to analyse the data by two or more variables, and to examine the associations between these variables. The statistical significance of these associations was tested by either the chi- square test or Cramers's V.
One-way analysis of variance	Used to determine whether specific sub-groups within the sample held significantly different views about shoplifting.
Correlation	Used to investigate the degree of association between the measures and variables contained within the theory of planned behaviour.
Multiple regression	Used to test the explanatory power of the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour and to investigate the significance and relative importance of each of the constituent measures.
Factor analysis	Used to redefine the variables contained within the global and belief measures in an attempt to overcome the problems of scale reliability and multicollinearity

7.10 Problems with and Limitations of the Research Design

Once the completed questionnaires were received and the analysis completed, it became apparent that there were several problems and limitations relating to the sample, the questionnaire design and the data analysis procedures.

7.10.1 The Sample

Although every attempt was made to ensure that the consumer sample was representative of shopping activity in Northampton, the use of convenience sampling restricts the extent to which the results can be generalised to the population, and also restricts the reliability of parametric statistical tests. Although it would have been preferable to use random sampling, stratified random sampling or multi-stage sampling, utilising these techniques in a shopping centre survey would have been logistically impossible.

A more rigorous sampling procedure was used for the school survey. This sample is, however, also subject to limitations, as sample selection was constrained by the restrictions imposed by the two schools. In order to cause minimum disruption, the classes selected to take part in the sample were identified by the school, rather than respondents being selected at random from the school roll. In addition, administration of the survey in a classroom setting resulted in students who were absent from school on that day being omitted from the sample. Thus truants, a population identified in the literature as being extensively involved in shoplifting, may have not have been included in the sample. Unfortunately, neither school was able to provide details of known truants. Finally, the two schools participating in the survey may not have been representative of schools in Northampton.

Despite the steps taken to maximise the response rate (the respondents were informed, both verbally and in the cover letter, of the value of the survey and that anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed), the consumer survey only achieved a response rate of 35%. Although this is average for a study of this type, the non-response of the majority of the consumers who initially agreed to participate in the survey restricts the reliability of the findings, as their beliefs, attitudes and opinions may differ in some important way from those who completed the survey. In view of the use of convenience sampling in a shopping centre, it was not possible to follow-up those who had not responded, as would have been the case if random sampling had been used. The response rate for the school survey was over 99%. Only one respondent, who had already participated in the consumer survey, declined to complete the questionnaire. Thus in terms of response rate, the school survey is likely to provide reliable findings.

7.10.2 The Questionnaire

The major problem with the consumer questionnaire was its length, and this may partly account for the low response rate of 35%. Although the sections of the questionnaire relating to shoplifting motivation, attitudes to retailers, the shoplifting decision and the control of shoplifting provided interesting information about shoplifting, it could be argued that the data from these sections may be unreliable (see discussion in Chapter 8, section 8.6), and therefore have little value, other than corroborating the findings from the theory of planned behaviour. It was with these problems in mind that the survey was redesigned for use with the school respondents. This resulted in a briefer questionnaire, which may partly account for the higher response rate from the school respondents.

The low number of missing responses in both surveys suggests that the respondents were

able to answer the questions and were interested in the topic. It is, however, impossible to assess the reliability of their responses due to the sampling method used. Nonetheless, the consistency of responses designed to elicit information about the same subject areas, only in different formats (some of the motivation questions requested the same information as the theory of planned behaviour questions, but in an indirect manner), provides limited support for the respondents having answered the questionnaire truthfully.

It is always easy in hindsight to identify areas which should have been included in the questionnaire, and many areas relating to shoplifting (for example, type of goods stolen, whether goods stolen were for personal use or resale) were omitted from the questionnaires due to their already excessive length. One area of shoplifting not covered in sufficient detail was previous shoplifting experience. Analysis of the findings indicated that this area should have been more precisely measured. Firstly, in terms of a general interval-scaled question for inclusion in the multiple regression. Secondly, the recency of shoplifting behaviour question should have been reworded to take into account that many of the adults completing the questionnaire may have shoplifted in their youth, thus the response *shoplifted over 5 years ago* was too general for this category of respondent.

Finally, inclusion of a social desirability scale would have enabled some estimation to be made of the impact of the respondents' tendencies to either deny or exaggerate socially undesirable attitudes and behaviour. In view of the already excessive length of the questionnaires it was decided not to include such a scale. It is recognised, however, that dishonest reporting may have biased the results (see Chapter 10, section 10.2.1.1).

7.10.3 Operationalising the Theory of Planned Behaviour

There were two problems relating to this area. Firstly, the theoretical basis for the belief questions is limited by the small number of respondents who completed the elicitation interview (27 students and 25 consumers), and the inability of the researcher to ascertain whether these respondents were non-shoplifters or shoplifters (as the elicitations were conducted in a "face-to-face" situation, it was not considered appropriate to ask the respondents about their shoplifting experiences). Although both the consumer and the student elicitations produced virtually identical sets of shoplifting beliefs, analysis of the belief questions indicated that a substantial number of respondents in both the consumer and school surveys did not consider the beliefs as being salient to shoplifting (evidenced by the proportion of respondents answering "neither" to the questions). Secondly, the question *I can imagine times when I might shoplift even if I hadn't planned to* was excluded from the school questionnaire, as it was considered that the students would find it problematic to answer. This question proved to be pivotal in explaining the intentions of potential shoplifters (see discussion in Chapter 8, section 8.7.6.1).

7.10.4 The Data Analysis

The major problem in the data analysis was that the data violated the assumption of normality required for parametric statistical tests. This was possibly due to the fact that the respondents, in particular the non-shoplifters, tended to answer at the polar extremes of the seven-point scales. In view of the subject matter, this was unavoidable, as shoplifting appears to be an area where people hold strong opinions, and alternative wordings of the questions were not viable. In an attempt to overcome this problem, and to increase confidence in the reliability of the findings, non-parametric techniques were used, wherever possible, to corroborate the findings from the more rigorous parametric tests. As both procedures produced very similar findings, it is possible that the violation of the assumptions of parametric tests was not major; however, this possibility must be considered when interpreting the findings.

7.11 Conclusion

Researching shoplifting behaviour in a reliable and rigorous manner is problematic due to the difficulties in obtaining a statistically robust and representative sample, and the problems of obtaining truthful answers about a behaviour that is both criminal and socially undesirable. Denzin (1989) and Jick (1983) argue that the use of triangulation in research achieves results in which greater confidence can be placed, and triangulation has been achieved in this research design in the following areas:

- 1. Within-method triangulation: the use of multiple scales to measure a concept, thus checking for internal consistency or reliability.
- 2. Data triangulation: the collection of data from two or more sources.
- 3. Analysis triangulation: the use of both parametric and non-parametric tests.

The sampling methods used and the low response rate for the consumer survey indicate that it would be inappropriate to generalise the findings from this study to the population as a whole. The main objective of this study is, however, to explore the utility of integrating consumer behaviour and situational crime prevention approaches to gain an understanding of shoplifting behaviour, rather than to make general statements about why consumers do, or do not, steal from shops.

CHAPTER 8

FINDINGS ABOUT THE CONSUMER RESPONDENTS

8.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings about the respondents to the consumer questionnaire. The analysis in the first part of the chapter is based on the conventional approach to shoplifting research, in that it explores the traditional correlates of shoplifting, age, gender and socio-economic class, and investigates shoplifting motivation and views on shoplifting prevention. The second section considers the consumer behaviour approach using the theory of planned behaviour to understand and explain shoplifting behaviour. The structure of the chapter is presented diagrammatically in Figure 8.1.

Figure 8.1 The Structure of the Analysis of the Consumer Findings



8.2 Questionnaire Distribution and Response

The questionnaires were distributed over a two-week period (24th March-6th April 1997) between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5.30 p.m., to consumers leaving shops selected to be typical of retailing activity in Northampton. To maximise the response rate, the consumers were advised: (a) of the survey's purpose, (b) that the questionnaire would take approximately 20 minutes to complete, and (c) that the questionnaire was completely confidential and anonymous. The questionnaire was only given to those who agreed to participate in the survey. A response rate of 35% was achieved. This is typical for shoplifting surveys of this type (Kallis and Vanier, 1985; Ray, 1987), and is possibly the best that could be expected in view of the questionnaire length and the survey topic.

8.2.1 Distribution and Response by Location and Type of Retail Outlet

The distribution of the questionnaire, and the consumers' response to it, is shown in Table 8.1. The questionnaires were distributed in three types of retail location, the central

Location Q	uestionnaires distributed	Questionnaires returned	Response rate
	n	n	%
Town Centre			
Со-ор	50	19	38%
M&S	110	29	26%
BHS	100	35	35%
Wilkinsons	100	28	28%
Boots	120	36	30%
Dixons	100	27	27%
Our Price	100	42	42%
C & A	70	26	37%
Total	750	242	32%
Suburban			
Kingsthorpe (Safeway, Waitros	e) 200	87	43%
Out-of-town			
J Sainsbury	150	46	31%
Homebase	100	42	42%
Total	250	88	35%

Table 8.1 Distribution and response by retail location

shopping district of Northampton, the suburban shopping centre of Kingsthorpe and two out-of-town superstores. Each questionnaire was coded according to the location of its distribution. Overall, a higher response rate was achieved in the suburban and out-of-town locations than in the town centre, possibly due to other market research being conducted in Northampton town centre during the period of consumer survey.

As retail crime surveys (for example, Bamfield, 1994a; Speed *et al*, 1995) indicate that retail business categories experience differential shoplifting rates, it was initially intended to compare the incidence of shoplifting by type of retailer. In practice, this proved to be problematic. With the exception of Sainsburys and Homebase, which are free-standing superstores situated within their own parking facilities, it was difficult to establish that the consumers approached had actually been using the store they were assumed to have left, due to the fact that several of the stores could be used as "short-cuts" or thoroughfares, and at certain periods during the data collection shopper flow was extremely heavy. Thus, further analysis by location of distribution has not been undertaken due to the high probability of sampling error.

8.2.2 Distribution and Response by Age and Gender

In order that comparisons could be made between the consumers who agreed to take part in the survey and those who returned the completed questionnaire, the age and gender of all consumers who agreed to participate were recorded when the questionnaire was distributed. The distribution and response rate is shown in Table 8.2.

Although every attempt was made to ensure that the sample selected was representative of shopping activity in Northampton, as there are no demographic shopping figures

	Questionnaires Distributed		Questionnaires returned			Response rate			
	male	female	total	male	female	total	male	female	total
under 16	49	83	132	19	32	51	39%	39%	39%
16-19	112	156	268	23	56	79	21%	36%	29%
20-29	132	129	261	30	60	90	23%	47%	35%
30-44	92	180	272	34	64	98	37%	36%	36%
45-59	61	109	170	19	45	64	31%	41%	38%
60+	38	59	97	15	20	35	39%	34%	36%
Total	484	716	1200	140	277	417	29%	39%	35%

 Table 8.2
 Distribution and response by age and gender

available for Northampton, it is impossible to estimate how representative the sample is. Of the consumers who agreed to participate in the survey, 66% were female, and it seems reasonable to assume that despite increasing male interest in shopping, the majority of shoppers are still female. Distribution of the questionnaire during the school and college holidays would also account for one-third of the sample being under the age of twenty. This, however, was a deliberate strategy in view of the likely involvement of this age group in shoplifting activity. The response rate for each age-group varied between 29% and 39%, with the overall response rate for males being 29% and for females 39%. Any explanation of the varying response rate between age groups and gender, would, however, be based on conjecture rather than fact.

8.3 Breakdown of the Response by Demographic Characteristics

Although several questionnaires had responses to individual questions missing, as none contained a substantial number of missing responses, all 417 returned questionnaires were included in the analysis. The biographic section of the questionnaire requested information on the respondent's age, gender, employment, income and frequency of using

	n	%		n	%
Gender			Employment		
Male	140	34%	Full time	116	28%
Female	277	66%	Part time	65	15%
			Housewife/husband	45	11%
Age			Student/at school	142	34%
Under 16	51	12%	Unemployed	13	3%
16 - 19	79	19%	Retired	33	8%
20 - 29	90	22%	Missing	3	1%
30 - 44	98	24%	-		
45 - 59	64	15%	Frequency of Using Shops		
60 - 74	35	8%	More than once a day	99	24%
			Once a day	116	28%
Annual Income			More than once a week	167	40%
Under £10,000	327	54%	Once a week	31	7%
£10,000-£19,999	88	21%	Missing	4	1%
£20,000 or over	63	16%	-		
Missing	39	9%			

Table 8.3 Characteristics of the sample (n=417)

shops. Table 8.3 reports the breakdown of the response by these factors. As the typical shopping population of Northampton is not known, to estimate the representativeness of the sample two measures were employed. Firstly, the demographic characteristics of the sample were compared with that of the general population of Northampton. Secondly, the sample was analysed by frequency of shopping activity.

8.3.1 Comparisons with the General Population of Northampton

The consumer sample was compared with the 1991 census figures for Northampton on three factors; age, gender and employment (Table 8.4). As the census utilised different age and employment categories, direct comparisons were problematic. The effective minimum age for the distribution of the consumer survey was 12. The employment data from the census was re-categorised as follows: *unemployed* the unemployed and those described as permanently sick; *housewife/husband* those described as 'economically inactive - other'; *students* the 10 to 15 age group plus the economically inactive students. Thus, the student category does not include those students working part-time.

	Consu	mer Sample	North	ampton		
	n	%	n	· %		
Gender						
Male	140	33.6%	87,767	48.6%		
Female	277	66.4%	92,800	51.4%		
Total	417	100.0%	180,567	100.0%		
Age						
0 - 9	-	-	25,953	14.4%		
10 - 15	51	12.2%	13,552	7.5%		
16 - 19	79	18.9%	9,605	5.3%		
20 - 29	90	21.6%	30,769	17.0%		
30 - 44	98	23.5%	39,991	22.2%		
45 - 59	64	15.3%	26,918	14.9%		
60 - 74	35	8.4%	33,779	18.7%		
Employment						
Full time	116	27.8%	70,146	38.9%		
Part time	65	15.6%	15,601	8.6%		
Housewife/husband	45	10.8%	14,330	7.9%		
Student/at school	142	34.1%	18,053	10.0%		
Unemployed	13	3.1%	11,682	6.5%		
Retired	33	7.9%	24,802	13.7%		

Table 8.4 Comparison of the demographic characteristics of the consumer sample and the population of Northampton.

Source: Official Population Censuses and Surveys (1992)

8.3.2 Frequency of Shopping Activity

Tables 8.3 and 8.4 indicate that females, students/schoolchildren, the under-20s, and those with an income of less than £10,000 per year, were over-represented in the sample. A sample of shoppers is not necessarily, however, a demographic sample of the population, but rather a sample of the consumers using the shops. Thus, females are likely to be over-represented in any sample of shoppers, as the majority of shoppers are usually female (Wilson *et al*, 1992), and the deliberate strategy of conducting the survey during the school/college holidays accounts for the disproportionate numbers of young people and students in the sample. In addition, the under-20s, students/schoolchildren and those with low incomes (only 7% of the respondents in this category were employed full time) are possibly the sectors of the population with the most time available for

shopping, and over 55% of the respondents in these three groups stated that they used shops at least once a day.

Although it is difficult to assess how representative the consumer sample is of shopping activity in Northampton, it is possible that the respondents completing the consumer questionnaire are a fairly accurate representation of the consumers using the shops in Northampton during the period of the consumer survey. As this study is concerned with identifying the differences between shoplifters and non-shoplifters, the consumer survey is analysed by the respondents' previous shoplifting involvement, rather than the variables of age, gender, employment and income. Data on these variables are only reported where they are relevant to the discussion.

8.3.3 Shoplifting Experience

The respondents were asked how many times they had ever shoplifted (frequency of shoplifting) and when was they last time they had shoplifted (recency of shoplifting). For both questions, the respondents were given the opportunity to state that they had never shoplifted. As shown in Table 8.5, 32% of the respondents admitted to involvement in shoplifting at some time during their lives. This figure is comparable with UK (Farrington, 1973) and USA (Cox *et al*, 1990) self-report studies, which indicate that between 30% and 40% of the respondents surveyed admitted to shoplifting.

Table 8.5Shoplifting history (n = 417)

How many times have you ever shoplifted?			When was the last time	e you sha	plifted?
	n	%		n	%
Never shoplifted	285	68%	Never shoplifted	285	68%
Once	61	15%	Over 5 years ago	71	17%
Twice	25	6%	1 - 5 years ago	34	8%
Four times	8	2%	Within last 12 months	27	7%
More than four times	38	9%			

To achieve the research objectives, it was necessary to compare the responses of shoplifters with those of non-shoplifters. Although either frequency or recency of shoplifting could have been used to categorise the respondents, recency of shoplifting behaviour was considered to be the most appropriate, as this would enable the comparison of those who had never shoplifted, those who had shoplifted in the past but no longer engaged in the behaviour, and those who were currently shoplifting. For analysis purposes the sample was categorised into **non-shoplifters** (never shoplifted), **past shoplifters** (those who had shoplifted over 12 months ago) and **recent shoplifters** (those who had shoplifted in the last 12 months). The sample breakdown on this basis is:

	11	70
Non-shoplifters	285	68%
Past shoplifters	105	25%
Recent shoplifters	27	7%

The past shoplifter category consisted of those who had shoplifted over 5 years ago and those who had shoplifted between 1 to 5 years ago. It is recognised that these two groups may differ in their attitudes, beliefs and opinions about shoplifting, and this is considered further in section 8.7.6.2.

8.3.4 Shoplifting and Age

Consistent with shoplifting surveys and criminological studies of property crime, the findings indicate that shoplifting was the most prevalent in the younger age groups, and that shoplifting involvement was inversely related to age. As shown in Table 8.6, 66.7% of the recent shoplifters were under 20, with 25.9% being under 16. Although these two age groups represented 31.1% of the total sample, 39% of the respondents under 20 admitted to shoplifting, with 14% having shoplifted in the previous 12 months. Only 2 respondents over the age of 30 were categorised as recent shoplifters.

	under 16	16-19	20-29	30-44	45-59	60+	Total
All	12.2%	18.9%	21.7%	23.5%	15.3%	8.4%	100%
Non	11.6%	16.1%	17.2%	24.2%	19.3%	11.6%	100%
Past	10.5%	21.0%	32.3%	26.6%	8.6%	1.0%	100%
Recent	25.9%	40.8%	25.9%	3.7%	-	3.7%	100%

Table 8.6 Respondents by age and shoplifting history (n = 417)

8.3.5 Shoplifting and Gender

Although 59% of the past shoplifters and 55.6% of the recent shoplifters were female, as 66.4% of the respondents were female, this indicates that the males were proportionately more involved in shoplifting. This is confirmed by the findings in Table 8.7. Of the males, 39.3% admitted to shoplifting (compared to 27.8% of the females), with 8.6% having shoplifted in the last 12 months (compared to 5.4% of the females).

 Table 8.7 Percentage of each gender involved in shoplifting (n=417)

	Non	Past	Recent	Total
Male	60.7%	30.7%	8.6%	100%
Female	72.2%	22.4%	5.4%	100%

Consistent with the shoplifting literature, in the under-20 age group males were likely to be involved in shoplifting than females. Of the males under 20, 45.3% admitted to shoplifting (compared to 36.4% of the females), with 16.7% having shoplifted in the previous 12 months (compared to 12.5% of the females). Although the findings suggest that males are more likely to shoplift, it is possible that males may be more prone to boasting about shoplifting involvement, or may be less inhibited about admitting to the behaviour. There is, however, no way of checking this due to the sampling method used.

8.3.6 Shoplifting and Employment and Income

As shown in Table 8.8, 53.3% of the past and 70.4% of the recent shoplifters earned less than $\pounds 10,000$ per annum. Although this suggests that shoplifting may be economically motivated, as 38.1% of the past and 66.7% of the recent shoplifters were students or at school (Table 8.9), the relationship is unclear, and of the shoplifters in full time employment, none of the recent, and only 6% of the past, earned less than $\pounds 10,000$ per year. The findings do, however, provide limited support for previous studies which indicate that shoplifters come from all employment categories and income groups.

	All	Non	Past	Recent	
Under £10,000	54.3%	53.3%	53.3%	70.4%	
£10,000 -£ 19,999	21.1%	20.4%	25.7%	11.1%	
£20,000 -£ 29,999	10.6%	11.6%	10.5%	-	
£30,000+	4.6%	5.6%	1.9%	3.7%	
Missing	9.4%	9.1%	8.6%	14.8%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

 Table 8.8 Shoplifting and Annual Income (n=417)

Table 8.9Shoplifting and Employment (n=417)

	All	Non	Past	Recent	
Full time	27.8%	28.8%	30.5%	7.4%	
Part time	15.6%	16.8%	14.3%	7.4%	
Housewife/husband	10.8%	10.8%	11.4%	7.4%	_
Student/at school	34.1%	29.5%	38.1%	66.7%	
Unemployed	3.1%	1.8%	5.7%	7.4%	
Retired	7.9%	11.2%	-	3.7%	
Missing	0.7%	1.1%	-	-	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

8.3.7 Shoplifting and Frequency of Using Shops

Consistent with the suggestion that shoplifting is an opportunistic crime (Lo, 1994), 81.5% of the recent shoplifters used the shops at least once day, compared to 63.8% of the past shoplifters and 44.2% of the non-shoplifters (Table 8.10). It is possible, however, that shoplifters may visit shops frequently to create shoplifting opportunities.

	All	Non	Past	Recent
More than once a day	23.7%	17.2%	32.4%	59.3%
Once a day	27.8%	27.0%	31.4%	22.2%
More than once a week	40.0%	47.7%	25.7%	14.8%
Once a week	7.4%	7.0%	9.5%	3.7%
Missing	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	-

Table 8.10Frequency of using shops (n=417)

8.3.8 Statistical Significance of the Demographic Characteristics

The chi square test was used to investigate the association between shoplifting behaviour and the variables of age, gender, income, employment and frequency of using shops. As shown in Table 8.11, shoplifting was significantly associated with age, frequency of using shops and employment (due to the number of shoplifters under 20 who were students).

 Table 8.11
 Statistical significance of the sample characteristics

Variable	Chi-square value	đf	Sig.	Cramer's V value	Approximate significance
Age	51.08940	12	.00000	.24750	.00000
Gender	5.79033	2	.05529	.11784	.05529
Income	9.47482	6	.14858	.11195	.14858
Employment	35.23622	10	.00011	.20629	.00011
Frequency of using shops	38.53256	6	.00000	.21599	.00000

8.3.9 Frequency of Shoplifting Behaviour

Of the recent shoplifters, 85% had shoplifted more than once, with 59% having shoplifted

more than four times. The past shoplifters, however, exhibited significantly less shoplifting involvement (Cramer's V value 0.75859, df 8, approximate significance 0.00000), with 46% having shoplifted only once, and 21% having shoplifted more than four times.

8.3.10 Shoplifting and Being Caught

UK Retail Crime Surveys (for example, Bamfield, 1994a; Speed *et al*, 1995) suggest that the majority of shoplifters escape apprehension, and this is supported by the findings from this study. Table 8.12 indicates that 71.4% of the past and 81.5% of the recent shoplifters

Table 8.12Shoplifting apprehensions (n=417)

	Past	Recent
Never been caught	71.4%	81.5%
Caught once	26.7%	11.1%
Caught more than once	1.9%	7.4%

had never been caught. As shown in Table 8.13, only 48% of the recent shoplifters stated that being caught would deter them from shoplifting, compared to 74.3% of the past shoplifters and 69% of the non-shoplifters (significant at F. Prob 0.0124). Of the shoplifters who had been caught, 90% of the past shoplifters would be deterred by apprehension compared to 20% of the recent shoplifters.

 Table 8.13 The deterrent effect of being caught (n=417)

Being caught	LIKELY			neither		UNLIKELY		
would deter me	extremely	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	extremely	
Non	53.3%	9.8%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	9.1%	10.9%	
Past	60.0%	7.6%	6.7%	-	9.5%	8.6%	7.6%	
Recent	18.5%	11.1%	18.5%	-	29.6%	11.1%	11.1%	

8.4 Shoplifting Motivation and Attitudes to Shoplifting and Shoplifting Prevention The questions relating to shoplifting motivation, the decision to shoplift and the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention measures were scaled from 7 (extremely likely) to 1 (extremely unlikely). The questions relating to attitudes to stores and attitudes to the control of shoplifting were scaled from 7 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). To compare the views of the three groups of respondents, both one-way analysis of variance and the Kruskal-Wallis test were used. Table 8.14 reports the questions for which there were significant differences between the three groups of respondents. Where the figures for all three groups of respondents are shown in bold, this indicates statistically significant differences between *all* three groups. Where only the figure for the recent shoplifters is shown in bold, this indicates that the recent shoplifters hold statistically significant different views from the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters. The frequency distributions are shown in Appendix C.

8.4.1 Shoplifting Motivation

To investigate shoplifting motivation, the respondents were asked to assess the likelihood of a number of factors (marketing, psychological, peer influence, economic, attitude to apprehension and attitude to retailers) causing shoplifting behaviour. In addition, the respondents were asked their opinions of how the decision to shoplift is made. These questions were all phrased indirectly, for example 'people shoplift because extremely likely/extremely unlikely', in the expectation that both the past and recent shoplifters would reveal the motives for their shoplifting behaviour, and the processes involved in the decision of whether or not to shoplift.

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig
Shoplifting motivation						
Easy access to goods	5.7193	5.3333	6.2963	9.3455	.0001	.0000
Prices charged are too high	4.1474	4.3462	5.4231	6.9455	.0011	.0016
Think its exciting	5.6877	5.7308	6.3704	4.4195	.0126	.0051
Can't afford the things they need	5.1972	5.4000	6.0370	4.5948	.0106	.0069
Think they won't be punished	4.8526	4.2762	5.5185	7.0894	.0009	.0003
Benefits greater than the costs	5.3298	5.0192	5.9259	4.0239	.0186	.0046
The Decision to shoplift						
Opportunity	5.4366	5.5905	6.0000	3.1196	.0452	.0448
Effectiveness of retail security						
Uniformed security	5.7042	5.3619	6.0370	3.9606	0.198	.0478
Control of shoplifting Should be treated more severely	6.0912	5.6571	5.1852	10.5304	.0000	.0000
Shops should report all shoplifters to the police	6.0421	5.5143	4.6667	14.7032	.0000	.0000
All shoplifters should be prosecuted	5.7509	5.3173	4.6538	7.8800	.0004	.0001
Shoplifters should be banned from shops	5.4175	5.2476	3.9615	8.0287	.0004	.0033
Anti-shoplifting campaigns	4.0877	3.3143	3.1154	9.5658	.0001	.0001
I would report a shoplifter	5.3368	3.9619	2.3846	51.0684	.0000	.0000

Table 8.14Shoplifting motivation, the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention, and
the control of shoplifting - Comparison of Mean Scores (n=417)

There was considerable support for the retailers' marketing strategies encouraging shoplifting. Over 70% of all respondents thought it likely that people shoplifted because they were tempted by the retailer's displays and promotional strategies, and over 85% because they had easy access to the goods they want to steal. Almost 50% of the recent shoplifters thought the latter motivation **extremely** likely.

Only 31% of the respondents overall thought it likely that people shoplifted due to psychological problems or stress, with the recent shoplifters thinking these motivations less

likely than the other two groups. There was considerably more support for the hedonic motivations of excitement and beating the system. Of the recent shoplifters, 100% thought it likely, and 56% **extremely** likely, that people shoplift because it is exciting. The non-shoplifters were more likely than the past and recent shoplifters to agree that people shoplift because they like the feeling of beating the system. Overall, 85% of respondents agreed that people shoplift because their friends encourage them, and 33.3% of the recent shoplifters thought that this motivation was **extremely** likely.

There was considerable support for economic factors motivating shoplifting behaviour, with 82% of all respondents agreeing that people shoplift because they cannot afford the things they need or to get money for drugs and alcohol. Although the recent shoplifters were significantly more likely than the past and non-shoplifters to think that people shoplift from economic necessity (93% thought it likely, and 41% **extremely** likely) they were less likely to agree that people shoplift to get money for drugs or alcohol.

Overall, 83% of the respondents thought it likely that people shoplift because they think they won't be caught and 63% because they won't be punished if they are caught. The recent shoplifters were significantly more likely to agree with these two motivations, with 52% and 44% respectively thinking these two motivations **extremely** likely. Although 72% of all respondents thought it likely that people shoplift because they perceive the benefits of the crime to exceed the risks and costs of being caught, the recent and past shoplifters held significantly different views. Of the recent shoplifters, 89% thought this motivation likely (44% **extremely** likely) compared to 67% of the past shoplifters. Presumably, the past shoplifters' experiences have influenced their views on this matter (29% of the past shoplifters had been caught shoplifting, compared to 18% of the recent).

8.4.2 Attitude to Retailers

Neutralisation theory suggests that shoplifters rationalise their behaviour, making such excuses as 'the store is ripping us off' or 'the item was over-priced' (Moore, 1984, p59), and the recent shoplifters were significantly more likely to think that people shoplift because the prices charged by shops are too high, with 74% agreeing with this motivation. Although the three groups of respondents did not differ significantly in their attitudes to the type of shop and the service received there, the recent shoplifters were less likely to agree that these variables would influence shoplifting behaviour with between 18% and 22% answering "neither" to these questions. Although it has been suggested that shoplifters may have emotional views about the shops they choose to steal from (Carolin, 1992; Russell, 1973), there appears to be little support for this proposition from the shoplifters in this study, which suggests that they may be more concerned with risks of apprehension than with their feelings about the shop.

8.4.3 The Decision to Shoplift

The discussion in section 8.4.1 indicates that the majority of respondents thought it likely that shoplifting results from a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the crime, however, when asked if people weigh up the pros and cons of shoplifting before they decide to shoplift, only 43% of respondents overall thought this likely, although 70% of the recent shoplifters agreed that it was either quite or slightly likely. The questions investigating whether shoplifting is a planned or impulsive behaviour produced inconsistent findings, with 84% of all respondents agreeing that shoplifting is planned and 77% agreeing that it is impulsive. Overall, 84% of the respondents, and 96% of the recent shoplifters thought it likely that people shoplifted because they had the opportunity to do so. Only

14% of the respondents overall, and 4% of the recent shoplifters, thought it likely that people don't realise that they have shoplifted.

8.4.4 Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures

The respondents were asked to evaluate the likelihood of the ten most commonly used shoplifting prevention measures deterring people from shoplifting. Overall, 92% of the respondents agreed that the technological measures of CCTV, electronic tags and alarms were likely to deter people from shoplifting. The "human" security measures of uniformed security guards and store detectives also received substantial support, with over 81% of the respondents overall agreeing that these two measures were likely to deter shoplifters. Less than 40% of the respondents thought it likely that friendly and helpful staff, mirrors and anti-shoplifting notices would deter shoplifters.

When asked to identify which three measures would be the most effective in deterring shoplifters, both the past and non-shoplifters named CCTV, electronic tags and alarms. The recent shoplifters, however, viewed uniformed security guards as being a more effective deterrent than the technological measures of CCTV and electronic tags, possibly because shoplifters will ultimately find a way to circumvent technology, whereas "human" security measures are more difficult to bypass. This is consistent with the research of Butler (1994), which suggests that shoplifters perceive humans to present a greater risk than security technology, and thus are a more effective deterrent to shoplifting. CCTV was seen as being the most effective measure for catching (as opposed to deterring) shoplifters by 81% of all respondents, and was the most frequently mentioned measure for all three groups. The second most frequently mentioned measure for both the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters was store detectives (58% and 60% respectively), for the

recent shoplifters, however, it was electronic tags (70%), suggesting that although the recent shoplifters view "human" security measures as being more effective in deterring shoplifting, they perceive security technology to be more effective in catching shoplifters.

Of the non-shoplifters, 63% agreed that none of the named security measures would make them feel apprehensive, and 91% that presence of these measures had never prevented them from using a shop. For both the past and recent shoplifters, the security measure that made them feel the most apprehensive was the security measure that they named as being the most effective deterrent, for the past shoplifters CCTV, and for the recent shoplifters uniformed security guards. The presence of security measures had prevented 22% of the past shoplifters and 41% of the recent shoplifters from using a shop, which suggests that retail security measures may be deterring some shoplifters.

8.4.5 Attitudes to the Control of Shoplifting

There was substantial support for shoplifters being treated more severely, with 88% of all respondents agreeing with this suggestion. The recent shoplifters, however, differed significantly as to the extent of their agreement. Only 7% of the recent shoplifters indicated **strong** agreement, compared to 31% of the past and 41% of the non-shoplifters. Over 80% of the non-shoplifters agreed that all shoplifters should be reported to the police and subsequently prosecuted and over 70% thought that shoplifters also agreed with these suggestions, their degree of agreement was not as strong, suggesting that these two groups felt there may be situations in which shoplifters should be treated more leniently (economic hardship and age of the shoplifter were among two of the extenuating circumstances mentioned in the comments section of the questionnaire).

Although only 27% of the respondents agreed that the shops should deal with shoplifters themselves, 60% agreed that civil recovery (shops fining shoplifters) was a viable method of dealing with shoplifters. Less than half the respondents felt that anti-shoplifting campaigns in the press and on television would help reduce shoplifting. The past and non-shoplifters were significantly more likely than the recent shoplifters to agree with this proposition, suggesting that this type of campaign would reinforce the attitudes of those who already think shoplifting is wrong, rather than change the attitudes of those currently involved in shoplifting. Only 58% of the respondents agreed that they would report a shoplifter, 17% did not answer either way. The three groups differed significantly on this question, with 78% of the recent shoplifters stating that they would not report a shoplifter.

8.5 Influence of the Demographic Variables on Shoplifting Attitudes and Opinions

One-way analysis of variance was used to investigate the influence of age, gender and economic status on the attitudes and beliefs of the non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters. The variables for which both the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests indicated statistically significant differences are reported in Appendix D (Tables D1-D6).

The male past and recent shoplifters were significantly more likely to agree that they will shoplift in the future, and to evaluate shoplifting positively. The younger shoplifters were less likely to think that they would be caught, with the younger past shoplifters being more influenced by their friends and perceptions of control than the older groups. The low income shoplifters were more likely to be influenced by the economic aspects of shoplifting than the more affluent groups, with the low income recent shoplifters being more likely to view shoplifting as a low risk crime.
8.6 Evaluation of the "Traditional" Approach

The analysis in the previous sections focuses on the conventional approach to shoplifting research, investigating the demographic characteristics of shoplifters, and the factors identified in the shoplifting literature as motivators of shoplifting behaviour. As in previous shoplifting and criminological studies, involvement in shoplifting is shown to be inversely related to age, and appears to be motivated by economic factors, low risk of apprehension, the search for excitement or thrills and peer associations. Two criticisms can be made of this approach. Firstly, the motivation questions are phrased indirectly, and ask for the respondents' opinions as to why they think other people shoplift. Thus, the responses of the non-shoplifters are not based on their personal experience, and those respondents who have shoplifted may be "neutralising" their shoplifting behaviour. Secondly, although this approach suggests that shoplifting is likely to be motivated by a number of factors, it does not indicate how these factors interact, either with each other or with the individual's beliefs and attitudes about shoplifting behaviour, to influence the decision of whether or not to shoplift.

The next section utilises the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour to investigate the factors which influence shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour, and the interaction between these factors. As the questions relating to the two theories request information about the respondents' own experiences, beliefs and attitudes, it seems likely that this approach may provide more accurate data as to why people do, or do not, steal from shops.

160

8.7 Shoplifting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour

This section reports the findings from the section of the questionnaire relating to the theory of planned behaviour. The theory hypothesises that intentions to perform or not to perform a behaviour are influenced by attitude towards the behaviour, subjective norm and perceived control. These three factors are assumed jointly to influence behavioural intentions. Two additional factors were included in the model: (a) the moral norm, to evaluate the effect of personal morality on shoplifting behaviour, and (b) previous shoplifting experience. These variables are collectively referred to as global measures, and the relative influence of each is determined by multiple regression analysis.

8.7.1 Reliability of the Global Measures

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed for each set of items designed to assess intention, attitude, perceived control and the subjective and moral norm. The alpha coefficients for each measure are shown in bold in the main diagonal in Table 8.15, which also reports the correlation coefficients between intentions and the global measures.

Table	8.15	Alpha	coefficients and	correla	tion coe	efficients	for th	e globa	l measures
-------	------	-------	------------------	---------	----------	------------	--------	---------	------------

n=417	No. of items	I	А	SN	PC	MN
Intention (I)	2	.96				
Attitude (A)	6	.63	.86			
Subjective norm (SN)	2	.45	.38	.72		
Perceived control (PC)	3	.38	.60	.22	.65	
Moral norm (MN)	3	.48	.62	.30	.48	.89

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. All correlation coefficients significant at p=.000

The data presented in Table 8.15 highlight two problems for the construction of the scales assessing the global measures, and the subsequent multiple regression analysis. Firstly, the alpha coefficient for the perceived control scale does not achieve the minimum acceptable reliability of 0.7 recommended by Nunnally (1978). Secondly, the correlation coefficients indicate a degree of multicollinearity between attitude, perceived control and the moral

norm. Jain (1994) suggests that multicollinearity is likely to be a problem when the correlation coefficient between two independent variables is larger than the correlation coefficient between these variables and the dependent variable, and argues that if multicollinearity is present, then a high degree of reliability cannot be associated with the regression coefficients. In an attempt to overcome these problems, factor analysis was used to redefine the global measures (see section 8.7.4). Before the results of this, and the resulting multiple regression, are reported, the multiple regression based on the global measures shown in Table 8.15 is discussed.

8.7.2 Multiple Regression of the Global Measures on Shoplifting Intentions

Multiple regression, with intentions as the dependent variable, was used to assess the explanatory power of the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour. To investigate the separate and combined influence of each component of the theories, the global measures were entered into the multiple regression in stages. Attitude and subjective norm (reasoned action) were entered first, followed by perceived control (planned behaviour), the moral norm and previous shoplifting experience (the additional measures included for this study). Self-reports of frequency of shoplifting were used as a measure of experience on the basis that the more frequently shoplifting behaviour had been performed, the more experienced the respondent was. Although this variable was not intervally scaled, Beck and Ajzen (1991) used a similar measure in their study of dishonest behaviours. Previous experience is a constant in the analysis for the non-shoplifters. The results of the multiple regression are summarised in Table 8.16. All coefficients of determination (\mathbb{R}^2) in the following analysis are significant at $\mathbf{F} = .0000$ unless otherwise stated. The frequencies used in the analysis are shown in Appendix C.

	Beta weight	Т	Sig. T	Adj R ²	Inc R ²	Sig. of inc. R ²	Correlation coefficient (r)
Attitude	.47	8.7 3	.0000				.68**
Subjective norm	.25	6.26	.0000	.46			.45**
Perceived control	02	-0.49	.6225	.46	-	ns	.38**
Moral norm	.11	2.23	.0265	.46	-	ns	.48**
Previous experience	.01	0.32	.7520	.46	-	ns	.39**

Table 8.16 Summary of the regression analysis for intentions (n=417)

** significant at p = .000

The theory of reasoned action (attitude and subjective norm) explained 46% of the variance in intentions. Inclusion of perceived control, moral norm and previous experience (the theory of planned behaviour) did not improve the percentage of variance explained. Although the moral norm achieved a significant beta weight, this was at the expense of the beta weight for attitude, which reduced from 0.54 to 0.47, suggesting that these two measures are associated. This is confirmed by the correlation between attitude and the moral norm of 0.62 (significant at p = .000). Ajzen (1991) suggests that if previous experience has a significant effect beyond that of the predictor variables, this would indicate that either these variables have been poorly measured, or that additional variables, not accounted for by the model, are influencing intentions. As previous experience did not contribute significantly to the explanation of intentions, this implies that the theory of reasoned action provides a sufficient explanation of shoplifting intentions.

8.7.3 The Belief Measures

Following the procedure described in Chapter 7, section 7.5.1, the belief measures were computed by multiplying the likelihood of each belief by its evaluation, and summing the resulting products to produce measures of outcome beliefs (influencing attitude), referent beliefs (influencing subjective norm) and control beliefs (influencing perceived control). Ajzen (1991) argues that if the expectancy-value model is valid, the belief-based measures of attitude, subjective norm and perceived control should correlate significantly with the global measures of the same constructs. Low correlations between the global and belief measures are frequently reported (Ajzen, 1991; East, 1997), and East (1993) argues that the type of scale used for measurement of the belief likelihood and evaluation can affect the product correlations. Four combinations of unipolar (1 to 7) and bipolar (-3 to +3) scales were investigated. The optimal product correlations between the global and belief measures were produced by scaling all questions 1 to 7. The correlations between the global and belief measures that the global measures, shown in Table 8.17, provide support for Ajzen's (1991) hypothesis that the global measures are influenced by the belief measures.

Table 8.17 Correlation between global measures and belief measures (n=417)

Attitude/outcome beliefs	Subjective norm/referent beliefs	Perceived control/control beliefs
.32**	.30**	.62**
** :: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :		

**significant at p<.01

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients, computed for each set of items designed to measure outcome, referent and control beliefs, are shown in bold in the main diagonal in Table 8.18. The coefficients for the outcome and referent beliefs did not achieve acceptable reliability, possibly due to the fact that the belief measures may be composites of different factors thought to underlie shoplifting behaviour. This is investigated further in section 8.7.4 which reports the results of a factor analysis to redefine the belief measures. To investigate the impact of beliefs on intentions, the outcome, referent and control beliefs (based on the

Table 8.18 Reliability coefficients and correlations - belief measures (n=417)

	No of items	I	OB	RB	СВ
Intention (I)	2	.96			
Outcome beliefs (OB)	5	.23**	.12		
Referent beliefs (RB)	3	.22**	.01	.62	
Control beliefs (CB)	5	.37**	.30**	.17**	.83

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. **significant at p < .01

measures in Table 8.18) were entered into the multiple regression after the global measures. The results, summarised in Table 8.19, indicate that none of the belief measures contributed significantly to the explanation of intentions, and their inclusion did not improve the percentage of variance explained. This suggests that beliefs about shoplifting influence intentions indirectly through their impact on the global measures.

Т Beta Sig. T Adj Inc. Sig. of Correlation \mathbf{R}^2 R² inc. R² weight coefficient (r) .68** .46 8.73 .0000 Attitude .45** Subjective norm .24 6.26 .0000 .46 -0.49 .38** Perceived control -.03 .6225 .46 ns 2.23 .0265 .48** Moral norm .11 .46 ns .39** Previous experience .7520 .00 0.32 .46 ns -Outcome beliefs .03 0.77 .4418 .23** 0.48 .6299 .22** Referent beliefs .02 Control beliefs .37** .02 0.40 .6905 .46 ns

 Table 8.19 Inclusion of the belief measures in the regression analysis (n=417)

** significant at p =.000

8.7.4 Multicollinearity and Scale Reliability

As discussed in section 8.7.1, the reliability of the regression coefficients is limited by multicollinearity. In addition, the scales for perceived control, outcome beliefs and referent beliefs did not achieve acceptable reliability. Jain (1994) and Tacq (1997) suggest that the problem of multicollinearity can be resolved by respecifying the model, and recommend the use of factor analysis (described in Chapter 7, section 7.9.2) to redefine the variables, as sizeable correlations between variables suggest that they may be measuring the same underlying construct or constructs.

A factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was performed on the fourteen variables contained in the global measures. The procedures and the findings are detailed in full in Appendix D. The solution provided by the factor

 Table 8.20
 Factor Analysis for the Global Measures

FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
attitude	perceived control	moral norm	subjective norm
right	easy	principles	avoid
honest	excite	guilty	approve
good	plenty	morally	
wise	reward		
	plan		
the second s			

analysis is shown in Table 8.20. Factor one, attitude, contained four of the original attitude variables, *right, wise, good* and *honest,* the remaining two attitude variables, *excite* and *reward,* were grouped with the perceived control variables (factor two). Ajzen and Driver (1992) and East (1993) suggest that attitudes are composed of instrumental (knowledge based) and experiential (relating to feelings) components. As the solution proposed by the factor analysis reflects this division of attitude, the scales for attitude and perceived control were reformulated on this basis, with revised attitude representing feelings about shoplifting, and revised perceived control being based on knowledge about shoplifting outcomes. The alpha and correlation coefficients for the revised measures are shown in Table 8.21. Although the reliability coefficients for attitude and perceived control improved, the problem of multicollinearity was not resolved.

 Table 8.21
 Reliability coefficients and correlations for the revised global measures

n=417	No. of items	I	Α	SN	PC	MN
Intention (I)	2	.96				
Attitude (A)	4	.68	.91			
Subjective norm (SN)	2	.45	.42	.72		
Perceived control (PC)	5	.44	.55	.25	.80	
Moral norm (MN)	3	.48	.59	.30	.54	.89

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. All correlations significant at p=.000

A factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was also performed on the 13 variables contained in the belief-based measures (see Appendix D).

 Table 8.22
 Factor analysis for the belief-based measures

FACTOR 1 Control beliefs risk ineffective security penalties short of money friends	FACTOR 2 Referent beliefs police family friends	FACTOR 3 Apprehension beliefs arrest caught	FACTOR 4 Cost beliefs costs
save			

The solution is shown in Table 8.22. Factor 1 represents the control beliefs plus the outcome beliefs of *pay* and *save*. Factor 2 represents the original referent beliefs. Factor 3 contains the outcome beliefs relating to being caught. Factor 4 represents increased prices for other customers. As a multiple regression on this basis did not improve the percentage of variance explained it was decided to proceed on the following basis. The control and referent beliefs retained their original formulation and the outcome beliefs were separated into economic beliefs (*pay* and *save*) and apprehension beliefs (*arrest* and *caught*). Shops passing on costs was excluded as the correlations between this variable and intentions were insignificant for all three groups of respondents. The reliability coefficients and correlations for the revised belief measures are shown in Table 8.23. Although the economic belief measures did not. In addition, the apprehension and control beliefs were more highly correlated with the economic beliefs than with intentions.

Table 8.23 Reliability coefficients and correlations for the revised belief measures

n=417	No of items	Ι	EB	AB	RB	CB
Intention (I)	2	.96				
Economic beliefs (EB)	2	.56**	.84			
Apprehension beliefs (AB)	2	20**	25**	.65		
Referent beliefs (RB)	3	.22**	.16**	11*	.62	
Control beliefs (CB)	5	.37**	.55**	11*	.17**	.83

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. *significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

8.7.5 Multiple Regression Based on the Revised Global and Belief Measures

Although the two factor analyses did not resolve the problems of multicollinearity and unacceptable scale reliability, as the solutions suggested a grouping of the variables which appeared to be superior to the original formulations, a multiple regression based on the revised measures was performed. The results, shown in Table 8.24, indicate that the revisions to the global and belief measures resulted in a 5% improvement in the percentage of variance explained.

	Beta weight	Т	Sig. T	Adj R ²	Inc. R ²	Sig. of inc. in R ²	Correlation coefficient
(r)							
Attitude	.45	8.25	.0000				.68**
Subjective norm	.21	5.24	.0000	.50			.45**
Perceived control	.03	0.60	.5508	.51	.01	.037	.44**
Moral norm	.06	0.14	.2553	.51	-	ns	.48**
Previous experience	02	39	.6982	.51	-	ns	.39**
Economic beliefs	.18	3.14	.0018				.56**
Apprehension beliefs	02	46	.6485				.20**
Referent beliefs	.00	07	.9457				.22**
Control beliefs	04	88	.3813	.51	-	ns	.37**

 Table 8.24
 Multiple regression based on the revised measures (n=417)

** significant at p = .000

8.7.6 The Intentions of the Non-shoplifters, Past Shoplifters and Recent Shoplifters

The model of shoplifting behaviour illustrated in table 8.24 indicates that the respondents' shoplifting intentions were influenced by their attitudes, subjective norm and beliefs about the economic benefits of shoplifting. As this model does not differentiate between the non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters, a further multiple regression analysis (based on the revised global and belief measures) for each group of respondents was performed. The results are shown in Table 8.25.

	Non (n=285)		Past (n	Past (n=105)			Recent (n=27)		
	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r
Reasoned Action Attitude Subjective norm	.29**	.42** .29**	.46** .39**	.34**	.35** .28**	.57** .37**	.40**	.38 .04	.66** .41**
Planned behaviour Perceived control Moral norm Previous exp.	.29** .31** -	.07 14* -	.16** .01 -	.37** .37** .37**	.22* .05 15	.43** .29** .01	.37** .54** .52**	20 .34 .01	.48* .69** .51**
Belief measures Economic Apprehension Referent Control	.31**	11 07 .02 .03	.11 13* .15* .05	.41**	.19 * 01 13 17	.43** 08 .07 .16	.60**	.34 .01 .31 27	.69** 47* .60** .34

 Table 8.25
 Multiple regression analysis by category of respondent

 $r = correlation \ coefficient$ *significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

8.7.6.1 The Non-shoplifters

Only 2.5% of the non-shoplifters thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, although 6.7% agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity. The theory of planned behaviour, including the belief measures, accounted for 31% of the variance in their intentions, with attitude and the subjective norm being the most significant measures. Although the moral norm was not significantly correlated with intentions, inclusion of this measure in the multiple regression had a significant effect (p<.05), the negative beta weight implying that those viewing shoplifting as immoral are more likely to shoplift. To investigate this further, the beliefs and attitudes of the 18 non-shoplifters who indicated that they were likely to shoplift in the future, or answered "neither" to the intentions questions were analysed. This group were named potential shoplifters.

Once the potential shoplifters had been excluded from the multiple regression for the nonshoplifters, the moral norm no longer had a significant effect on intentions. As this suggests that it is the moral views of the potential shoplifters which account for the significant negative impact of this measure, a multiple regression on this group was attempted. Although the small sample size resulted in a non-significant coefficient of determination, and thus unreliable findings, the multiple regression indicated perceived control to be the most influential predictor of intentions for this group, with both attitude and moral norm having negative beta weights. These findings are supported by the correlations with intentions (attitude -0.30, moral norm -0.07, perceived control 0.46), although none of these correlations were significant. In addition, the variable relating to unplanned shoplifting was significantly correlated with intentions (0.56 p<.05). This suggests that although the potential shoplifters may have strong anti-shoplifting views, these views may be overridden when they are confronted with a low risk shoplifting opportunity and are able to rationalise their shoplifting behaviour.

8.7.6.2 The Past Shoplifters

Of the past shoplifters, 6.9% thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and 8.6% agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity. The theory of planned behaviour, including the belief measures, explained 41% of the variance in their intentions, with attitude to shoplifting and the subjective norm being the most significant measures. Perceived control and economic beliefs about shoplifting were also significant, suggesting that the factors which restrict shoplifting behaviour (i.e. potential obstacles and opportunities) and beliefs about the economic consequences of the crime also influenced the intentions of this group. Correlation analysis indicated that although past experience was not significantly correlated with shoplifting intentions, it was significantly correlated with attitude (0.23 p<.05) and the moral norm (0.27 p<.01). This suggests that their previous

experiences of shoplifting may have influenced the attitudes and moral views of this group, and inclusion of previous experience in the regression model resulted in an increase of the beta weights for these two variables.

The past shoplifter category consists of two groups; those who had shoplifted over 5 years ago and those who had shoplifted between 1 and 5 years ago. It is recognised that these two groups may differ in their views about shoplifting, therefore further statistical analysis was performed (Appendix D, Tables D9 and D10). One-way analysis of variance indicated statistically significant differences between the two groups. As these differences impacted on the global and belief measures (with the exception of intention and subjective norm) a multiple regression analysis for the two groups of past shoplifters was conducted. For those who had shoplifted over 5 years ago, attitude, subjective norm and perceived control were the most significant measures with the moral norm having a negative impact on intentions. Further analysis of this was not viable as only 3 of the respondents thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future. For those who had shoplifted between 1 and 5 years ago, as the coefficient of determination was not significant, the results of the multiple regression are not reliable. Correlation analysis indicated that the two variables most strongly associated with the intentions of this group were attitudes and economic beliefs about shoplifting. Thus, the respondents who had shoplifted over 5 years ago appear to be more similar to the non-shoplifters than to the respondents who shoplifted between 1 and 5 years ago. As the analysis for both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters indicates that those who view shoplifting negatively and perceive shoplifting to be a behaviour not under their control are less likely to shoplift, the differences between the two groups of past shoplifters were not considered to be of major importance.

8.7.6.3 The Recent Shoplifters

Of the recent shoplifters, 51.8% thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity to do so. Although the theory of planned behaviour, including the belief measures, explained 60% of the variance in their intentions, none of the global or belief measures was individually significant. Attitude, the moral norm and economic beliefs were the measures with the highest beta weights, and were also the measures which correlated the most strongly with intentions (see Table 8.25). Inclusion of past experience in the regression reduced the percentage of variance explained by 2%, suggesting that previous behaviour influences future intentions through its impact on the global measures. This is confirmed by the moderate to strong correlations between this measure and attitude $(0.56 \ p < .01)$, subjective norm $(0.56 \ p < .01)$, perceived control $(0.65 \ p < .01)$ and the moral norm $(0.59 \ p < .01)$.

8.8 The Influence of the Individual Variables

Although the shoplifting intentions of the non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters appear to be influenced by similar factors, these factors operate in different ways or in different combinations to inhibit or encourage shoplifting behaviour. To investigate further the interaction between the global and belief measures, and to establish the most significant determinants of intentions for the three groups of respondents, this section analyses the influence of the individual variables contained within the global and belief measures on shoplifting intentions. It was originally intended to explore further the interrelationships between the global and belief measures by using structural equation modelling. Initial attempts, however, produced inconclusive findings, and it was decided to abandon this approach as it seemed possible that the data were unsuitable.

The main thrust of the following analysis is to identify areas of difference between the nonshoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters, and to establish how the individual variables interact to influence their shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour. As the preceding analysis indicates that the main determinants of shoplifting intentions are attitudes and moral views, the outcomes of shoplifting, social influences and factors which facilitate or inhibit shoplifting, each of these factors is considered in turn, and the impact of previous shoplifting experience is discussed where relevant. The frequencies used in the analysis are shown in Appendix C.

8.8.1 The Statistical Procedures

The following analysis is based on the revised global and belief measures discussed in section 8.7.4, and utilises both parametric and non-parametric techniques wherever possible, in order to increase the confidence which can be placed in the findings. Table 8.26 compares Pearson's product moment correlations with the non-parametric Spearman's rank order correlations. Although the two techniques produced similar findings (providing

Cable 8.26 Comparise	on of Pearson's and	l Spearman's correlations
--------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

	Non	_	Past		Recent	
	Pearson correlation	Spearman correlation	Pearson correlation	Spearman correlation	Pearson correlation	Spearman correlation
Global measures attitude subjective norm percvd control moral norm previous exp.	.46** .39** .16** .01 -	.40** .50** .21** .11 -	.57** .37** .43** .29** .01	.57** .27** .52** .39** .05	.66** .41* .48* .69** .51**	.67** .41* .64** .68** .53**
Belief measures economic apprehension referent control	.11 13* .15* .05	.17** 17** .25** .01	.43** 08 .07 .16	.49** 05 .12 .21*	.69** 47* .60** .34	.75** 51** .66** .34

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

limited support for the use of parametric tests), as Spearman's correlation is possibly more reliable it is used throughout the rest of the analysis. It must be noted, however, that a significant correlation between two variables does not necessarily imply a cause and effect relationship, but rather that the two variables are associated.

To compare the views of the three groups of respondents, both one-way analysis of variance (parametric) and the Kruskal-Wallis test (non-parametric) were used. The two statistical techniques produced very similar results, which increases the confidence which can be placed in the reliability of the findings. The results of the one-way analysis of variance, reported in full in Appendix D (Tables D11-D18), indicate that the recent shoplifters held statistically significant views from the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters for all the questions relating to the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour except for: *being arrested for shoplifting is good/bad, the police think that I should avoid shoplifting* and *the penalties for shoplifting are not severe*.

8.8.2 Attitudes and Moral Views

Over 95% of the non-shoplifters and over 80% of the past shoplifters agreed that shoplifting is wrong, foolish, dishonest, bad, morally wrong and against their principles, and that they would feel guilty if they shoplifted. In comparison, only 62.9% of the recent shoplifters considered shoplifting dishonest, only 55.5% thought it wrong and only 48.1% viewed it as bad or foolish. The recent shoplifters' attitudes to shoplifting were supported by their moral views about the behaviour. Only 48.1% viewed shoplifting as morally wrong, 51.8% stated that shoplifting was **not** against their principles, and only 59.2% agreed that they would feel guilty if they shoplifted.

	Non (n=285)	Past (n=105)	Recent (n=27)
good/bad	.31**	.53**	.75**
honest/dishonest	.33**	.43**	.41*
right/wrong	.44**	.43**	.67**
wise/foolish	.45**	.51**	.54**
guilty	.12*	.34**	.69**
morally wrong	.06	.35**	.68**
principles	.13*	.26*	.44*

 Table 8.27
 Correlation between intentions and attitudes and the moral norm

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The correlations between intentions and the attitude and moral variables, shown in Table 8.27, indicate that for both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters, the attitude variables were more strongly associated with their shoplifting intentions than the moral variables. Although this could imply that moral considerations influence attitudes, the correlations between the attitude and moral variables did not support this conclusion. For the recent shoplifters, both the attitude and moral variables were strongly associated with shoplifting intentions, suggesting that favourable shoplifting attitudes, together with a lack of moral inhibitions about shoplifting are likely to facilitate the behaviour. The correlations shown in Table 8.28 suggest that for the recent shoplifters, their attitudes and moral views may be influenced by their previous shoplifting experiences.

Table 8.28 Correlations between past behaviour and attitudes and moral concerns

	good	honest	right	wise	guilty	morally	principles
past (n=105)	.21*	.14	.16	.13	.28*	.19	.33**
recent (n=27)	.56**	.32	.56**	.34	.60**	.53**	.36

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

8.8.3 The Outcomes of Shoplifting Behaviour

All the recent shoplifters agreed that shoplifting would result in free goods and would enable them to save money, with 77.7% viewing getting goods without paying as good

(48.1% extremely good) and 81.4% agreeing that saving money by shoplifting is good (44.4% extremely good). Although over 49% of the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters agreed that shoplifting would result in financial gain, over 90% of the non-shoplifters and 70% of the past shoplifters viewed this as being an adverse outcome of shoplifting.

The recent shoplifters' evaluation of the financial benefits of shoplifting appears to be related to their economic status. Of the 19 recent shoplifters with an annual income of less than $\pm 10,000, 100\%$ though that getting free goods by shoplifting was good (compared to 5.3% of low income non-shoplifters and 25% of low income past shoplifters) and 89.5% viewed saving money by shoplifting as being good (compared to 1.3% of low income non-shoplifters).

Only 14.8% of the recent shoplifters thought it likely that they would be caught shoplifting (compared to 80.7% of non-shoplifters and 56.2% of past shoplifters) and only 33.3% thought they would be arrested for committing a crime if they were caught (compared to 78.6% of non-shoplifters and 73.4% of past shoplifters). Of the shoplifters who had been caught for shoplifting, 60% of the past and 20% of the recent agreed that apprehension was likely (for the past shoplifters this variable was significantly correlated with previous experience, 0.24 p<.05). Over 70% of the recent shoplifters viewed being caught and arrested for shoplifting as bad, and 48.1% agreed that being caught would deter them from shoplifting in the future (compared to 68.8% of non-shoplifters and 74.3% of past shoplifters).

The correlations shown in Table 8.29 indicate that the outcome belief measures (resulting from the combination of the outcome beliefs and outcome evaluations) were

	Non (n=285)		Past (n=	105)	Recent (n=27)	
	attitude	moral norm	attitude	moral norm	attitude	moral norm
economic beliefs	.43**	.37**	.64**	.44**	.75**	.57**
apprehension beliefs	15**	10	03	15	70**	31

Table 8.29 Correlations between the outcome beliefs and attitude and moral norm

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

significantly associated with attitudes and moral views, particularly for the recent shoplifters. This suggests that beliefs about the outcomes of shoplifting may influence attitudes and moral views about the behaviour (or vice versa).

The correlations shown in Table 8.30 indicate that the individual attitude and moral norm variables were associated with beliefs about shoplifting outcomes. For both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters, the weak correlations between *caught* and the attitude and moral variables suggest that their attitudes and moral views were influenced by their negative view of the financial benefits of shoplifting rather than the risk of apprehension. For the recent shoplifters, the strong negative correlations between *caught* and the attitude variables suggest that their positive view of shoplifting was associated with their perception that the risks of apprehension are low, in addition to their perceptions of the

Table 8.30 Correlations between outcome measures and the global variables

	Non (n=285)			Past (n=105)			Recent (n=27)		
	pay	save	caught	pay	save	caught	pay	save	caught
good	.40**	.37**	17**	.54**	.46**	03	.70**	.61**	56**
honest	.24**	.18**	10	.45**	.28**	03	.64**	.38**	71**
right	.36**	.37**	15*	.49**	.45**	01	.70**	.57**	72**
wise	.34**	.28**	20**	.51**	.41**	11	.60**	.52**	81**
guilty	.26**	.22**	08	.38**	.22*	29**	.58**	.52**	33
morally	.32**	.30**	11	.46**	.43**	18	.55**	.54**	49**
principles	.33**	.30**	04	.31**	.20*	20*	.35	.37	11

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

economic advantages of the crime. The correlations between the individual outcome beliefs and intentions are shown in Table 8.31. The intentions of both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters were associated with their negative views about the financial benefits of shoplifting, and for the non-shoplifters the correlations were weak, possibly due to their non-experience of the behaviour. For the recent shoplifters, the correlations indicate that their shoplifting intentions were strongly associated with their favourable beliefs about the financial benefits of shoplifting and their view of the low risk of apprehension (the negative correlation implying that those who view apprehension as unlikely are more likely to shoplift). This suggests that the recent shoplifters were influenced by their perception that the financial benefits of shoplifting outweigh the risks of being caught. None of the outcome measures were associated with past experience except for goods without paying for the recent shoplifters (0.53 p<.01).

Table 8.31 Correlations between intentions and the outcome belief measures

	Non (n=285)	Past (n=105)	Recent (n=27)
goods without paying	.20**	.41**	.65**
saving money	.14*	.39**	.72**
get caught	17*	08	52**
be arrested	10	05	39*

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Retailers passing the costs of shoplifting to other consumers was not significantly correlated with intentions for any of the three groups. Both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters were significantly more likely than the recent shoplifters to think that shoplifting would result in higher prices (80.4% of non-shoplifters and 77.2% of past shoplifters compared to 48.1% of recent shoplifters), and over 75% of both groups agreed that this was an adverse outcome of shoplifting, compared to 48.1% of the recent shoplifters.

8.8.4 Social Influence and Shoplifting

Although over 79% of respondents overall agreed that most people important to them would not approve of shoplifting and would want them to avoid the behaviour, the recent shoplifters differed significantly in the extent of their agreement (Appendix D, Table D12). Over 86% of the non-shoplifters and 75% of the past shoplifters **strongly** agreed with these two statements, compared to less than 26% of the recent shoplifters. This suggests that the recent shoplifters were more likely to know people favourably disposed to shoplifting, and were less likely to be subject to social pressure to refrain from shoplifting.

The correlations shown in Table 8.32 indicate that majority of the attitude, moral and perceived control variables were significantly associated with the subjective norm measure. This suggests that people important to the respondents may possibly play an influential role in their shoplifting (or non-shoplifting) behaviour. The correlations were the strongest for the recent shoplifters, which suggests that people important to them may be a source of information about shoplifting behaviour.

Tuble ole Continutions been con subjective norm und the Brobal variables
--

	good	honest	right	wise	guilty	morally	excite	rewrd	easy	oppty
non	.23**	.30**	.33**	.37**	.06	.12*	.17**	.17**	.14*	.17**
past	.36**	.34**	.38**	.27**	.26**	.31**	.17	.32**	.18	.03
recen t	.44**	.40**	.54**	.37**	.40**	.50**	05	.40**	.65**	.42**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The referent groups identified in the elicitation as being salient to shoplifting were family, friends and the police. As shown in Appendix D, Table D17, the recent shoplifters were significantly less likely to agree that their family and friends would think that they should avoid shoplifting, and were also significantly less motivated to comply with their views.

Only 48.1% of the recent shoplifters thought it **extremely** likely that their family would want them to avoid shoplifting (compared to 92.6% of non-shoplifters and 85.7% of past shoplifters), and only 3.7% thought it **extremely** likely that their friends would want them to avoid shoplifting (compared to 72.6% of non-shoplifters and 51.4% of past shoplifters).

Overall, 95.2% of the respondents agreed that the police would want them to avoid shoplifting. There was, however, some variation in the strength of this agreement, with 91.2% of the non-shoplifters and 87.6% of the past shoplifters and thinking it **extremely** likely, compared to 74.1% of the recent shoplifters. Although 85.2% of the non-shoplifters and 70.4% of the past shoplifters thought that doing what the police want them to do is good, only 51.8% of the recent shoplifters agreed, and 25.9% of this group thought that doing what the police want them to do is **extremely** bad. Table 8.33 shows the variables significantly correlated with motivation to comply with the police for the recent shoplifters. The strong negative correlations indicate that anti-police attitudes were associated with shoplifting beliefs, attitudes and intentions (or vice versa).

Table 8.33	Significant correlations with police - recent shoplifters (n=27)	

intend	49*	reward	50**	pay	65**
will	46*	guilty	39*	save	54**
good	50**	principles	59**	ineffective	
right	42*			security	53**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

•

Consistent with the results of the multiple regression, the subjective norm was significantly associated with the intentions of the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters, although the correlations between the referent groups and shoplifting intentions were low (Table 8.34). For the recent shoplifters, identifying the referent groups rather than using general measures produced more significant correlations. In addition, for the recent

	Non (n=285)	Past (n=105)	Recent (n=27)
Subjective norm	.50**	.27**	.41*
approve	.52**	.27**	.39*
avoid	.50**	.34**	.38*
Referent beliefs	.25**	.12	.66**
family	.14*	.05	.47*
friends	.24**	.19	.47*
police	.06	12	25

Table 8.34 Correlations between intentions, subjective norm and referent beliefs

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

shoplifters, the subjective norm was significantly correlated with previous shoplifting experience (0.56 p<.01), and the family belief measure was significantly correlated with attitude and perceived control (0.58 p<.01). This suggests that knowledge of their family's reaction to previous shoplifting behaviour may influence the shoplifting attitudes and intentions of the recent shoplifters.

8.8.5 Factors which Facilitate or Inhibit Shoplifting

The perceived control variables, and the associated control beliefs, refer to the factors likely to facilitate or inhibit shoplifting. The recent shoplifters were significantly more likely to agree with the perceived control variables (Appendix D, Table D13). For example, 88.8% viewed shoplifting as exciting, 77.7% viewed shoplifting as easy and rewarding, 85% agreed that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting, and 74% that there may be occasions when they might shoplift even if they hadn't planned to. For the recent shoplifters the variables of *easy*, *plan* and *plenty* were significantly correlated with their past shoplifting experience (0.57, 0.58 and 0.52 respectively, all significant at p<.01). The correlations between intentions and the perceived control variables (Table 8.35) suggest that for both the past and recent shoplifters, the combined effect of the perceived control measure appears to be stronger than that of the individual variables.

	Non	Past	Recent	
Perceived control	.21**	.52**	.64**	
exciting/boring	.24**	.49**	.21	
rewarding/punishing	.24**	.36**	.57**	
easy/difficult	.20**	.36**	.51**	
plenty of opportunities	.05	.27**	.52**	
unplanned shoplifting	.23**	.20**	.51**	

Table 8.35 Correlation between intentions and perceived control (n=417)

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Although perceived control was a significant predictor of intentions for the past shoplifters, it was not significant for either the non-shoplifters or the recent shoplifters. This was an unexpected finding in view of the expectation that shoplifting would be restricted by potential obstacles and opportunities, and the significance of this variable in previous planned behaviour studies (Ajzen, 1991). Although examination of the correlations in table 8.26 indicates that perceived control was significantly correlated with the intentions of all three groups, for the non-shoplifters, attitude and subjective norm were more highly correlated with intentions, and for the recent shoplifters, attitude and the moral norm. The relationship is further complicated by the high degree of multicollinearity between attitude, moral norm and perceived control (see section 8.7.1), and the correlations in Table 8.36 demonstrate the strong associations between perceived control and attitudes and moral views, particularly for the recent shoplifters.

	good	honest	right	wise	guilty	morally	principles
non	.36**	.18*	.26**	.23**	.28**	.27**	.28**
past	.54**	.36**	.44**	.50**	.34**	.42**	.37** .2
recent	.81**	.52**	.73**	.56**	.70**	.55**	5

Table 8.36 Correlations between perceived control and attitudes and morals

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The three groups held significantly different beliefs about the likelihood of the control factors facilitating shoplifting behaviour (Appendix D, Table D18). Between 41% and 56%

of the non-shoplifters thought it **extremely unlikely** that any of the control factors would facilitate shoplifting. In comparison, over 50% of the recent shoplifters agreed that it was **extremely likely** that shoplifting would be easier if there was little risk of being caught, the penalties for shoplifting were not severe and the retailers' security measures were ineffective, and over 40% thought it **extremely** likely that being short of money and encouragement by friends would facilitate shoplifting.

Overall, 64.2% of the respondents agreed that the penalties for shoplifting are not severe. Of the recent shoplifters, 81.4% agreed that there is little risk of being caught (compared to 39.3% of non-shoplifters and 44.7% of past shoplifters) and 85.2% that retailers security measures are ineffective (compared to 45.2% of non-shoplifters and 47.7% of past shoplifters). The recent shoplifters' beliefs about retail security were significantly correlated with previous shoplifting behaviour (0.50 p < .01). Of the 28.6% of the past shoplifters who had been caught shoplifting, 60% agreed that the penalties are not severe, 36.7% that retail security is ineffective, and 30% there is little risk of being caught. Only 5 of the recent shoplifters had been caught. Of these, 2 agreed that the penalties are not severe, 3 that there is little risk of being caught and 4 that retail security is ineffective.

Of the recent shoplifters, 85.2% thought it likely that being short of money would encourage them to shoplift, and 74% agreed that they were often short of money. Although 41% of the non-shoplifters and 51.4% of the past shoplifters were also often short of money, only 22.4% and 39% respectively thought that this would encourage them to shoplift. Of the 19 low income recent shoplifters, 94.7% agreed that being short of money would encourage them to shoplift, and 83.3% that they were often short of money. Although 53.3% of non-shoplifters also earned less than £10,000 p.a., only 43.4% of this group agreed that they were often short of money and only 22.4% that this would encourage them to shoplift. Similarly of the low income past shoplifters (53.3% of the group) only 67.9% agreed that they were often short of money and only 41.1% that this would encourage them to shoplift. Past experience was significantly correlated (0.26, p<.05) with the combined short of money measure for the past shoplifters.

Only 3.6% of the non-shoplifters and 5.8% of the past shoplifters agreed that their friends encouraged them to shoplift (implying that the majority of their friends did not approve of shoplifting)compared to 44.4% of the recent shoplifters, and 59.2% of the recent shoplifters agreed that encouragement by friends would facilitate shoplifting behaviour (compared to 9.2% of non-shoplifters and 19.1% of past shoplifters). The correlations between the variable *my friends often encourage me to shoplift* and the individual attitude, moral and control variables for the recent shoplifters are shown in Table 8.37, and indicate that the attitudes and beliefs of the recent shoplifters were strongly associated with peer influence.

Table 8.37 Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables

Correlations between the individual attitude, moral and control variables - recent shoplifters (n=27)									
good .69 honest .65 right .61 wise .56	** reward ** easy ** guilty **	.58** .57** .40*	arrest caught pay	46* 58** .50**	ineffective security penalties not severe little risk of being caught	.57** .55** .47*			

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Table 8.38 Correlations between control variables and intentions (n=417)

	Non	Past	Recent
little risk	.02	.24*	.14
security ineffective	07	.15	.46*
penalties not severe	13*	.04	.32
short of money	.01	.19	.20
peer encouragement	.23**	.18	.46*

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

For the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters, the correlations between intentions and the control beliefs were weak (Table 8.38). The recent shoplifters' intentions were associated with peer influence and their perception that retail security is ineffective. For the recent shoplifters the control beliefs were more highly correlated with the global attitude measure than with the global perceived control measure (Table 8.39). This suggests that the control beliefs are influencing attitude rather than perceived control.

Table 8.39 Correlations between control beliefs and attitude and perceived control

	Non (n=285)		Past (n=1	05)	Recent (n=27)		
peers security penalties risk money	Attitude .23* .03 .05 .14* .10	Percvd Control .35** .40** .31** .46** .33**	Attitude .31** .33** .18 .33** .43**	Percvd Control .35** .33** .08 .43** .44**	Attitude .63** .82** .52** .70** .39	Percvd Control .53** .60** .45** .31 .38	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Table 8.40 Correlations between intentions and the individual variables

Non (n=285) Past (n=105)			Recent (n=27)								
approve	.52	right	.44	good	.53	honest	.43	good	.75	morally	.69
avoid	.50	honest	.33	wise	.51	right	.43	save	.72	right	.67
wise	.45	good	.44	excite	.49	easy	.36	guilty	.69	pay	.65

All correlations significant at p < .01

8.8.6 The Impact of the Individual Variables on Shoplifting Intentions

Table 8.40 shows the six variables most strongly correlated with intentions for each group of respondents. Consistent with the multiple regression (Table 8.25), attitudes were strongly associated with the shoplifting intentions of all three groups, with social pressure being important for the non-shoplifters, perceptions of control for the past shoplifters, and moral and economic beliefs for the recent shoplifters.

CHAPTER 9

FINDINGS ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS TO THE SCHOOL SURVEY

9.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings about the respondents to the two school surveys. As the findings were analysed using the same procedures as for the consumer survey, these procedures are not described in detail. The results are presented in a similar format to that of the consumer survey, and the structure of the chapter is presented diagrammatically in figure 9.1. The first section of the chapter reports the distribution of and response to the two school surveys (the respondents are henceforth referred to as the students). The second section examines the demographic composition of the school sample and their shoplifting history. The third section reports the findings from the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour. The fourth section reports the impact of the traditional correlates of shoplifting behaviour (age, gender and socio-economic status) on the beliefs, attitudes and intentions of the respondents.





9.2 Questionnaire Distribution and Response

The shoplifting survey was conducted at two Northampton schools during March and April 1998. 451 questionnaires were distributed to students at the two schools, who completed the questionnaire in a classroom environment, and 450 completed questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 99.8%. Of these questionnaires, 6 were excluded from the analysis due to a substantial number of missing responses.

9.2.1 The Respondents from School A

School A is a co-educational upper school located in a suburb approximately two miles from the centre of Northampton. 293 questionnaires were distributed to students between the ages of 13 and 18 years (years 9 through 13). Although all 293 students completed the survey, 4 questionnaires were excluded from the analysis as less than half the questions had been completed (3 males, 1 female; 2 aged 13, 1 aged 14, 1 aged 15). The final sample of 289 students represented 21.4% of the school's population of 1353 students. As shown in Table 9.1, 47.4% of the sample were male, 52.6% female (48.9% of the school's population were male, 51.1% female). Thus, 20.7% of the school's male students and 22% of the school's female students completed the survey.

 Table 9.1
 Demographic characteristics of the School A sample (n = 289)

Age	Male	Female	Total Number	Total %
13 or under	14	20	34	11.8%
14	34	32	66	22.8%
15	24	22	46	15.9%
16	22	36	58	20.1%
17	34	30	64	22.1%
18	9	12	21	7.3%
Total	137 (47.4%)	152 (52.6%)	289	100%

9.2.2 The Respondents from School B

School B is a co-educational upper school located in rural area approximately five miles outside Northampton. 158 questionnaires were distributed to students between the ages of 13 and 17 years (years 9 through 11). Years 12 and 13 were not available for the survey due to timetabling problems, examinations and examination revision. 157 questionnaires were returned, 1 female student declined to complete the questionnaire as she had already participated in the consumer survey. Two of the returned questionnaires were excluded from the analysis (both female, aged 13 and 15) due to the high proportion of missing answers. The final sample of 155 students represented 28.1% of the school's population for years 9, 10 and 11 (551 students). As shown in Table 9.2, 49.7% of the sample were male, and 50.3% female (49% of the students in years 9 to 11 were male and 51% female). Thus, 28.5% of the male students and 27.8% of the female students in years 9 to 11 completed the questionnaire.

Age	Male	Female	Total Number	Total %
13 or under	6	15	21	13.5%
14	25	19	44	28.4%
15	31	28	59	38.1%
16	15	14	29	18.7%
17	-	2	2	1.3%
Total	77 (49.7%)	78 (50.3%)	155	100%

 Table 9.2 Demographic characteristics of the School B sample (n = 155)

9.2.3 The Combined School Sample

To compare the respondents from the two schools, chi square and Cramer's V were used, and for the interval scaled data, ANOVA and the Kruskal-Wallis test (only where both tests report p<.05 have the differences been regarded as statistically significant). The results are reported in Appendix F and indicate that the respondents from the two schools differed significantly on the following variables: *age, money, frequency of shoplifting in the previous 12 months, recency of shoplifting, breaking the law is good/bad, friends think I should avoid shoplifting* and *friends often encourage me to shoplift*. The students from School A were significantly older than those from School B (chi square 63.3171, d.f. 3, Cramer's V 0.37763, significance .00000), due mainly to the fact that students in years 12 and 13 at School B were not available for the survey. Students at school A also had significantly more money to spend each week (chi square 37.17882, d.f. 3, Cramer's V 0.29135, significance .00000). Further analysis indicated that age accounted for all the significant differences between the two samples, except for *breaking the law is good/bad*. As the two school samples differed significantly on only a small number of variables, the samples were combined. The demographic characteristics of the combined sample are shown in Table 9.3.

Age	Male	Female	Total Number	Total %
13 or under	20	35	55	12.4%
14	59	51	110	24.8%
15	55	50	105	23.6%
16	37	50	87	19.6%
17	34	32	66	14.9%
18	9	12	21	4.7%
Total	214 (48.2%)	230 (51.8%)	444	100%

 Table 9.3 Demographic characteristics of the combined school sample (n = 444)

9.3 Demographic Characteristics and Shoplifting Experience

The frequency and recency of shoplifting by the respondents is shown in Table 9.4. As in the consumer survey, the school students were categorised by the recency of their

How many times have shoplifted?	you ever	,	When was the last time shoplifted?		
-	n	%	-	n	%
Never	219	49.3	Never	219	49.3
Once	57	12.8	Can't remember	39	8.8
Twice	26	5.9	Over 5 years ago	29	6.5
Three times	16	3.6	1 to 5 years ago	75	16.9
Four times	10	2.3	Within the last 12 months	s 82	18.5
More than four times	115	25.9			
Not answered	1	0.2			

 Table 9.4
 Shoplifting History (n=444)

shoplifting behaviour into non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters. The past shoplifter category consisted of those who had shoplifted over 5 years ago, those who had shoplifted 1 to 5 years ago, and those who had shoplifted but couldn't remember when. As these three groups differed significantly on only three variables (see Appendix F): gender, the deterrent value of apprehension and breaking the law, the three groups were combined into one overall category of past shoplifters. The breakdown of the sample by shoplifting history is:

Non-shoplifters	219	49.3%
Past Shoplifters	143	32.2%
Recent shoplifters	82	18.5%

9.3.1 Shoplifting and Age

The 14-16 year olds were the most involved in shoplifting (Tables 9.5 and 9.6), 81.7% of the recent shoplifters were in this age group, and 22.2% of the 14-16 year olds admitted

Table 9.5Shoplifting by age (n=444)

Age	13	14	15	16	17	18	Total
Non	12.3%	25.6%	21.0%	18.7%	16.0%	6.4%	100%
Past	13.3%	24.5%	22.4%	17.5%	18.2%	4.2%	100%
Recent	11%	23.2%	32.9%	25.6%	6.1%	1.2%	100%

Age	13	14	15	16	17	18
Non	49.1%	50.9%	43.8%	47.1%	53.0%	66.7%
Past	34.5%	31.8%	30.5%	28.7%	39.4%	28.6%
Recent	16.4%	17.3%	25.7%	24.2%	7.6%	4.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

 Table 9.6 Involvement in shoplifting by age group (n=444)

to shoplifting in the last 12 months. The figures for the past shoplifters suggest substantial shoplifting involvement by those under the age of 13, and 56% of the past and 66% of the recent shoplifters stated that they were under the age of 13 when they first shoplifted, with the mean age for the past shoplifters being 11.2 years and for the recent shoplifters 10.7 years.

9.3.2 Shoplifting and Gender

Males were more likely to admit to shoplifting than females, 56.6% of the past and 59.8% of the recent shoplifters were male. As shown in Table 9.7, 60.7% of the males admitted to shoplifting (compared to 41.3% of the females), with 22.9% having shoplifted within

 Table 9.7 Shoplifting and gender (n=444)

	non-shoplifters	past shoplifters	recent shoplifters	Total
male	39.3%	37.8%	22.9%	100%
female	58.7%	27%	14.3%	100%

the previous 12 months (compared to 14.3% of the females). The males appeared to start their shoplifting "career" at earlier age than the females, 80.6% of the male past and 90% of the male recent shoplifters started shoplifting before the age of 13 (compared to 49% of the female past and 58% of the female recent shoplifters). Table 9.8 indicates limited support for females shoplifting at later age than males, although the peak age for both groups was 15.

15 Total 13 14 16 17 18 11.1% 32.1% 23.5% 11.1% 18.5% 3.7% 100% Past male female 16.2% 14.5% 21.0% 25.8% 17.7% 4.8% 100% 8.2% 4.1% Recent male 26.5% 34.7% 26.5% 100% 3.0% female 15.2% 18.2% 30.3% 24.2% 9.1% 100%

 Table 9.8 Shoplifting by age and gender (n=444)

9.3.3 Shoplifting and Money

As shown in Table 9.9, the non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters did not differ significantly on money available to spend each week, and 61.6% of the past and 56.1% of the recent shoplifters had over £10 per week spending money.

Table 9.9 Shoplifting and money available to spend each week (n=444)

	Under £5	£5 - £10	£10 - £15	Over £15	not answered	Total
non	13. 7%	30.6%	20.5%	32.9%	2.3%	100%
past	10.5%	27.3%	18.2%	43.4%	0.7%	100%
recent	14.6%	29.3%	19.5%	36.6%	-	100%

9.3.4 Shoplifting and Frequency of Using the Shops

The recent shoplifters used the shops more frequently than the other two groups (Table 9.10), 60.5% used the shops at least once a day compared to 49% of the past and 31% of the non-shoplifters. Overall, frequency of using shops was significantly associated with weekly spending money (Cramer's V 0.16174, significance .0006), for the recent

Table 9.10 Shoplifting and frequency of using the shops (n=444)

	less than once week	once a week	more than once week	once a day	more than once a day	not answered	Total
non	10.0%	15.5%	43.4%	26.0%	5.0%	0.1%	100%
past	4.9%	9.8%	36.4%	29.4%	19.6%	-	100%
recent	-	12.2%	26.8%	34.1%	25.6%	1.2%	100%

shoplifters, however, the association between these variables was not significant (Cramer's V, 0.24228, significance .1132), suggesting that they may be creating opportunities for shoplifting.

9.3.5 Shoplifting and the Sample Characteristics

Chi square and Cramer's V were used to investigate the relationship between shoplifting and the sample characteristics. Shoplifting behaviour was significantly associated with gender, frequency of using shops and frequency of shoplifting (Table 9.11).

 Table 9.11 Statistical significance of the sample characteristics (n=444)

Variable	Chi-square value	df	Sig.	Cramer's V value	Approximate significance
Age	15.01246	10	.13161	.13002	.13161
Gender	16.96860	2	.00021	.19549	.00021
Money	4.04845	6	.67012	.06798	.67012
Shopping frequency	42.76122	8	.00000	.21969	.00000
Shoplifting frequency	50.69677	4	.00000	.47574	.00000

Although the majority of the past shoplifters had shoplifted only sporadically (Table 9.12), 81.8% of the recent shoplifters had shoplifted more than four times.

 Table 9.12 Frequency of shoplifting (n= 225)

	once	twice	three times	four times	more than four	Total
Past	35.9%	16.9%	7.7%	5.6%	33.9%	100%
Recent	7.3%	2.4%	6.1%	2.4%	81.8%	100%

9.3.6 The Deterrent Value of Apprehension

As shown in Table 9.13, 83.9% of the past shoplifters had never been caught shoplifting compared to 76.8% of the recent shoplifters. Although 65.7% of the past shoplifters agreed that being caught would deter future shoplifting activity (Table 9.14), the recent shoplifters were less likely to agree with the deterrent effects of apprehension, and only

Have you ever been caught?	No	Caught once	Caught more than once	not answered
Past	83.9%	14.0%	1.4%	0.7%
Recent	76.8%	13.4%	9.8%	-

Table 9.13 Apprehension for shoplifting (n=225)

21% of those who had been caught agreed that this would stop them from shoplifting in

the future (compared to 77.3% of the apprehended past shoplifters).

Table 9.14 The deterrent effect of apprehension (n=225)

Would being caught stop you from shoplifting?	Yes	No	Don't know
Past	65.7%	7.7%	26.6%
Recent	30.5%	29.3%	40.2%

9.4 Shoplifting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour

To determine the influence of the global measures and belief measures on shoplifting intentions, the procedures described in Chapter 8, section 8.7 were followed.

9.4.1 Reliability of the Global Measures

Cronbach's Alpha was used to test the reliability of the global measures. As the reliability coefficients, shown in bold in the main diagonal of Table 9.15, exhibited acceptable reliability (with the exception of perceived control), global measures for each construct were computed by summing the relevant items. The correlations reported in Table 9.15

Table 9.15 Reliability coefficients and correlations for the global measures (n=444)

	No. of items	I	Α	SN	PC	MN
Intention (I)	2	.91				
Attitude (A)	6	.69	.85			
Subjective norm (SN)	2	.44	.48	.72		
Perceived control (PC)	2	.36	.49	.25	.58	
Moral norm (MN)	2	.59	.67	.42	.39	.74
Past experience	1	.56	.49	.33	.39	.53

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. All correlations significant at p=.000.

indicate that the subjective norm, perceived control and moral norm were correlated more highly with attitude than with intentions (multicollinearity). As similar problems were encountered in the consumer analysis, the procedures followed in Chapter 8, section 8.7.4 were used for the school survey. Before these are discussed, the multiple regression based on the global measures in Table 9.15 is reported.

9.4.2 Multiple Regression of the Global Measures on Intentions

Table 9.16 summarises the results of the multiple regression (with shoplifting intentions as the dependent variable) and also shows the correlations between intentions and the global measures. Attitude and subjective norm were entered first, followed by perceived control, moral norm and previous shoplifting experience. Overall, the theory of planned behaviour explained 56% of the variance in intentions. All the coefficients of determination (\mathbb{R}^2) reported in the following analysis are significant at $\mathbf{F} = .0000$.

 Table 9.16 Summary of regression analysis for intentions (n=444)

	Beta weight	Т	Sig. T	Adj R ²	Inc. R ²	Sig. of inc. R ²	Correlation coefficient (r)
Attitude	.47	9.75	.0000				.69**
Subjective norm	.08	2.20	.0282	.49			.44**
Perceived control	03	87	.3837	.49	-	ns	.36**
Moral norm	.11	2.46	.0142	.51	0.02	.000	.59**
Previous experience	.26	6.60	.0000	.56	0.05	<.05	.56**

** significant at p=.000

The theory of planned behaviour theory provided a superior explanation of shoplifting intentions to the theory of reasoned action (unlike the consumer survey). Although perceived control was not significant, both the moral norm and past experience achieved significant beta weights, and inclusion of these two measures significantly improved the percentage of variance explained. The significance of past experience could indicate that variables external to the model are influencing intentions, or that past experience has a
separate effect on intentions, not mediated by the global measures. This is discussed further in section 9.4.7.

9.4.3 Inclusion of the Belief Measures

The school survey utilised the same beliefs as the consumer survey. The procedure for computing the measures is described in Chapter 7, section 7.5.1. The alpha reliability coefficients for the belief measures are shown in bold in the main diagonal in Table 9.17. As in the consumer survey, the outcome and the referent beliefs did not achieve acceptable reliability. The correlations indicate that multicollinearity should not be a problem.

9.17 Reliability coefficients and correlations for the belief-based measures (n=444)

	No. of items	Ι	OB	RB	CB
Intention (I)	2	.91			
Outcome beliefs (OB)	6	.56	.59		
Referent beliefs (RB)	3	.45	.41	.62	
Control beliefs (CB)	5	.59	.51	.39	.78

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. All correlations significant at p < .00

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Ajzen (1991) hypothesise that the global measures are influenced by the belief measures, and this is supported by the correlation coefficients between the global measures and the corresponding belief measures, shown in Table 9.18.

 Table 9.18 Correlation between the global and belief measures (n=44)

attitude/outcome beliefs	subjective norm/referent beliefs	perceived control/control beliefs		
.68**	.33**	.43**		

**significant at p<.05

It is possible that the belief-measures may have a direct influence on intentions not mediated by the global measures. To investigate this multiple regression was used, with the outcome, referent and control measures being entered after the global measures. As shown in Table 9.19, inclusion of the belief measures resulted in a significant increase of

	Beta weight	Т	Sig. T	Adj R ²	Inc. R ²	Sig. of inc. R ²	Correlation coefficient (r)
Attitude	.33	6.27	.0000				.69**
Subjective norm	.07	1.87	.0624	.49			.44**
Perceived control	06	-1.71	.0884	.49	-	ns	.36**
Moral norm	.09	2.04	.0416	.51	0.02	.0000	.59**
Previous experience	æ .22	5.75	.0000	.56	0.05	.0000	.56**
Outcome beliefs	.05	1.13	.2589				.56**
Referent beliefs	.09	2.44	.0153				.45**
Control beliefs	.18	4.42	.0000	.59	0.03	<.05	.59**

Table 9.19 Summary of multiple regression - belief and global measures (n=444)

** significant at p<.01

3% to the percentage of variance explained, with both referent and control beliefs being significant. Inclusion of the belief measures resulted in the beta weights for all the global measures reducing, the largest reductions being in attitude and past experience.

9.4.4 Multicollinearity and Scale Reliability

As in the consumer survey, factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was used in an attempt to resolve the problem of multicollinearity between the global measures, and the low reliability of the measures for perceived control, outcome beliefs and referent beliefs. The procedures and the findings are detailed in full in Appendix F. The solution provided by the factor analysis for the global measures is shown in Table 9.20. Factor 1, attitude, contained the four original attitude variables of *honest*, *right*, *good* and *stupid* plus the moral norm variables of *morally* and *guilty*. The remaining two attitude variables of *exciting* and *rewarding* were grouped

 Table 9.20
 Factor Analysis for the Global Measures

FACTOR	1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
attitude		perceived control	subjective norm
honest right good stupid	morally guilty	easy opportunity exciting rewarding	approve avoid

with the perceived control variables (Factor 2). Factor three, the subjective norm, contained the same variables as the original formulation. As a multiple regression on this basis did not solve the problem of multicollinearity, and resulted in the percentage of variance explained reducing by 1%, it was decided to proceed on the same basis as the consumer survey. The global measure of attitude was revised to contain: *good*, *right*, *honest* and *stupid*, and the global measure of perceived control to contain: *easy*, *opportunity*, *exciting* and *rewarding*. The moral norm and the subjective norm retained their original formulation. As shown in Table 9.21, although the revised global measures all achieved acceptable reliability, the problem of multicollinearity was not resolved.

n=444	No. of items	I	Α	SN	PC	MN
Intention (I)	2	.96				
Attitude (A)	4	.67	.83			
Subjective norm (SN)	2	.44	.47	.72		
Perceived control (PC)	4	.55	.60	.38	.75	
Moral norm	2	.60	.62	.42	.58	.74

 Table 9.21
 Reliability coefficients and correlations for revised global measures

Alpha coefficients shown in bold. All correlations significant at p=.000

The same factor analysis procedure was followed for the 14 variables contained with the belief measures, and the results are reported in full in Appendix F. As the solution provided by the factor analysis did not improve the reliability of the outcome and referent measures, and the regression based on the revised factors reduced the percentage of variance explained, the formulation of the beliefs utilised in the consumer analysis was adopted. The referent and control beliefs retained their original formulation. The economic belief measure contained the variables of *pay* and *save*, and the apprehension belief measure contained the variables of *arrest* and *caught*. The variables of *costs* and *law* were excluded from the measures.

9.4.5 Multiple Regression based on the Revised Global and Belief Measures

The multiple regression based on the revised attitude and perceived control measures, and with the economic and apprehension beliefs grouped separately, is shown in Table 9.22.

	Beta weight	Т	Sig. T	Adj R ²	Inc. R ²	Sig. of inc. R ²	Correlation coefficient (r)
Attitude	.30	6.42	.0000				.67**
Subjective norm	.06	1.64	.1028	.46			.44**
Perceived control	02	43	.6683	.49	.03	.0000	.55**
Moral norm	.10	2.11	.0353	.52	.03	.0000	.60**
Previous experience	.23	5.83	.0000	.57	.05	.0000	.56**
Economic beliefs	.11	2.28	.0234				.62**
Apprehension beliefs	03	89	.3761				09
Referent beliefs	.07	2.02	.0443				.45**
Control beliefs	.17	3.97	.0001	.60	.03	<.05	.59**

 Table 9.22
 Multiple regression based on the revised measures (n=444)

** significant at p=.000

The revised measures resulted in a 1% increase in the percentage of variance explained. Although the beta weight for perceived control was not significant, inclusion of this measure in the model significantly improved the percentage of variance explained (at the expense of attitude). Separation of the outcome beliefs into economic beliefs and apprehension beliefs resulted in the economic outcomes of shoplifting contributing significantly to the explanation of intentions.

9.4.6 The Intentions of the Non-shoplifters, Past shoplifters and Recent Shoplifters

The model of shoplifting behaviour shown in Table 9.22 indicates that the respondents' intentions were influenced by their attitudes to shoplifting, their previous experience of the behaviour and their shoplifting beliefs. To investigate whether the global and belief measures impacted differently on non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters, a further multiple regression analysis for each group of respondents was performed (see Table 9.23). The frequencies used in the following analysis are shown in Appendix E.

	Non (n=219)			Past (n=143)			Recent (n=82)		
	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r	Adj R ²	Beta W.	r
Reasoned Action Attitude Subjective norm	.29**	.34 ** .07	.53** .31**	.20**	.20 ** .13	.45** .32**	.33**	.32 ** .06	.57** .35**
Planned behavr Perceived control Moral norm Previous exp.	.29** .32** -	08 .18* -	.29** .50** -	.23** .25** .27**	.05 .11 .19*	.37** .35** .30**	.39** .38** .49**	.04 .08 .34**	.57** .43** .45**
Belief measures Economic Apprehension Referent Control	.35**	.05 06 .05 .22**	.45** 10 .18** .49**	.33**	.02 08 .14 .25**	.33** 08 .19* .41**	.54**	.31** 02 .02 .14	.63** 06 .39** .42**

 Table 9.23
 Multiple regression analysis for intentions by category of respondent

 $r = correlation \ coefficient \ *significant \ at \ p<.05 \ **significant \ at \ p<.01$

9.4.6.1 The Non-shoplifters

Of the non-shoplifters, only 4.1% thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and only 2.7% agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity. The theory of planned behaviour explained 32% of the variance in their shoplifting intentions, and inclusion of the belief measures improved the percentage of variance explained by 3%. Attitude, the control beliefs and the moral norm were the most significant predictors of intentions. Thus, for the non-shoplifters, their shoplifting behaviour is inhibited by a combination of their negative attitudes and moral views about shoplifting, and their beliefs about the factors which are likely to discourage the behaviour.

9.4.6.2 The Past Shoplifters

Of the past shoplifters, 11.9% thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and 12.6% agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity. Although the theory of planned behaviour explained 27% of the variance of in their shoplifting intentions,

inclusion of the belief measures improved the percentage of variance explained by 6%. Control beliefs, attitudes to shoplifting and previous experience were the most significant predictors of their intentions. Although neither the moral norm nor perceived control contributed significantly to the explanation of intentions, these two measures were significantly correlated with previous experience (0.30 and 0.33 respectively, significant at p<.01). This suggests that past shoplifters' previous experiences of shoplifting may inform their moral views about shoplifting, and their perceptions of the factors which are likely to restrict shoplifting behaviour (i.e. potential obstacles and opportunities).

9.4.6.3 The Recent Shoplifters

Of the recent shoplifters, 56.1% thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and 57.3% agreed that they would shoplift if they had the opportunity. The theory of planned behaviour explained 49% of the variance in their intentions, and inclusion of the belief measures improved the percentage explained by 5%. Previous experience was the most significant predictor of their intentions, and inclusion of this variable in the model improved the percentage of variance explained by 11%. This suggests that for the recent shoplifters, their past success (or failure) at shoplifting influences their future behaviour. Attitude and beliefs about the economic consequences of shoplifting were also significant for this group.

9.4.7 The Influence of Previous Experience

For the consumers, previous experience was not a significant predictor of intentions, and this was taken as an indication that the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour provided a sufficient explanation of shoplifting intentions. The significance of this variable in the school survey merits further investigation. The variable used as a measure of past behaviour is frequency of shoplifting, which is based on the number of times the respondents have engaged in the behaviour. As discussed in sections 9.3.5 and 9.3.6, 76.8% of the recent shoplifters had never been caught, and 81.8% had shoplifted more than four times. This suggests that the majority of the recent shoplifters were both experienced and successful. Although the majority of the past shoplifters had never been caught, only 33.9% had shoplifted more than four times, suggesting that as a group they were less experienced. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Ajzen (1991) maintain that past experience only influences intentions through its effect on the components of the model, however, the school survey suggests that it may have a separate effect. The correlations between past behaviour and the global and belief measures are shown in Table 9.24.

Table 9.24 Correlations between past behaviour and global and belief measures

	Revised global measures					Revised belief measures			
	Attitude	Subj. Norm	Perceived Control	Moral norm	Econ- omic	Appre- hension	Refe- rent	Control	
Past (n=143)	.17*	.16	.30**	.32**	.09	01	06	.10	
Recent (n=82)	.09	.35**	.30**	.03	.32**	.05	.10	.14	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

For the recent shoplifters, although neither the subjective norm nor perceived control were significant predictors of intentions, both measures were significantly correlated with past shoplifting experience. This could imply that the recent shoplifters' knowledge of shoplifting and opportunities for committing the crime, together with their perception that people important to them would not disapprove of the behaviour, are influenced by their past shoplifting experiences, which, together with their positive attitude and beliefs about the economic consequences of the crime, facilitates their future shoplifting behaviour. For the past shoplifters, further analysis indicated that previous experience of shoplifting only became significant when attitude was separated into experiential (relating to feelings)

and instrumental (knowledge based) components, and when beliefs about shoplifting outcomes were included in the model. This suggests that the more experienced the past shoplifters were at shoplifting, and the more knowledgeable they were about the behaviour, the more likely they were to state that they would shoplift in the future, and of the past shoplifters who had shoplifted more than four times, 33.3% agreed that future shoplifting involvement was likely (compared to 7.5% of the less experienced shoplifters).

9.5 The Influence of the Individual Variables

As in consumer analysis, the individual variables contained within the global and belief measures are analysed under the categories of attitudes and moral views, the outcomes of shoplifting, social influence and the factors which control shoplifting. Previous shoplifting behaviour is analysed separately. Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between intentions and the individual variables, and one-way analysis of variance was used to investigate the significance of any differences between the three groups. The frequencies used in the following analysis are reported in Appendix E.

9.5.1 Comparison of the Non-shoplifters, Past Shoplifters and Recent Shoplifters

The regression and correlation coefficients reported in Table 9.23 indicate that the global and belief measures impact differently on the three groups of respondents. Before the influence of the individual variables contained within these measures is considered, the Pearson's product moment correlations are compared with the Spearman's rank order correlations (Table 9.25). As in the consumer survey, the analysis is based on the revised measures of attitude, perceived control and economic and apprehension beliefs. Although the two correlation methods produced similar findings, as Spearman's correlation is likely to produce more statistically reliable findings it is used throughout the rest of the analysis.

	Non (n=219))	Past (n=14	3)	Recent (n=82)		
	Pearson correlatio n		Pearson correlatio n	Spearman correlation	Pearson correlation	Spearman correlatio n	
Global measures attitude subjective norm perceivd control moral norm previous exp.	.53** .31** .29** .50**	.52** .36** .29** .51** -	.45** .32** .37** .35** .30**	.49** .37** .33** .32** .27**	.57** .35** .57** .43** .45**	.61** .36** .61** .44** .46**	
Belief measures economic apprehension referent control	.45** 10 .18** .49**	.40** 05 .19** .44**	.33** 08 .19* .41**	.33** 07 .29** .42**	.63** 06 .39** .42**	.65** 03 .39** .43**	

Table 9.25Correlation between intentions and the global and belief measures -
Pearson's and Spearman's correlations compared

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

To compare the views of the three groups of respondents, both one-way analysis of variance (parametric) and the Kruskal-Wallis test (non-parametric) were used. The two statistical techniques produced very similar results, which increases the confidence which can be placed in the reliability of the findings. The results of the one-way analysis of variance, reported in full in Appendix F (Tables F17-F24), indicate that the recent shoplifters held statistically significant views from the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters for the majority of questions relating to the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour. These differences are investigated further in the following sections.

9.5.2 Attitude and Moral Considerations

The recent shoplifters held significantly different attitudes and moral views about shoplifting from the other two groups (Appendix F, Tables F17 and F20). Over 90% of both the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters thought shoplifting bad, wrong and dishonest, and over 80% viewed shoplifting as stupid. In comparison, only 46.3% of the

recent shoplifters thought shoplifting bad, 74.4% perceived it as wrong, 79.3% as dishonest and 54.0% as stupid. The respondents' shoplifting attitudes were supported by their moral views. Only 48.8% of the recent shoplifters viewed shoplifting as morally wrong (compared to 89.9% of non-shoplifters and 77.6% of past shoplifters), and only 34.1% agreed that they would feel guilty if they shoplifted (compared to 89.4% of non-shoplifters and 67.9% of past shoplifters).

Shoplifting attitudes were a significant predictor of intentions for all three groups, and the correlations reported in Table 9.26 indicate that both the attitude and moral variables were moderately associated with shoplifting intentions. The moral variables were the most influential for the non-shoplifters, and the moral norm was a significant predictor of intentions for this group.

	Non (n ≈219)	Past (n=143)	Recent (n=82)
good/bad	.39**	.37**	.56**
honest/dishonest	.32**	.25**	.34**
right/wrong	.40**	.35**	.39**
wise/stupid	.46**	.44**	.42**
guilty	.50**	.27**	.44**
morally wrong	.49**	.35**	.33**

Table 9.26 Correlation between intentions and attitudes and the moral norm

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

9.5.3 The Outcomes of Shoplifting

The three groups of respondents did not differ significantly in their perceptions of the economic impact of shoplifting, with 54.2% of all respondents agreeing that shoplifting results in higher prices. The recent shoplifters were, however, significantly less likely to view this as an adverse outcome of shoplifting (only 68.3% viewed it as bad compared to 87.6% of the non-shoplifters and 85.3% of the past shoplifters). Although over 68%

of all respondents agreed that shoplifting results in personal financial benefits, the extent of agreement differed between the three groups. Over 65% of the recent shoplifters thought it **extremely** likely that shoplifting would enable them to get free goods and to save money (compared to 25% of the non-shoplifters and 51% of the past shoplifters). The three groups also differed significantly in their evaluation of these outcomes (Appendix F, Table F21). Of the recent shoplifters, 69.5% viewed getting goods without paying as being good (48.8% **very** good), and 61.1% viewed saving money by shoplifting as good (35.4% **very** good). Thus, although all three groups viewed the financial benefits of shoplifting as likely, the differences in perceptions of whether these outcomes are good or bad result in the recent shoplifters having more favourable beliefs overall about the economic benefits of shoplifting than the other two groups.

Evaluations of the financial beliefs about shoplifting appear to be related to economic status. Of the low income recent shoplifters (43.9% had less than £10 a week to spend), 72% thought getting goods without paying is good (compared to 24.7% of the low income non-shoplifters and 31% of the low income past shoplifters) and 63.9% that saving money by shoplifting is good (compared to 8.2% of the low income non-shoplifters and 24% of low income past shoplifters).

The apprehension beliefs relate to the respondents' perceptions of the risks of being caught and arrested, and their view of the criminality of shoplifting. The recent shoplifters were significantly less likely to agree that they would be breaking the law if they shoplifted, and to view this as being bad (Appendix F, Table F22). Only 79.2% viewed shoplifting as breaking the law (compared to over 93% of non-shoplifters and past shoplifters) and only 69.5% agreed that breaking the law is bad (compared to over 89%)

of non-shoplifters and past shoplifters) with 13.4% stating that breaking the law is very good. The recent shoplifters also differed significantly in their view of the likelihood of apprehension and arrest. Only 26.9% of the recent shoplifters thought it likely that they would be caught (compared to 70.3% of non-shoplifters and 46.9% of past shoplifters), with 30.5% thinking it very unlikely, and only 62.5% thought they would be arrested for committing a crime (compared to 76.3% of non-shoplifters and 72.8% of past shoplifters). Although 84% of all the respondents agreed that being caught and arrested for shoplifting is bad, as the majority of the recent shoplifters did not think that they would be caught, the threat of apprehension and arrest is unlikely to deter them. Of the past shoplifters who had been apprehended, 59% thought it likely they would be caught if they shoplifted in the future (compared to 31% of the apprehended recent shoplifters) but only 5% thought it likely that they would be arrested if they were caught (compared to 57.9% of the apprehended recent shoplifters).

The economic and apprehension belief measures consist of the combined variables of *pay* and *save*, and *arrest* and *caught*, respectively. As shown in Table 9.27, the economic beliefs were significantly associated with attitude and the moral norm, which suggests that these beliefs may influence attitudes and moral views (or vice versa). This is confirmed by the correlations between the individual variables (Table 9.28).

Table 9.27 Correlations between the economic beliefs and attitude and moral norm

	Non		Past		Recent		
	attitude	moral	attitude	moral	attitude	moral	
economic beliefs	.53**	.54**	.48**	.23**	.53**	.48**	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

	Non (n=	Non (n=219)			Past (n=143)			Recent (n=82)		
	pay	save	caught	pay	save	caught	pay	save	caught	
good	.40**	.47**	.04	.36**	.38**	01	.52**	.53**	14	
honest	.27**	.28**	.09	.17*	.27**	.03	.25**	.08	.02	
right	.45**	.48**	02	.24**	.36**	.05	.27*	.36**	.02	
stupid	.53**	.50**	01	.42**	.44**	06	.44**	.34**	17	
guilty	.43**	.52**	04	.22**	.19*	10	.34**	.46**	31**	
morally	.42**	.47**	03	.19*	.25**	07	.41**	.37**	17	

 Table 9.28
 Correlations between outcome variables and the global variables

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The correlations shown in Table 9.29 indicate that the intentions of both the nonshoplifters and the past shoplifters were associated with their negative views about the financial outcomes of shoplifting, whereas the intentions of the recent shoplifters were associated with their perception that the economic benefits of shoplifting exceed the risks of being caught and punished. For the recent shoplifters, it was expected that the correlations between intentions and the measures of *caught*, *arrest* and *law* would be

 Table 9.29 Correlations between intentions and individual outcome beliefs

	Non-shoplifters (n=219)	Past shoplifters (n=143)	Recent shoplifters (n=82)
arrest	08	02	.06
caught	05	17	14
law	.11	.08	.19
pay	.35**	.28**	.62**
prices	.14*	.14	.21
save	.40**	.35**	.59**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

negative as in the consumer survey. Further analysis (Table 9.30) indicated that the likelihood of each of these variables was negatively correlated with intentions, suggesting that the less the respondents viewed these beliefs as being likely, the more likely they would be to shoplift. Thus, it is the combination of the likelihood with the evaluation which caused the positive and non-significant correlations.

likelihood of	Non-shoplifters (n=219)	Past shoplifters (n=143)	Recent shoplifters (n=82)
arrest	25**	13	35**
caught	21**	21*	27*
law	33**	20*	33**

 Table 9.30
 Correlations between intentions and apprehension belief likelihood

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

9.5.4 Social Influence and Shoplifting

Although the subjective norm was not a significant predictor of intentions, over 80% of all the respondents agreed that most people important to them would not approve of shoplifting and would think that they should avoid the behaviour. The recent shoplifters differed significantly as to the extent of their agreement (Appendix F, Table F18). Less than 51% **strongly** agreed with these two statements, compared to over 80% of the non-shoplifters and 71% of the past shoplifters, which suggests that the recent shoplifters may be less likely to be subject to social pressure to refrain from shoplifting. For all three groups, the subjective norm was significantly correlated with both the attitude and moral variables (Table 9.31). For the non-shoplifters, social pressure not to shoplift was more strongly associated with moral views than with attitudes, whereas for the past shoplifters, the situation was reversed. For the recent shoplifters, their perceptions of the ease or difficulty of shoplifting were associated with social views. Although the correlations were weak, they suggest that people important to the respondents may, to a certain extent,

Table 9.31 Correlations between subjective norm and the global variables

	good	honest	right	stupi d	guilty	morally	excite	reward	easy	oppty
non	.22**	.22**	.30**	.29**	.36**	.27**	.24**	.30**	.04	.03
past	.32**	.23**	.31**	.31**	.17**	.25**	.24**	.26**	.10	.10
recnt	.26**	.13	.29**	.30**	.29**	.25**	.23**	.27**	.32**	.17

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

influence their views about shoplifting. The recent shoplifters were significantly less likely to have family and friends who would think that they should avoid shoplifting (Appendix F, Table F23). Only 59.8% of the recent shoplifters thought it **very** likely that their family would want them to avoid shoplifting (compared to 92.7% of non-shoplifters and 89.5% of past shoplifters) and only 33% thought that their friends would want them to avoid shoplifting (compared to 85% of non-shoplifters and 64.4% of past shoplifters). Only 56.1% of the recent shoplifters thought that doing what their family wants them to do is good (compared to 75.9% of non-shoplifters and 71.4% of past shoplifters), and only 50.2% of respondents overall agreed that doing what their friends want them to do is good. There was little variation between the three groups on this question, with 35.1% of all respondents answering "neither".

Although 97.8% of the non-shoplifters and 93.7% of the past shoplifters agreed that the police would want them to avoid shoplifting, the recent shoplifters were significantly less likely to agree with this statement, and were also significantly less likely to be motivated to comply with the police. Only 46.3% of the recent shoplifters agreed that doing what the police want them to do is good (compared to 76.3% of non-shoplifters and 62.3% of past shoplifters) and 26.8% stated that doing what the police want them to do is very bad. Table 9.32 shows the variables significantly correlated with motivation to comply with the police for the recent shoplifters. The negative correlations suggest that anti-police attitudes are associated with shoplifting beliefs, attitudes and intentions (or vice-versa).

 Table 9.32
 Significant correlations with police (evaluation) - recent shoplifters

chance	28*	stupid	22**	easy	40**	morally	26*
will	28*	excite	42*	oppty	25*	law	40**
good	40**	reward	27*	guilty	35**	save	22*

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Neither the subjective norm, nor the referent beliefs were significant predictors of intentions for any of the groups, and as shown in Table 9.33, the correlations between intentions and the individual social variables were low. The exception to this was *friends* for the recent shoplifters. This suggests that for this group, peer influence is associated with shoplifting behaviour, and the *friends* belief measure was significantly correlated with attitude $(0.49 \ p < .01)$, perceived control $(0.45 \ p < .01)$ and the moral norm $(0.49 \ p < .01)$.

Table 9.33 Correlations between intentions, subjective norm and referent beliefs

	Non (n=219)	Past (n=143)	Recent (n=82)
Subjective norm	.36**	.37**	.36**
approve	.33**	.34**	.36**
avoid	.37**	.23**	.30**
Referent beliefs	.19**	.29**	.39**
family	08	05	.25*
friends	.29**	.35**	.45**
police	06	12	13

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

9.5.5 Factors which Facilitate or Inhibit Shoplifting

The recent shoplifters were more significantly more likely to agree with the perceived control variables (Appendix F, Table F19), 58.6% viewed shoplifting as rewarding (compared to 13.7% of non-shoplifters and 25.2% of past shoplifters), 59.7% thought it exciting (compared to 14.1% of non-shoplifters and 27.3% of past shoplifters) and 79.3% thought it easy (compared to 38.4% of non-shoplifters and 62.5% of past shoplifters). Overall, 70% of the respondents agreed that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting, with 48.8% of the recent shoplifters **strongly** agreeing. Perceived control was significantly correlated with the intentions of all three groups (Table 9.34), and for the past and recent shoplifters was a significant predictor of intentions until the belief measures were included in the multiple regression. For the past

	Non	Past	Recent	
Perceived control exciting	.29** .41**	.37** .31**	.57** .55**	
easy	.09	.38**	.48**	
plenty of opportunities	.07	.14	.40**	

Table 9.34 Correlations between intentions and the perceived control variables

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

and recent shoplifters, the combined effect of the perceived control variables appears to be stronger than that of the individual variables. The correlations in Table 9.35 demonstrate moderate associations between perceived control, attitude and moral views, particularly for the recent shoplifters.

Table 9.35 Correlations between perceived control and attitudes and morals

	good	honest	right	wise	guilty	morally
non (n=219)	.39**	.23**	.34**	.48**	.33**	.38**
past (n=143)	.42**	.34**	.30**	.48**	.38**	.29**
recent (n=82)	.67**	.31**	.38**	.47**	.52**	.54**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The three groups exhibited significantly different views on the likelihood of the control beliefs facilitating shoplifting behaviour (Appendix F, Table F24), with the non-shoplifters being the least likely to agree with the belief statements. Over 74% of the recent shoplifters agreed that low risk of apprehension, ineffective security and lenient penalties would encourage them to shoplift, with over 45% **strongly** agreeing. Although over 32% of the non-shoplifters and over 49% of the past shoplifters also agreed that these variables would facilitate shoplifting, both groups were significantly less likely to agree that there is little risk of being caught and that retail security is ineffective. Of the recent shoplifters, 68.3% agreed that there is little risk of being caught and that retail security is ineffective to 45.2% of the non-shoplifters and 49.7% of the past shoplifters), and only 33% agreed

that retail security is effective (compared to 45.7% of the non-shoplifters and 43.4% of the past shoplifters). Only 28.7% of the non-shoplifters thought that they would be severely punished if they were caught, compared to 57.4% of the past shoplifters and 56.1% of the recent shoplifters. The shoplifters' perceptions are possibly influenced by their previous experiences of being caught. Of the past and recent shoplifters who had been caught, 68.2% of the past and 57.9% of the recent agreed that the punishments are severe, 50% of the past and 35% of the recent viewed retail security as good, and 50% of the past and 57.9% of the recent felt there was little risk of apprehension.

Being short of money would encourage 68.3% of the recent shoplifters to steal from shops (compared to 35.6% of the non-shoplifters and 58.8% of the past shoplifters), and 48.8% agreed that they are often short of money (compared to 41.5% of the non-shoplifters and 35.7% of the past shoplifters). Only 18.8% of the non-shoplifters thought they would be more likely to shoplift if their friends encouraged them, and only 3.6% agreed that their friends often encouraged them to shoplift, with 78.5% **strongly** disagreeing. Although 42% of the past shoplifters thought that peer encouragement would facilitate shoplifting, only 10.5% stated that their friends often encourage them to shoplift. This implies that friends discourage shoplifting behaviour in these two groups. Of the recent shoplifters, 48.7% thought it likely that peer encouragement would facilitate shoplifting, and 30.5% agreed that their friends often encourage *me to shoplift* and the individual variables for the recent shoplifters, shown in Table 9.36, indicate that their beliefs, attitudes and intentions were associated with peer influence.

Correlations	between frier	nds' encourage	ment and the	e individual variables (recent	shoplifters n=82)
chance	.44**	excite	.43**	free goods	.39**
will	.45**	easy	.30**	save money	.35**
good	.29**	guilty	.38**	ineffective security	.33**
stupid	.51**	morally	.33**	little risk	.32**

Table 9.36 Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The control beliefs were all significantly and positively associated with shoplifting intentions (Table 9.37), suggesting that the control beliefs may inhibit the shoplifting behaviour of those who do not intend to shoplift, but may facilitate the behaviour in those who do intend to shoplift. As with perceived control, the combined effect of the control beliefs measure appears to be stronger than that of the individual variables.

 Table 9.37 Correlations between intentions and individual control beliefs

	Non-shoplifters	Past shoplifters	Recent shoplifters
	(n=219)	(n=143)	(n=82)
Control beliefs	.44**	.42**	.43**
friends	.52**	.31**	.44**
security good	.40**	.30**	.27*
severe penalties	.31**	.21*	.21*
little risk	.32**	.36**	.15
short of money	.33**	.29**	.27*

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Although only 42.5% of respondents overall viewed retail security as being good at catching shoplifters, there was more support for the deterrent effect of individual measures. Overall, 70% of respondents agreed that CCTV, security guards, and electronic tags would deter shoplifters, and 61.7% store detectives. The recent shoplifters were less likely to agree that these measures would stop shoplifters (Table 9.38), and were significantly less likely to be worried by the security measures (chi square value 19.9124, d.f. 4, significance .00082). Only 41.5% agreed that the security measures would make them feel apprehensive (compared to 55.7% of the non-shoplifters and 65.7% of the past

	Non-shoplifters	Past shoplifters	Recent shoplifters	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
CCTV	4.2085	4.1250	3.8718	2.6101	.0747	.4600
Store detectives	3.7943	3.8120	3.5974	0.9600	.3837	.5387
Electronic tags	4.3474	4.3015	3.6104	11.7722	.0000	.0047
Security guards	4.0190	3.9926	3.5065	6.4924	.0017	.0453

 Table 9.38
 Likelihood of security measures deterring shoplifting - mean scores

questions scaled : 5 very likely to 1 very unlikely

shoplifters), although 18.3% agreed that the presence of these measures had stopped them from using a shop (compared to 11.4% of non-shoplifters and 14% of past shoplifters).

9.5.6 The Impact of the Individual Variables on Intentions

Table 9.39 shows the six individual variables most strongly correlated with intentions for each group of respondents. The intentions of the non-shoplifters were the most strongly associated with peer influence, their attitudes and moral views and their perceptions of retail security. The past shoplifters' intentions were most strongly associated with their attitude, their perceptions of the risks of shoplifting and the influence of their friends. The recent shoplifters' intentions were most strongly associated with their beliefs about the economic benefits of the crime, their attitude to shoplifting and peer influence.

Table 9.39 Correlations between intentions and the individual variables

Non (n=285)		Past (n=105)		Recent (n=27)	
peer influence	.52**	stupid	.44**	pay	.62**
guilty	.50**	reward	.38**	save	.59**
morally wrong	.49**	good	.37**	good	.56**
stupid	.46**	risk	.36**	excite	.55**
excite	.41**	right	.35**	friends	.45**
security	.40**	friends	.35**	peer influence	.44**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

9.5.7 The Influence of Previous Experience

Table 9.40 reports the variables significantly correlated with past shoplifting behaviour.

Past (n=143)	Recent (n=82)
Global measuresintention.27**attitude.21*perceived control.30**moral norm.34**	Global measures intentionBelief measures economicattitude.21*subj. norm.38** perceived control .30**
Individual variables chance .24** stupid .20** morally .25** will .31** excite .32** caught17* avoid .18* reward .29** police20* good .18* guilty .36**	Individual variables chance .43** reward .22* pay .27* will .44** stupid .23* save .33** approve .32** easy .38** avoid .32** oppty .24*

Table 9.40 Variables significantly correlated with previous shoplifting behaviour

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The correlations suggest that previous shoplifting experience has a direct influence on intentions (as indicated by the multiple regression, Table 9.23) and an indirect influence through the global and belief measures and the individual variables.

9.6 The Influence of Demographic Variables

One-way analysis of variance was used to investigate whether age, gender and economic status influenced the attitudes and beliefs of the three groups of respondents. The results are reported in Appendix F, Tables F25-F27. Of the non-shoplifters, the males, the under-16s and the low income students were more likely to state that they would shoplift in the future, to evaluate shoplifting positively and to be influenced by their friends. The male past shoplifters were more likely to think that they would shoplift in the future and the younger past shoplifters were more influenced by their friends. The low income past shoplifters were more likely to be short of money and to view shoplifting as a risky crime. The recent shoplifters did not significantly differ by age, however, the males were more likely to state that they would shoplift in the future, were less motivated to comply with the police and were less likely to think shoplifting stupid and to view retail security as effective. The low income recent shoplifters were more likely to be short of money.

CHAPTER 10

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS FROM THE CONSUMER AND SCHOOL SURVEYS

10.1 Introduction

The consumer and school surveys have produced a wealth of information about shoplifting and indicate that a number of factors are likely to influence shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour. Due to the constraints of space, it would be impossible to discuss all the findings in detail, therefore the discussion focuses on the major findings which represent this study's contribution to shoplifting knowledge. Throughout the discussion, the findings from the consumer and school surveys are compared with previous shoplifting studies, and, where appropriate, are considered in relation to the relevant criminological and consumer behaviour theories.

The major finding of this study is that the theory of planned behaviour provides a useful framework for investigating shoplifting. There are, however, certain limitations to this approach. Thus, the first section of this chapter evaluates the approach taken by this study, considering how the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour have enabled the factors influencing shoplifting behaviour to be investigated, and discussing the problems associated with this approach. The second part of the chapter focuses on the factors identified as likely to be influential in shoplifting behaviour: past shoplifting behaviour, attitudes and moral views, economic factors, apprehension factors and social influence. The chapter concludes with a discussion of shoplifting as a rational crime, and reviews the findings from the consumer study which were considered to be interesting but not major. The structure of the chapter is presented diagrammatically overleaf.

Figure 10.1 The Structure of the Discussion of the Findings from the Consumer and School Surveys



10.2 Shoplifting and the Theory of Planned Behaviour

This study applied two theories used in consumer research to shoplifting behaviour. Both the theory of planned behaviour, and the theory of reasoned action on which it is based, provide a theoretical framework for determining the factors which influence behaviour, and for investigating the interaction between these factors. This section examines the reliability and validity of the research method used, summarises the explanation of shoplifting provided by the two theories, considers the problems arising from their application to shoplifting and evaluates the utility of this approach for shoplifting research.

10.2.1 The Reliability and Validity of the Research Design

As discussed in Chapter 7, section 7.5.3, determining the reliability and validity of the research design was problematic, due to the sampling methods used and the guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality given to the respondents. To establish the reliability and validity of this study, this section firstly considers the assumptions underlying the research design, then compares the findings of the two surveys, firstly with each other, then with previous applications of the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour.

10.2.1.1 The Assumptions Underlying the Study

The analysis of the findings in the preceding two chapters indicate that the assumptions underlying this study, detailed in full in Chapter 7, section 7.2.1, were justified. The response rates for both surveys, the low numbers of questionnaires excluded due to excessive missing data, and the percentages of respondents admitting to shoplifting behaviour, indicate that respondents are prepared to disclose information about their shoplifting experiences, and shoplifting attitudes and opinions, providing that confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed, and that these guarantees are accepted. Two major concerns with the use of self-report studies are dishonest reporting, especially when the behaviour in question is socially undesirable or criminal, and the representativeness of the sample. The substantial percentage of self-confessed shoplifters in both surveys (see Table 10.1), and the consistency of the responses for the two

	Consumers		Stu	dents	
	n	%	n	%	
Non-shoplifters	285	68.3%	219	49.3%	
Past shoplifters	105	25.2%	143	32.2%	
Recent shoplifters	27	6.5%	82	18.5%	
Total	417	100%	444	100%	

Table 10.1 Comparison of the Respondents by Shoplifting Experience

questionnaires, suggests that the respondents may have completed the questionnaire truthfully, although this cannot be verified. The proportions of respondents admitting to shoplifting are consistent with previous UK self-report studies of adolescent shoplifting (Graham and Bowling, 1995; Farrington, 1973), and indicate that shoplifting behaviour is fairly common. Conducting the survey in a classroom setting, in the presence of teachers, did not appear to inhibit the students from admitting to shoplifting, and the school sample contained a higher proportion of shoplifters than the consumer sample. This could, however, be due to the prevalence of shoplifting in the younger age groups, as discussed in the literature review, and as supported by the findings from the consumer survey. The representativeness of the sample is uncertain, due to the sampling methods used, and the low response rate for the consumer survey. Nevertheless, the similarity of the findings from the two studies suggests that the results may be typical.

The theoretical framework of the theory of planned behaviour provided a means by which the respondents' attitudes and beliefs could be identified and measured, and categorisation of the respondents by their shoplifting experience indicated that nonshoplifters and shoplifters held different attitudes and beliefs about shoplifting behaviour. This is considered further in sections 10.3 to 10.7, which discuss the factors which influence shoplifting intentions. In view of the difficulties in directly measuring shoplifting behaviour, consistent with previous criminological and shoplifting studies (Nagin and Paternoster, 1993; Tibbetts, 1997), and the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour, shoplifting intentions were used as a proxy for behaviour in the analysis.

10.2.1.2 Consistency of the Theories of Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour

This section compares the findings from the consumer and school surveys, firstly with each other, and then with the findings from other applications of the theories. In the following analysis, the findings discussed are based on the original formulation of the global and belief measures, rather than the amendments suggested in Chapters 8 and 9, which are discussed in section 10.2.3.

Although the wording of the consumer questionnaire was changed slightly to provide greater clarity for use with the students, the sections relating to the theory of planned behaviour covered the same topic areas and are, therefore, directly comparable. The overall findings from the consumer and school surveys, summarised in Table 10.2, indicate that both surveys produced very similar findings despite being conducted on two heterogenous populations in two different environments. The major exceptions to this being the higher percentage of variance explained for the students, and the direct contribution of previous shoplifting experience to the explanation of their intentions. These differences, however, may result from the age discrepancies between the two groups of respondents.

	Co	Consumers (n=417)			Students (n=444)			
	r	b	R	Adj R ²	r	b	R	Adj R ²
Attitude	.68**	.47**	(0)		.69**	.47**		40++
Subjective norm	.45**	.25**	.68	.46**	.44**	.08*	.70	.49**
Moral norm	.48**	02 .11*	.08 .68	.40** .46**	.50**	05 .11*	.70 .72	.49**
Past experience	.39**	.01	.68	.46**	.56**	.26**	.75	.56**

 Table 10.2
 Multiple regression analysis for intentions - consumers and students

r, correlation coefficient; b, standardised regression coefficient (beta weight); R, multiple correlation. All coefficients of determination (Adj R^2) significant at F = .0000.** significant at p < .01; * significant at p < .05.

Sheppard *et al* (1988) conducted a meta-analysis of 87 applications of the theory of reasoned action. Based on a total sample of 12,642, they report a frequency-weighted average correlation between intention, and attitude plus the subjective norm, of 0.66 (significant at the 0.001 level). In the consumer survey, the multiple correlation between intention, and attitude plus subjective norm, was 0.68, and in the student survey 0.70 (both significant at p<.01). In his comparison of 16 applications of the theory of planned behaviour, Ajzen (1991) reports an average multiple correlation of 0.71. The consumer and student findings compare favourably with this (consumers 0.68, students 0.75, significant at p<.01). Unlike the studies in the Ajzen analysis, perceived control did not contribute significantly to the shoplifting intentions of either the consumers or the students. This is discussed further in section 10.2.3.

Beck and Ajzen (1991) used the theory of planned behaviour to investigate dishonest behaviours (including shoplifting) in a sample of American college students. Their findings for shoplifting are compared with the findings from the consumer and school surveys in Table 10.3. The American study reports a higher multiple correlation, and in addition, perceived control, moral norm and past shoplifting experience played a more significant

	Beck and Ajzen (n=146)			Consumers (n=417)			Students (n=444)					
	r	b	R	R ²	r	b	R	R ²	r	b	R	R ²
Attitude Subjective norm Perceived control Moral norm Past experience	.78 .38 .79 .75 .74	.20* 03 .25* .30* .30*	.78 .83 .87 .89	.61 .69 .76 .79	.68 .45 .38 .48 .39	.47* .25* 02 .11* .01	.68 .68 .68 .68	.46 .46 .46 .46	.69 .44 .36 .59 .56	.47* .08* 03 .11* .26*	.70 .70 .72 .75	.49 .49 .51 .56

Table 10.3 Comparison with Beck and Ajzen's (1991) study

r, correlation coefficient; b, standardised regression coefficient (beta weight); R, multiple correlation. *significant regression coefficient (p<.05).

role than in the consumer and school surveys. These differences could, however, result from the difference in sample composition. In the Beck and Ajzen study, the respondents were all students aged between 17 and 30, and only 19% of the sample were male.

The preceding discussion indicates that the theory of planned behaviour provides a valid and reliable method of researching shoplifting behaviour. Although the consumer and school surveys achieved different response rates (35% for the consumer survey and 99% for the school surveys), overall, the findings appear to be consistent, which suggests that the results may be typical. In addition, the findings from the consumer and school surveys compare favourably with the findings from other applications of the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour. Any inconsistencies could be due to variations in the samples, which suggests that different segments of the population may have different beliefs and attitudes about shoplifting. Although analysis of the two samples by age, gender and economic status revealed statistically significant differences in beliefs and attitudes, these are not considered separately but are included in those sections where they make an important contribution to the discussion.

10.2.2 Explaining Shoplifting Using the Theory of Planned Behaviour

Overall, the theory of planned behaviour explained 46% of the variance in intentions of the consumer respondents, and 56% of the variance in intentions of the student respondents. Inclusion of the belief measures did not improve the percentage of variance explained for the consumers, but for the students, the percentage increased by 3%. As shown in Table 10.4, attitude, the subjective norm and the moral norm were the most significant predictors of intentions for the consumers. For the students, attitude, previous experience, control beliefs and the moral norm were the most significant factors. Although the explanation of shoplifting provided by this model is consistent with the shoplifting literature (for example, Tibbetts, 1997; Tibbetts and Herz, 1996), it was felt that two areas, perceived control and shoplifting beliefs, required further investigation.

Table 10.4 Multiple regression of the global and belief measures on intentions

	Consumers	(n=417)		Students (n=444)			
	Correlation coefficient	Beta weight	Adj R ²	Correlation coefficient	Beta weight	Adj R ²	
Attitude	.68**	.46**		.69**	.33**		
Subjective norm	.45**	.24**		.44**	.07		
Perceived control	.38**	03		.36**	06		
Moral norm	.48**	.11*		.59**	.09*		
Past experience	.39**	.00	.46**	.56**	.22**	.56**	
Outcome beliefs	.23**	.03		.56**	.05		
Referent beliefs	.22**	.02		.45**	.09		
Control beliefs	.37**	.02	.46**	.59**	.18**	.59**	

**significant at p<.01 *significant at p<.05

The failure of perceived control to contribute significantly to shoplifting intentions was an unexpected finding in view of the significance of this measure in previous planned behaviour studies (Ajzen, 1991, Beck and Ajzen, 1991), and the assumption made by the author that shoplifting would be restricted by the availability of opportunities and perceptions of the ease or difficulty of performing the crime. In addition, although the perceived control measure was formulated following the procedure advocated by Ajzen (1991), and in consultation with applications of theory of planned behaviour (Beck and Ajzen, 1991; East, 1993), in practice, this measure presented the following problems:

- 1. The scale composed of the variables used to assess this construct did not achieve an acceptable reliability coefficient in either the consumer or the school survey.
- 2. The high degree of multicollinearity between attitude, perceived control and the moral norm suggests that these measures do not represent separate underlying dimensions of intentions, and restricts the reliability of the regression coefficients.

Although multicollinearity was not a problem with the belief measures, only the control belief measure achieved acceptable reliability in both the consumer and school analysis. In addition, previous planned behaviour studies (East, 1993; East, 1997) indicate that beliefs may have an impact on intentions not mediated by the global measures. This proved to be the case for the student respondents, but not for the consumer respondents.

10.2.3 The Revised Model

Factor analysis was used in an attempt to resolve the problems of the perceived control and belief measures, and for both the consumers and the students produced very similar solutions. As shown in Table 10.5, the factor analysis for the global measures indicated that the attitude variables of *excite* and *reward* were more appropriately grouped with

 Table 10.5
 Factor analysis for the global measures

	FACTOR 1 Attitude	FACTOR 2 Perceived control	FACTOR 3 Moral Norm	FACTOR 4 Subjective norm
Consumer survey	good honest right wise	easy excite plan reward plenty	guilty morally principles	approve avoid
School survey	good guilty honest morally right wise	easy excite plenty reward		approve avoid

the perceived control variables. The global measures of attitude and perceived control were, therefore, reformulated on this basis, with attitude representing positive or negative feelings about shoplifting, and perceived control being based on knowledge of shoplifting outcomes. The reliability coefficients for perceived control improved from 0.65 to 0.80 for the consumers, and from 0.58 to 0.75 for the students. The moral norm remained as a separate measure in view of its significance in the consumer and the student regression. Although it has not been possible to completely eradicate multicollinearity in this study, it appears to be a common problem in reasoned action and planned behaviour studies (see for example, Beck and Ajzen, 1991; East, 1993).

The factor analyses for belief measures for both the consumer and the student surveys indicated that the outcome variables of *pay* and *save* should be grouped with the control beliefs, and that the outcome variables of *arrest* and *caught* (named apprehension beliefs) represented a separate dimension of shoplifting behaviour. A multiple regression analysis on this basis did not, however, improve the percentage of variance explained, and neither the apprehension beliefs nor the referent beliefs achieved acceptable reliability. As the separation of the outcome beliefs into economic and apprehension outcomes inherently makes sense, it was decided to adopt this approach. The outcome beliefs were separated into economic and apprehension beliefs nor the regression based on the revised global and belief measures represented an improvement on the original model, explaining 51% of the variance in intentions for consumers, and 60% of the variance in intentions for students (an increase of 5% and 1% respectively). The multiple regression for each category of respondent based on the revised global and belief measures is shown in Table 10.6.

	Non		Past		Recent		
	consumers (n=285)	students (n= 219)	consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)	
Adj R ²	.31**	.35**	.41**	.33**	.60**	.54**	
	Beta W.	Beta W.	Beta W.	Beta W.	Beta W.	Beta W.	
attitude	.42**	.34**	.35**	.20*	.38	.32**	
subjective norm	.29**	.07	.28**	.13	.05	06	
perceived control	.08	08	.22*	.05	20	04	
moral norm	14*	.18*	.05	.11	.34	.08	
previous experience	-	-	15	.19*	.01	.34**	
economic beliefs	11	.05	.19*	02	.34	.31*	
apprehensionbeliefs	07	06	02	08	.00	.02	
referent beliefs	.02	05	13	.14	.31	.02	
control beliefs	.03	.22**	17	.25**	27	.14	

 Table 10.6
 Multiple regression based on the revised global and belief measures

* significant at p < .05 ** significant at p < .01

10.2.3.1 Perceived Control

The division of attitude and perceived control proposed by the factor analyses is consistent with the proposition that attitudes are composed of two components: instrumental or evaluative, based on knowledge; and experiential or affective, relating to feelings (Ajzen and Driver, 1992; East, 1993). The correlations shown in Table 10.7 indicate that previous experience was more strongly associated with the revised perceived control measure than with the revised attitude measure (except for consumer past shoplifters), and thus provide some support for the proposition that perceived control is based on knowledge, arguing that perceived control may not be a realistic measure of intentions

Table 10.7 Previous experience and revised attitude and perceived control

	Past		Recent		
	consumers (n=105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n=27)	students (n=82)	
attitude percvd control	.21* .18	.21* .30**	.51** .62**	.21 .30**	

* significant at p < .05 ** significant at p < .01

when a person has little information about the behaviour. Consistent with this proposition, perceived control was not a significant predictor of intentions for either the consumer or the student non-shoplifters, and separation of the instrumental and experiential components of attitude resulted in the attitude measure increasing in significance. For the consumer past shoplifters, this division of attitude resulted in the impact of perceived control increasing, thus reflecting their previous knowledge of shoplifting. This effect was replicated to a lesser extent in the student regression, and in addition, the previous experience measure increased in significance. This suggests that previous experience of shoplifting impacted on the intentions of both the consumers and the students, albeit through different components of the theory. For both the consumer and the student recent shoplifters, although perceived control was not significant predictor of intentions, it was moderately to strongly correlated with their intentions (Chapter 8, Table 8.26; Chapter 9, Table 9.25), and neither group viewed the perceived control variables as problematic. Over 81% agreed that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting, and over 77% agreed that shoplifting is easy.

The findings from both the surveys suggest that in the case of shoplifting, the perceived control measure may be more appropriately viewed as attitudes to shoplifting based on knowledge obtained from prior experience of the behaviour, rather than the factors which are perceived as controlling shoplifting behaviour. Although this is not consistent with the findings from the Beck and Ajzen (1991) study, it is consistent with Ajzen's (1991) view that perceived control is knowledge-based.

228

10.2.3.2 Shoplifting Beliefs

Although the inclusion of the revised belief measures in the model resulted in little improvement to the percentage of variance explained, as shown in Table 10.6, separation of the outcome beliefs into economic and apprehension beliefs resulted in the economic beliefs becoming a major predictor of intentions for both the consumer and the student recent shoplifters (although this could result from the respondents self-justifying their behaviour). For the student non-shoplifters and past shoplifters, control beliefs were a major predictor of intentions, and as shown in Chapter 9, Table 9.25 were moderately correlated with intentions (0.44 and 0.42 respectively, significant at p<.01). This indicates that the belief measures have an impact on intentions not mediated by the global measures, consistent with the research of East (1993), and also that the control beliefs may be a more appropriate measure of perceived control, than knowledge-based attitude.

As shown in Table 10.6, the belief measures have differential effects on the three categories of respondents. East (1993) argues that if the same belief measures are used for all the respondents, then it is likely that some of these beliefs will not be salient for a percentage of the sample, and examination of the frequency distributions in Appendices C and E indicates that for some of the belief variables, a substantial proportion of respondents have answered "neither". Elliott *et al* (1995) have demonstrated that different groups, for example, users and non-users, may have different salient beliefs, and examination of the correlations between the individual belief measures and intentions (Chapter 8, Tables 8.31, 8.34, 8.38; Chapter 9, Tables 9.29, 9.33, 9.34) indicates that the three groups of respondents were influenced by different beliefs, and that beliefs salient for shoplifters were not salient for non-shoplifters and vice versa.

The correlations between the control beliefs and attitude (ATT) and perceived control (PC), shown in Table 10.8, indicate that several of the control beliefs were moderately to strongly correlated with both attitude and with perceived control, and for the consumer recent shoplifters, the control beliefs were more strongly correlated with attitude than with perceived control. This possibly explains the multicollinearity between these two measures, and the low explanatory power of perceived control.

Table 10.8 The control measures and attitude and perceived control

	Non		Past		Recent		
	consumers (n=285)	students (n= 219)	consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)	
peers security pnlts risks money	ATT PC .23* .35** .03 .40** .05 .31** .14* .46** .10** .33**	ATT PC .44** .36** .48** .46** .33** .27** .43** .44** .37** .37**	ATT PC .31** .35** .33** .33** .18 .08 .33** .43** .43** .44**	ATT PC .22* .11 .28* .37** .20* .15 .30* .38** .38**.30**	ATT PC .63** .53** .82** .60** .52** .45 .70** .31 .39 .38	ATT PC .32** .26* .20 .34** .00 .03 .19 .36** .18* .16	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

10.2.4 Evaluation of the Theories of Reasoned Action and Planned Behaviour

In view of the problems of multicollinearity and scale reliability, the theory of reasoned action provides a better statistical fit to the data than the theory of planned behaviour. The theory of planned behaviour, however, provides a more comprehensive and insightful explanation of shoplifting, and thus may have more value in view of the additional information it reports. The discussion in this section demonstrates that both the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour provide a valid framework for investigating the factors which influence shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour. This conclusion is, however, drawn with some reservations. As discussed in Chapter 7, section 7.9.1, it is possible that the data collected for this study do not comply with the requirements of parametric tests such as multiple regression. Thus, the findings from

multiple regression analysis, particularly for the consumer recent shoplifters, may not be statistically reliable. Although it is useful to identify the combined and separate effects of the global and belief measures on intentions, the major value of the planned behaviour approach is that it enables shoplifting behaviour to be traced to the beliefs underlying the behaviour. These beliefs influence shoplifting intentions both directly, and indirectly through their impact on the global measures of attitude, subjective norm, perceived control and the moral norm. It should, therefore, be theoretically possible to change intentions, attitudes, moral views and perceptions of social pressure and control by identifying the beliefs which influence these measures, and formulating strategies to modify either the likelihood or evaluation component of the belief in question.

The following discussion is based on this proposition. The analysis of the findings in Chapters 8 and 9 indicate that four areas are likely to be influential in shoplifting behaviour: attitudes and moral views, economic factors, apprehension factors and social influence. As a primary objective of this thesis is to gain an understanding of the motivation of shoplifters, and the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft, the discussion in each section focuses on the recent shoplifters, considering how the views of this group differ from those who have never shoplifted, and those who have shoplifted in the past but no longer do so. It is hoped that by organising the discussion in this manner the factors which inhibit or encourage customer theft will be identified, and thus, possible strategies for changing the behaviour of shoplifters will be indicated. In view of the possible problems with the use of parametric techniques, the following discussion is based on the findings from non-parametric tests. The discussion commences with a consideration of the role of previous experience.
10.3 The Impact of Previous Shoplifting Experience

The theory of planned behaviour hypothesises a causal path from beliefs to attitudes to intentions to behaviour, maintaining that previous experience of the behaviour only impacts on future behaviour through its influence on the global or belief measures. Analysis of the consumer survey provides support for this hypothesis, in the student analysis, however, previous experience was a significant predictor of shoplifting intentions. Although the two surveys have produced somewhat conflicting findings as to the precise role of previous shoplifting experience, both surveys indicate that it is likely to be an important indicator of future shoplifting behaviour, either indirectly through the global and belief measures as in the consumer survey, or directly on future shoplifting intentions, as in the student survey. This is consistent with Foxall's (1992) argument that cognitive approaches to consumer behaviour should consider the impact of previous behaviour. In view of the likely importance of previous shoplifting experience, its impact is discussed in the following sections wherever relevant. The discussion is, however, based on correlation analysis, which only indicates the strength of the relationship between two variables, not the direction of the relationship. Thus, it is impossible to ascertain whether attitudes cause behaviour, or whether behaviour causes attitudes.

10.4 Attitudes and Moral Views

The model of shoplifting intentions illustrated in Table 10.6, indicates that shoplifting attitudes were the major predictor of intentions for all groups of respondents except for the student recent shoplifters, who were equally influenced by their previous shoplifting experiences. This section discusses the impact of attitudes and moral views on shoplifting, and the influence of past experience and beliefs on these two measures.

10.4.1 The Impact of Attitudes and Moral Views on Intentions

Analysis of the frequency distributions for the consumer and student respondents, summarised in Table 10.9, indicates little difference in views between the two groups of respondents. The non-shoplifters and past shoplifters, however, differed in their attitudes

	Consumers (n= 417) Students (n=444)					
	non	past	recent	non	past	recent
Percentage thinking shoplifting: bad dishonest wrong foolish/stupid	96.8% 95.2% 96.1% 94.7%	87.7% 93.3% 88.6% 86.7%	48.1% 62.9% 55.5% 48.1%	95.0% 95.8% 96.9% 88.2%	90.9% 92.3% 93.0% 82.5%	46.3% 79.3% 74.4% 54.9%
Percentage agreeing that shoplifting: would make them feel guilty would be morally wrong is against their principles	97.3% 95.8% 96.9%	82.8% 83.9% 80.0%	59.2% 48.1% 44.4%	89.4% 89.9% -	67.9% 77.6% -	34.1% 48.8% -

Table 10.9 Attitudes and moral views

and moral views from the recent shoplifters. Both the consumer and the student recent shoplifters were less likely to view shoplifting as bad, dishonest, wrong and stupid, and were less likely to agree that shoplifting is morally wrong, against their principles and would make them feel guilty. This suggests that the recent shoplifters may be more tolerant of shoplifting and are, therefore, possibly more likely to engage in the behaviour. The impact of moral values and attitudes on shoplifting intentions is illustrated in Table 10.10, which shows the correlations between intentions, and attitudes and moral views, in descending order of significance for each group. Overall, the two samples have produced fairly consistent findings, the major differences being the low correlations between intentions and the moral variables for the consumer non-shoplifters, and the stronger association of the moral variables with intentions for the consumer recent shoplifters. Both the correlation analysis and the frequency distributions demonstrate the

Non		Past		Recent		
consumersstudents(n=285)(n=219)		consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)	
foolish .45 wrong .44 bad .31 dishonest .33 principles .13 guilty .12 morally .06	guilty.50morally.49foolish.46wrong.40bad.39dishonest.32	bad .53 foolish .51 wrong .43 dishonest .43 morally .35 guilty .34 principles .26	foolish.44bad.37wrong.35morally.35guilty.27dishonest.25	good.75guilty.69morally.68right.67foolish.54principles.44honest.41	good .56 guilty .44 wise .42 right .39 honest .34 morally .33	

Table 10.10 Correlations between intentions and attitudes and moral views

figures in bold indicate correlations significant at p < .05

importance of attitudes and moral views to shoplifting behaviour, and suggest that shoplifting attitudes and moral views inhibit the shoplifting behaviour of those who do not shoplift and facilitate the behaviour of those who do.

10.4.2 Attitudes, Morals and Previous Shoplifting Experience

The correlations between previous shoplifting experience, and global attitude and moral norm and the individual attitude and moral variables are shown in Table 10.11. For the consumer shoplifters, both past and recent, previous experience was significantly associated with their attitudes and moral views, but was not a significant predictor of intentions, suggesting that previous experience influences intentions through its impact

Table 10.11 Correlations between past experience and attitudes and morals

	global attitude	good	honst	right	wise	global moralnorm	guilty	moral	prncpls
Consumers past recent	.21* .51**	.21* .56**	.14 .32	.16 .56**	.13 .34	.29** .59**	.28* .60**	.19 .53**	.33 ** .36
Students past recent	.21* .21	.18 * .21	.10 02	.12 .00	.20* .23*	.34 ** .07	.36 ** .14	.25 ** 02	-

* significant at p < .05 ** significant at p < .01

on attitudes and moral views (as hypothesised by the theory of planned behaviour). For the student past and recent shoplifters, previous experience had a direct influence on intentions, not mediated by either attitude or the moral norm, which possibly explains the lower correlations between these variables and previous experience.

10.4.3 Attitudes, Morals and Beliefs About Shoplifting

The correlations between the belief measures and the global measures of attitude (AT) and moral norm (MN), shown in Table 10.12, produced fairly consistent results across the consumer and student respondents, and indicate that both attitude and the moral norm were associated with shoplifting beliefs. The strongest correlations were for the recent shoplifters, with the figures for the consumer recent shoplifters being particularly indicative of the beliefs associated with their shoplifting behaviour. The correlations for the recent consumer shoplifters also provide some support for attitudes and moral views being separate dimensions of shoplifting behaviour.

	Non-s	Non-shoplifters				hoplifte	rs		Recen	Recent shoplifters			
	consu (n=28	consumers (n=285) (dents consu 219) (n= 1		mers	stude (n=1	students (n=143)		consumers (n= 27)		nts 2)	
	AT	MN	AT	MN	AT	MN	AT	MN	AT	MN	AT	MN	
economic	.43	.37	.52	.54	.64	.44	.48	.23	.75	.57	.53	.49	
apprhnsn	15	10	.05	.01	03	15	.03	.00	70	31	01	.05	
referent	.13	.01	.23	.20	.21	.15	.21	.01	.61	.30	.51	.40	
control	.08	.25	.48	.45	.37	.34	.39	.32	.75	.18	.28	.32	

 Table 10.12
 Correlations between belief measures and attitudes and moral views

figures in bold indicate correlations significant at p < .05

10.5 Shoplifting and the Economic Factors

Shoplifting is usually perceived as an economic crime (Klemke, 1992; Ray and Briar, 1988; Yates, 1986), and the findings from the consumer survey support the impact of economic motivations on shoplifting behaviour, with 82% of the consumers overall, and 93% of the recent consumer shoplifters, agreeing that people shoplift because they can't afford the things they need. Although this suggests that shoplifting is likely to be associated with low incomes, it is also possible that shoplifting could be associated with greed, perceived deprivation, getting something for nothing, the high resale value of the goods or perceptions that the goods are over-priced (see Chapter 4, section, 4.3.2).

10.5.1 Shoplifting and the Economic Beliefs

The economic beliefs relate to the financial outcomes of shoplifting (getting goods without paying and saving money) and the impact of lack of money as a facilitator of shoplifting behaviour. As shown in Table 10.13, the two samples of respondents exhibited similar patterns in their estimation of the likelihood of the economic beliefs, and their evaluation of these beliefs. Both the consumer and the student non-shoplifters and past shoplifters acknowledged that shoplifting could result in personal financial gain,

Table 10.13 Likelihood and evaluation of the economic factors

	Consumers (n= 417)			Students (n=444)		
	non	past	recent	non	past	recent
Percentage thinking it likely that: shoplifting will result in free goods shoplifting will result in saving money being short of money would facilitate shoplifting	50.6% 49.1% 22.4%	73.4% 60.0% 39.0%	100% 100% 85.2%	55.7% 63.5% 35.6%	79.0% 78.3% 58.8%	82.9% 84.2% 68.3%
Percentage agreeing that: getting free goods by shoplifting is good saving money by shoplifting is good they are often short of money	5.0% 1.8% 41.0%	21.9% 13.3% 51.4%	77.7% 81.4% 74.0%	19.2% 6.4% 41.5%	33.6% 22.4% 35.7%	69.5% 61.1% 48.8%

however, as the overwhelming majority viewed this as being bad, their overall view of the economic outcomes of shoplifting was unfavourable, and, as shown in Table 10.12, this was associated with their anti-shoplifting attitudes and moral views. Although between 35% and 52% of the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters stated that they were often short of money, the majority of the non-shoplifters agreed that this would not encourage them to shoplift. The past shoplifters, however, were more likely to agree that being short of money would facilitate shoplifting. Thus, it is possible that lack of money may have contributed to their previous shoplifters were significantly associated with their shoplifting intentions (as shown in Table 10.14). Thus, their unfavourable perceptions of the economic outcomes of shoplifting together with their anti-shoplifting attitudes and moral views discourage them from engaging in the behaviour.

 Table 10.14
 Correlations between economic beliefs and shoplifting intentions

	Non-shoplifters		Past shoplift	ers	Recent shoplifters	
	consumers	students	consumers	students	consumers	students
	(n=285)	(n= 219)	(n= 105)	(n=143)	(n= 27)	(n= 82)
goods without paying	.20**	.35**	.41**	.28**	.65**	.62**
saving money	.14*	.40**	.39**	.35**	.72**	.59**
short of money	.16**	.33**	.09	.29**	.22	.27**

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Of the recent shoplifters, 100% of the consumers and over 82% of the students agreed that shoplifting would benefit them economically, and over 77% of the consumers and over 61% of the students viewed personal financial gain as being a good outcome of shoplifting behaviour. Over 85% of the consumer recent shoplifters and over 68% of the students agreed that being short of money would facilitate shoplifting, although the consumers were more likely to admit to being short of money than the students (74.4%)

compared to 48.8%). Thus, for both the consumer and the student recent shoplifters, their favourable beliefs about the economic outcomes of shoplifting, together with their beliefs about being short of money, are likely to facilitate their involvement in the behaviour. In addition, the economic beliefs of the recent shoplifters were significantly associated with their previous shoplifting behaviour (consumers, *pay* 0.54 *p*<.01; students *pay* 0.26*p*<.05, *save* 0.34*p*<.01), which suggests that their previous experience has reinforced their perceptions of the economic benefits of the crime.

10.5.2 Shoplifting and Economic Status

The consumer respondents were more likely than the students to think that being short of money would facilitate involvement in shoplifting. This is possibly explained by the fact that the consumers were less "well-off" than their student counterparts, as illustrated in Table 10.15 As reported in Appendices D and F (Tables D6 and F27), the low income consumer non-shoplifters and past shoplifters were significantly more likely than the higher income groups to agree that they were often short of money, as were all the low income student respondents. The consumer high and low income recent shoplifters did not differ significantly in their perceptions about being short of money. Of this group, 74% agreed that they were often short of money, although 29.6% of the group were classified as high income. Perceptions of the benefits of shoplifting appear to be related

 Table 10.15
 Percentage of respondents classified as being on a low income

	Non-shoplifters		Past shoplift	ers	Recent shoplifters	
	consumers (n=285)	students (n= 219)	consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)
Low income	53.3%	44.3%	53.3%	37.8%	70.4%	43.9%

low income is defined as an annual income of less than $\pounds 10,000$ p.a for the consumers, and less than $\pounds 10$ a week to spend for the students

to economic status, with 100% of the consumer and 72% of the student low income recent shoplifters viewing getting goods without paying as good, and 89.5% of the consumers and 63.9% of the students viewing saving money by shoplifting as good.

Although the financial benefits of shoplifting were strongly correlated with the intentions of both the consumer and student recent shoplifters (Table 10.14), for the consumers, 74% of whom stated that they were frequently short of money, being short of money was not significantly correlated with their intentions. This suggests that perceptions of economic need are not the only economic motivator of the behaviour. Shoplifting could also be motivated by greed (Griffin, 1970), the attraction of getting something for nothing (Kraut, 1976), perceived deprivation (Ray and Briar, 1988) and the high resale value of the goods or perceptions that they are over-priced (Ray, 1987).

10.6 The Risks and Costs of Shoplifting

The literature indicates that shoplifters perceive shoplifting to be a low risk, low cost crime (Montmarquette *et al*, 1988; Saltzman *et al*,1982), and the findings from the consumer survey are consistent with this proposition. Of the consumer respondents, 83% thought it likely that people shoplift because they think they won't get caught, and 63% because they won't be punished if they are caught. This section considers the respondents' perceptions of the risks and costs of being caught and the effectiveness of retail security, and the impact of previous shoplifting experience on these perceptions. The respondents' attitudes to the police and breaking the law are also discussed. The focus is on the views of the past and recent shoplifters in order to determine the effectiveness of apprehension and punishment as a deterrent to shoplifting.

10.6.1 Shoplifting and the Apprehension Factors

The apprehension outcome beliefs relate to beliefs about being caught and arrested for shoplifting, and in addition, for the students, perceptions of the criminality of shoplifting. The apprehension control beliefs relate to perceptions of the effectiveness of retail security, the severity of the penalties for shoplifting and the risks of being caught. Table 10.16 compares the percentages of respondents in each survey thinking the apprehension beliefs likely, and agreeing with the beliefs. Although there was there was considerable agreement between the two samples regarding the apprehension beliefs, the students were less likely than the consumers to agree that being caught and arrested for shoplifting is good. This could, however, be due to the respondents' interpretation of the questions. It is possible that the consumer non-shoplifters and past shoplifters viewed both questions as applying to shoplifters overall rather than personally, which is how the question was meant to be interpreted, and appears to be how the students interpreted it.

	Consum	ers (n= 41	7)	Students	(n=444)	
	non	past	recent	non	past	recent
Percentage thinking it likely that:						
they will be caught if they shoplift	80.7%	56.2%	14.8%	70.3%	46.9%	26.9%
they will be arrested	78.6%	73.4%	33.3%	76.3%	72.8%	62.5%
they will be breaking the law	-	-	-	93.0%	93.0%	79.2%
Percentage thinking it likely that the						
following will facilitate shoplifting:						
ineffective security	39.0%	52.4%	88.9%	37.0%	62.3%	85.4%
lenient penalties	29.1%	47.6%	81.5%	32.4%	49.7%	74.4%
low risks of apprehension	24.9%	44.8%	85.2%	33.8%	56.7%	74.4%
Percentage agreeing that:						
being caught shoplifting is good	42.5%	28.6%	11.1%	9.1%	7.7%	8.5%
being arrested for shoplifting is good	27.8%	18.1%	14.8%	8.3%	9.8%	12.2%
breaking the law is good	-	-	-	1.4%	4.9%	19.5%
retail security is ineffective	45.2%	46.7%	85.2%	37.0%	44.1%	52.4%
penalties are not severe	65.3%	60.0%	70.0%	61.2%	30.1%	25.6%
there is little risk of being caught	39.3%	44.7%	81.4%	45.2%	49.7%	68.3%

 Table 10.16
 Likelihood and evaluation of the apprehension factors

10.6.2 The Risks and Costs of Apprehension

The risk of being caught and punished will only act as an effective deterrent to shoplifting if people believe that they will be caught and punished if they steal from shops, and as shown in Table 10.16, the non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters held very different views about this. For the non-shoplifters, the risks and costs of apprehension appeared to be an effective deterrent, with the majority of non-shoplifters agreeing that it is likely that shoplifting would result in their being caught and arrested, and that this is an adverse outcome of the behaviour, although just over 60% of the non-shoplifters agreed that the penalties for shoplifting are not severe. Although 80.7% of the consumer non-shoplifters and 70.3% of the student non-shoplifters agreed that apprehension for shoplifting is likely, 39.3% and 44.7% respectively agreed that there is little risk of being caught. This finding is somewhat inconsistent. It is possibly explained, however, by the non-shoplifters' perceptions of the effectiveness of retail security, with 45.2% of the consumers and 37% of the students agreeing that it is ineffective. Less than 40% of the non-shoplifters agreed that low risks of apprehension, ineffective security and lenient penalties would encourage them to shoplift, suggesting that their non-shoplifting behaviour is deterred by something more than the risks and costs of being caught.

Although the past shoplifters were less likely than the non-shoplifters to think that shoplifting would result in apprehension and arrest, over 45% thought it likely that they would be caught, and 73% agreed that they would be arrested. Less than half of the past shoplifters viewed retail security as being ineffective, and shoplifting as a low risk crime, and the consumers were more likely than the students to view the penalties for shoplifting as not being severe (60% of the consumers compared to 30.1% of the students).

Only 14.8% of the consumer recent shoplifters thought it likely that they would be caught if they shoplifted, and only 33.3% that they would be arrested for committing a crime. This is consistent with their views of the risks of shoplifting and the effectiveness of retail security, 85.2% viewed retail security as ineffective and 81.4% agreed that there is little risk of being caught. The students were more likely to think that they would be caught and arrested for shoplifting (26.9% and 62.5% respectively) and were less likely to agree that retail security is ineffective and the risks of being caught low (52.4% and 68.3% respectively). Although 70% of the consumers agreed that the penalties for shoplifting are not severe, only 25.6% of the students agreed with this view. Unsurprisingly, over 85% of the recent shoplifters agreed that ineffective security would facilitate shoplifting, and over 74% lenient penalties and low risks of apprehension. Overall, the perception of the recent shoplifters was that shoplifting is a low risk, low cost crime, and although the majority agreed that being caught and arrested for shoplifting is an adverse outcome of the behaviour, as most of the recent shoplifters did not think that they would be caught, the threat of arrest and punishment is unlikely to deter them.

10.6.3 Apprehension and Previous Experience

The recent and past shoplifters held different perceptions of the risks and costs of shoplifting, and it is likely that their perceptions are influenced by their previous experiences of shoplifting (previous experience was significantly correlated with apprehension beliefs for the consumer past shoplifters, *arrest* -0.20 p<.05, *caught* -0.29 p<.01). Of the consumers, 26.5% of those admitting to shoplifting had been caught shoplifting at least once (28.6% of the past and 18.5% of the recent shoplifters), and of the students, 18.2% of those admitting to shoplifting had been caught at least once

(15.4% of the past and 23.2% of the recent shoplifters). Table 10.17 shows the apprehended shoplifters' extent of agreement with the apprehension beliefs. Although the apprehended recent shoplifters were more likely to think that they would be caught than the apprehended past shoplifters, they were also more likely to agree that retail security is ineffective and that the penalties for shoplifting are not severe. In addition, they were more likely to agree that they would shoplift in the future. Thus, although the threat of being caught and punished appears to have deterred the apprehended past shoplifters, it seems to have had less impact on the apprehended recent shoplifters. When asked whether being caught would deter them from future shoplifting, only 20% of the apprehended consumer recent shoplifters and 21% of the apprehended student recent shoplifters agreed that it would (compared to 90% of the consumer past shoplifters and 77.3% of the student past shoplifters).

Table 10.17 The views of	the ap	prehended	shoplifters
----------------------------------	--------	-----------	-------------

	Past shoplifters		Recent shop	lifters
	consumers (n=30)	students (n=22)	consumers (n=5)	students (n=19)
Percentage thinking it likely that: they will be caught they will be arrested	36.7% 20.0%	22.7% 0	40.0% 60.0%	52.6% 15.8%
Percentage agreeing that: retail security is ineffective penalties are not severe	36.7% 60.0%	27.3% 27.3%	80.0% 40.0%	42.1% 63.2%
Percentage thinking it likely that: they intend to shoplift in the future they will shoplift if they have the opportunity	6.7% 3.3%	0 4.5%	40.0% 40.0%	63.2% 68.4%

10.6.4 Attitudes to the Police and Breaking the Law

One of the major findings of this study was the attitude of the recent shoplifters to the police. Of the consumer recent shoplifters, 44.4% agreed that doing what the police want them to do is bad (25.9% **extremely** bad). Of the student recent shoplifters, 26.8% agreed that doing what the police want them to do is **extremely** bad (25.6% answered "neither"). The correlations shown in Table 10.18, suggest a strong relationship between negative attitudes to the police and several aspects of shoplifting behaviour, which could imply that anti-police attitudes encourage shoplifting behaviour or vice versa. Lack of motivation to comply with the police appears to be related to gender. Both the consumer and student male recent shoplifters were significantly less likely than the females to think that doing what the police want them to do is good (Appendices D and F, Tables D4 and F26).

 Table 10.18
 Significant correlations between motivation to comply with the police and the individual global and belief variables - recent shoplifters

consumers - variables significantly correlated with motivation to comply with the police			students - variables significantly correlated with motivation to comply with the police				
intend will good right reward	49* 46* 50** 42* 50**	guilty principles pay save ineffective security	39* 59** 65** 54**	chance will good stupid excite reward	28* 28* 40** 22* 42** 27*	easy opptnty guilty morally law save	40** 25* 35** 26* 40** 22*

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

The student respondents were asked about their views on the criminality of shoplifting. The recent shoplifters were significantly less likely to view shoplifting as breaking the law and to feel that breaking the law is bad. Only 79.2% thought shoplifting a crime, and 19.5% viewed breaking the law as good. This analysis suggests that the recent shoplifters have little respect for the law, and it seems likely that this, together with their view that there is little risk of being caught and punished, facilitates their shoplifting behaviour.

10.6.5 Apprehension Factors and Shoplifting Intentions

The correlations between the apprehension factors and shoplifting intentions are shown in Table 10.19. For the consumer non-shoplifters and past shoplifters, the majority of these correlations were not significant, which suggests that other factors may be more important in influencing their shoplifting intentions. For the consumer recent shoplifters, the negative correlations between *caught* and *arrest* and intentions indicate that those

 Table 10.19
 Correlations between apprehension factors and shoplifting intentions

	Non-shoplif	Non-shoplifters		ers	Recent shoplifters		
	consumers (n=285)	students (n= 219)	consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)	
caught	17*	08	08	02	52**	.06	
arrested	10	05	05	17	39	14	
breaking the law	-	.11	-	.08	-	.19	
ineffective security	.07	.40**	.15	.30**	.46*	.27*	
penalties not severe	13*	.31**	.04	.21*	.32	.21*	
little risk	.02	.32**	.24*	.36**	.14	.15	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

respondents who thought apprehension and arrest unlikely were more likely to shoplift, and this, together with their perceptions of the ineffectiveness of retail security, was significantly associated with the likelihood of their future shoplifting behaviour. The concerns of the student non-shoplifters and past shoplifters about the effectiveness of retail security, the risks of shoplifting and the penalties for the behaviour were significantly associated with their shoplifting intentions, which suggests that they may be deterred from shoplifting by the risks and costs of being caught. Although the student recent shoplifters were more likely to think that they would be caught and arrested than their consumer counterparts, their shoplifting intentions were associated with their perceptions of the ineffectiveness of retail security and the low risks of being caught and punished.

10.7 The Influence of Social Factors

Social influence, in terms of family and friends, has been found to be an important determinant of shoplifting activity (Cox *et al*, 1990; Cox *et al*, 1993; Tibbetts, 1997), and can impact on shoplifting behaviour in two ways: firstly, as a control, in that the disapproval of shoplifting by family and friends can inhibit the behaviour (Cox *et al*, 1993); secondly, as a facilitator, in that having family or friends who shoplift or who approve of shoplifting may provide a supportive climate for the behaviour (including information about shoplifting), and result in it being seen as acceptable (Bales, 1982; Cox *et al*, 1990; Kraut 1976). There is considerable support from both the consumer and the student surveys that family and friends play a major role in both inhibiting and facilitating shoplifting behaviour.

10.7.1 The Subjective Norm

Although the subjective norm (social pressure to perform or not to perform the behaviour) was a significant predictor of intentions for both the consumer non-shoplifters and past shoplifters, it was not significant for either the consumer recent shoplifters, or for the student respondents, although it was significantly correlated with intentions for these groups (see Tables 8.34 and 9.33). Comparison of the mean scores for the consumer and student respondents (Appendices D and F, Tables D12 and F18) indicates that the recent shoplifters in both groups were significantly less likely than the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters to know people who disapproved of shoplifting, or who thought that they should avoid the behaviour.

The opinions of people who are important to the respondents were significantly associated with the majority of the attitude, moral norm and perceived control variables, as shown in Chapter 8, Table 8.32, and Chapter 9, Table 9.31. For example, the perceptions of the consumer recent shoplifters that shoplifting is *right, rewarding, easy* and not *morally wrong*, and that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting, were strongly associated with the opinions of people important to them. This is consistent with the Theory of Differential Association (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966; 1970) which hypothesises that the skills, motives and attitudes necessary for criminal behaviour are learned through interaction with others. Similarly, consistent with social control theorists (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Hirschi, 1969), for the student non-shoplifters, the significant correlations between the subjective norm and *dishonest, wrong, stupid, guilty* and *morally wrong* suggest that their anti-shoplifting attitudes and their strong moral views about the behaviour were associated with the views of people important to them.

10.7.2 The Influence of Family and Friends

Family and friends were identified as the referent groups who were likely to have an important impact on shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour, and as shown in Table 10.20, the likelihood and evaluation of the beliefs relating to these two groups exhibited a similar pattern across the two samples of respondents. Overall, the recent shoplifters were less likely than the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters to have family and friends who would want them to avoid shoplifting, and were less likely to be motivated to comply with the views of their family and friends. In addition, both groups of recent shoplifters were more likely to think that encouragement by friends would facilitate shoplifting behaviour, and more likely to agree that their friends often encouraged them to shoplift.

	Consum	ers (n= 4)	17)	Students (n=444)		
	non	past	recent	non	past	recent
Percentage thinking it likely that:						
family think they should avoid shplftng	97.2%	92.4%	92.4%	92.7%	94.4%	73.3%
friends think they should avoid shplftng	88.7%	69.5%	40.7%	85.0%	64.4%	33.0%
encouragement by friends would facilitate shoplifting	9.2%	19.1%	59.2%	18.8%	42.0%	48.7%
Percentage agreeing that:						
doing what my family wants is good	81.8%	71.5%	81.4%	75.9%	71.4%	56.1%
doing what my friends want is good	88.7%	48.5%	44.4%	51.6%	48.3%	52.5%
my friends encourage me to shoplift	3.6%	5.8%	44.4%	3.6%	10.5%	30.5%

Table 10.20 Likelihood and evaluation of the social factors

The correlations between the variable *my friends often encourage me to shoplift* (peer influence) and the individual global and belief variables for the recent shoplifters are shown in Table 10.21. The strong associations between the variables demonstrate that peer influence may play a major role in shoplifting behaviour. For example, for the consumer recent shoplifters, the strong correlation between peer pressure and *easy* suggests that their friends may have influenced their perception of how easy or difficult shoplifting is likely to be. The correlations also suggest that their friends may have communicated information about the benefits of shoplifting, the effectiveness of security

Table 10.21 Correlations between peer influence and the individual variables

Global and belief variables correlating significantly with peer influence - recent shoplifters										
Consumer recent shoplifters (n=27)			Student recent shoplifters (n=82)							
intend will good honest right wise reward	.59** .56** .69** .65** .61** .56** .58**	easy guilty arrest caught pay ineffective security penalties not sever little risk	.57** .40* 46* 58** .50* 7 .57** e .55** .47*	chance will good wise excite easy guilty morally	.44** .45** .29** .51** .43** .30** .38** .33**	pay save ineffective sec little risk	.39** .35** nurity .33** .32**			

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

measures and the risks of being caught. Similarly the strong correlations between *intend* and *will* and peer influence indicate that peer encouragement is strongly associated with the likelihood of future shoplifting involvement. This is supported by the correlations between intentions and the social factors shown in Table 10.22.

 Table 10.22
 Correlations between intentions and the social variables

	Non-shoplift	ers	Past shoplift	ers	Recent shoplifters		
	consumers (n=285)	students (n= 219)	consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumers (n= 27)	students (n= 82)	
approve avoid family	.52** .50** 14*	.33** .37**	.27** .27** 05	.37** .34** - 05	.41** .39** 47*	.36** .36** 25*	
friends peer influence	.24** .23**	.29** .52**	.19 .18	.35** .31**	.47* .46*	.25 .45** .44**	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

Thus, social pressure is likely to influence shoplifting behaviour in two ways. The influence of family and friends who do not approve of shoplifting behaviour is likely to reinforce and/or influence the negative shoplifting attitudes and views of those who do not shoplift. Whereas, for those who do shoplift, their family and friends, who are more approving of shoplifting behaviour, are likely to provide information about shoplifting, a supportive climate for the behaviour, and reinforce and/or influence their pro-shoplifting attitudes and amoral views about the behaviour.

10.8 Is Shoplifting a Rational Crime?

Rational choice theories of crime (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a) hypothesise that offenders choose to engage in criminal behaviour, basing their decision on a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the crime. Applied to shoplifting, this would suggest that potential shoplifters compare the economic benefits of shoplifting with the risks and costs of being caught, and select the alternative with the highest utility. This proposition implies that shoplifters are outcome-oriented, and to determine whether shoplifting is a rational crime for the respondents in this study, the correlations between shoplifting intentions and the economic outcomes and the apprehension outcomes were compared. As shown in Table 10.23, for the recent shoplifters, shoplifting certainly appeared to be a rational crime. For the consumers, the strong positive correlations between intentions

Table 10.23 Intentions and the economic and apprehension beliefs

If I shoplift	Non-shoplifters		Past shoplifte	ers	Recent shoplifters		
	consumersstudents(n=285)(n=219)		consumers (n= 105)	students (n=143)	consumersstudent(n= 27)(n= 82)		
I will get free goods	.20**	.35**	.41**	.28**	.65**	.62**	
I will save money	.14*	.40**	.39**	.35**	.72**	.59**	
I will be caught	17*	05	08	17	52*	14	
I will be arrested	10	08	.05	02	39*	.06	

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

and getting goods without paying and saving money, and the strong negative correlations between intentions and apprehension and arrest (indicating that those who view apprehension and arrest as unlikely are more likely to shoplift) indicate that their perceptions that the economic benefits of shoplifting outweigh the risks and costs of being caught were strongly associated with their shoplifting intentions. Similarly, the student recent shoplifters were more influenced by the benefits of shoplifting than the risks of apprehension and arrest, the positive (but insignificant) correlations between intentions and *arrest* and *caught* reflecting that the students were more likely than the consumers to think that shoplifting would result in apprehension and arrest.

Although a similar relationship is indicated for both the consumer and the student nonshoplifters and past shoplifters, the correlations were not as strong, which suggests that other factors may be more influential on their shoplifting intentions. The significant correlations shown in Table 10.12 suggest that perceptions of the economic outcomes of shoplifting were strongly associated with shoplifting attitudes and moral views about the behaviour. Thus, although both the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters were aware of the economic benefits of shoplifting, their anti-shoplifting attitudes and their strong moral views about the behaviour prevented them from intending to shoplift in the future.

The six global and belief measures with the strongest correlations with intentions for each category of respondent are listed in Table 10.24 in descending order of significance. For the consumer non-shoplifters, the variables most strongly associated with their intentions related to social pressure (subjective norm) and attitude, whereas for the student non-shoplifters, moral views and peer influence were more strongly associated with their intentions, and retail security was also important. For the consumer past shoplifters, the attitude variables, both affective and knowledge-based (perceived control) were the variables most strongly associated with their intentions. Similarly, for the student past shoplifters, the affective and knowledge-based components of attitude were important, as were their perceptions of the risks of shoplifting and the influence of their friends.

 Table 10.24
 The six most significant global and belief variables

Non-shoplifters Past shoplifters						Recent shoplifters					
consumers (n=285)students (n=219)consumers (n=105)		ers	students		consumers		students				
)	(n=143)		(n= 27)		(n= 82)				
approve	.52	peers	.52	good	.53	wise	.44	good	.75	pay	.62
	.50	guilty	.50	wise	.51	reward	.38	save	.72	save	.59
wise	.45	morally	.49	excite	.49	good	.37	guilty	.69	good	.56
right	.44	stupid	.46	honest	.43	risk	.36	morally	.68	excite	.55
honest	.33	excite	.41	right	.43	right	.35	right	.67	peers	.45
good	.31	security	.40	easy	.36	friends	.35	pay	.65		.44

all correlations significant at p<.01

Although the correlations in Table 10.24 indicate that for the consumer and the student recent shoplifters, shoplifting was a rational crime, motivated by their perception that shoplifting would benefit them economically, the correlations also suggest that shoplifting results from rather more than a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the behaviour. Their pro-shoplifting attitudes and amoral views about the behaviour suggest that the recent shoplifters were less critical of shoplifting behaviour than their non-shoplifting counterparts, and were unlikely to be inhibited from shoplifting by feelings of guilt or strong moral views. Peer influence was also important, and the discussion suggests that the recent shoplifters were more likely to have friends who approve of shoplifting and who provided support and encouragement for the behaviour.

10.9 Interesting But Less Major Findings

As discussed in the introduction, the two surveys produced a wealth of information about shoplifting behaviour. This section discusses the findings, which although interesting and relevant to shoplifting and shoplifting prevention, were considered to be less important than the findings discussed in the previous sections.

10.9.1 The Impact of Retailers' Marketing Strategies

Increases in shoplifting behaviour have been attributed to modern retailing practices, and the consumer survey attempted to evaluate the impact of retailers' marketing strategies on shoplifting behaviour. The findings are summarised below:

- 74% of respondents overall, and 89% of recent shoplifters, thought it likely that people shoplift because they are tempted by the displays of goods in the shops.
- 70% of respondents overall, and 89% of recent shoplifters, thought it likely that people shoplift because the retailers' promotional strategies encourage them to want things they can't afford.

- 85% of respondents overall, and 96% of recent shoplifters, thought it likely that people shoplift because they have easy access to the goods they want to steal.
- 84% of respondents overall, and 96% of recent shoplifters, thought it likely that people shoplift because they have the opportunity to do so.

The opportunistic nature of shoplifting is supported by the fact that recent shoplifters were more frequent users of shops than the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters, with 81.5% of the consumer recent shoplifters and 60.5% of the student recent shoplifters visiting shops at least once a day. It could be argued, however, that the recent shoplifters were making opportunities for shoplifting.

Thomas (1980) argues that retailers are faced with conflicting objectives in that easier access to goods and more attractive displays will not only increase sales but also increase the amount of theft. Beck and Willis (1998) agree with this view and argue that a balance is required between ease of access to goods and retail security measures. As more restrictive security practices may have the effect of deterring honest shoppers from using the shops, retailers need to consider the impact of their security measures on customers. Of the consumer non-shoplifters, 63% stated that retail security measures did not make them feel apprehensive, and 91% agreed that the presence of security measures had never prevented them from using a shop (compared to 78.1% of past shoplifters and 59.3% of recent shoplifters). Thus, it appears that the majority of honest shoppers are not "put off" by retail security, although it appears to be deterring some shoplifters.

10.9.2 The Effectiveness of Individual Security Measures

Although 45.2% of consumer respondents overall, and 85.2% of the consumer recent shoplifters, viewed retail security as ineffective, there was considerably more support for

the effectiveness of individual security measures, with 92% of all consumer respondents agreeing that CCTV, alarms, and electronic tags were likely to deter people from shoplifting. Although the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters agreed that CCTV, electronic tags and alarms were the most effective deterrents to shoplifting, the recent shoplifters viewed uniformed security guards as being a more effective deterrent than the technological measures. This is consistent with the research of Butler (1994), which suggests that as shoplifters perceive humans to present a greater risk than security technology, they are a more effective deterrent to shoplifting.

10.9.3 Strategies to Control Shoplifting

The consumer respondents were asked their opinion about eight potential strategies for

controlling shoplifting behaviour. The results are summarised below:

- Over 75% of respondents overall, and 65% of recent shoplifters, agreed that shoplifters should be treated more severely, that retailers should report all shoplifters to the police and that all shoplifters should be prosecuted.
- Only 27% of respondents overall felt that the shops should deal with the shoplifters themselves, although there was considerably more support for civil recovery, with 60% of all respondents agreeing that this is a viable method of dealing with shoplifters.
- Only 41% of respondents overall, and 26% of recent shoplifters, agreed that media anti-shoplifting campaigns would help reduce shoplifting.
- Only 58% of respondents overall, and 11% of recent shoplifters, agreed that if they saw someone shoplifting, they would report them to the shop.

10.9.4 Evaluation of the Less Major Findings

Although the areas discussed in the previous three sections provide useful information

for retailers, these findings were not considered to be major for the following reasons.

Firstly, the questions relating to these three areas were phrased indirectly, for example, *people shoplift because...... extremely likely/extremely unlikely*, and thus may not provide reliable data, as the non-shoplifters' responses were not based on their personal experiences, and the past and recent shoplifters may be neutralising their shoplifting behaviour. Secondly, as the majority of the questions relating to these three areas were only asked in the consumer survey, it is impossible to verify the accuracy of the findings by comparing them with those of the student respondents. Despite the possible unreliability of these findings, they provide some useful information as to how retailers might combat shoplifting, and the implications for retailers of the overall findings from this study are discussed further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 11

CONCLUSION -

DRAWING THE THREADS TOGETHER

11.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to bring together the discussion and findings from the two shoplifting surveys. The first section restates the research objectives and discusses how the approach taken by this study has enabled the research objectives to be achieved. The second section evaluates the contribution made by this study to shoplifting knowledge. The third section discusses the implications of the findings for shoplifting prevention, and the fourth section considers areas for further research. The final section brings the thesis to a conclusion by summarising the purpose of the study and how the approach taken provides a useful strategy for understanding and explaining shoplifting behaviour.

11.2 The Research Objectives

This study was undertaken with the aim of achieving the following research objectives:

- 1. To explore the utility of applying a consumer behaviour approach to situational crime prevention theory in order to provide a greater understanding of shoplifting behaviour.
- 2. To investigate the applicability of using the Theory of Planned Behaviour to understand and explain shoplifting behaviour.
- 3. To gain an understanding of attitudes toward shoplifting and the beliefs underlying shoplifting behaviour, and how these differ between non-shoplifters and shoplifters.
- 4. To identify the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft. This includes an investigation of shoplifting motivation, and of the impact of retailers' shoplifting prevention measures and marketing strategies on shoplifting.

The following discussion demonstrates that each of these objectives have been achieved.

11.2.1 Research Objective 1: The Consumer Behaviour Approach

Shoplifting shares certain similarities with "normal" shopping behaviour in that it results from the coincidence of three factors: a motivated customer (or in the case of customer theft, shoplifter), attractive and available goods, and the opportunity to purchase (or steal) them. This view of shoplifting is consistent with the Rational Choice Perspective (Cornish and Clarke, 1986a) on which current situational crime prevention approaches are based. Situational crime prevention is, however, concerned with manipulating the environment to prevent crime, rather than trying to understand and change criminal motivation (Cornish, 1994). Thus, attention is focused on how crime can be prevented, either by reducing opportunities for crime or by increasing the risks of apprehension (Clarke, 1983, Ekblom, 1986), and with a few exceptions (Butler, 1994; Carroll and Weaver, 1986), little attention has been paid to the factors influencing the theft decision.

As the understanding of the factors influencing consumers' choices and decisions is the concern of consumer behaviour theorists (East, 1990, 1997; Tuck, 1976), it was considered appropriate to use a theory of consumer behaviour to research shoplifting. Cognitive theories of consumer behaviour are based on the premise that consumers are reasonably rational decision-makers (Bettman, 1979; Engel *et al*, 1995; Howard, 1994) and are thus consistent with the rational choice perspective on which situational crime prevention is based. The consumer behaviour approach, however, provides an additional dimension to the understanding of shoplifting behaviour, in that it attempts to provide some explanation of how situational crime prevention measures interact with the beliefs, attitudes and perceptions of the individual to influence the decision to steal (or not to steal). Integrating consumer behaviour and situational crime prevention approaches has

proved to be a successful strategy for researching shoplifting behaviour as the discussion in the following sections demonstrates.

11.2.2 Research Objective 2: The Theory of Planned Behaviour

A cognitive theory of consumer behaviour, the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) was selected to investigate the factors which influence the choices and decisions of shoplifters and non-shoplifters, and to examine the interaction between the attitudes and beliefs underlying shoplifting (and non-shoplifting) behaviour and retailers' marketing and shoplifting prevention strategies.

The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) provides a theoretical framework for understanding and explaining behaviour, and traces behaviour through a series of intervening concepts (intentions, attitudes, subjective norm, perceived control, and in the case of this study, moral considerations) to the beliefs underlying behaviour. By use of multiple regression, it is possible to establish which components of the theory exert the strongest influence on shoplifting intentions (and thus, by implication, shoplifting behaviour) and to investigate the separate and combined effects of these measures. The theory provides a further level of explanation in that it enables the identification of the beliefs underlying shoplifting behaviour, and the investigation of the relationship between these beliefs and shoplifting intentions, attitudes, social pressure, moral views and perceptions of control over the behaviour. Thus, the use of the theory of planned behaviour allowed a consumer behaviour approach to be applied to situational crime prevention theory in order to determine the factors which influence shoplifting (and nonshoplifting) behaviour, and to investigate how these factors interact with the shoplifting prevention strategies of retailers to influence the decision of whether or not to shoplift. The findings from the consumer and school surveys indicate that this approach is an appropriate method of researching shoplifting behaviour. The theoretical framework provided by the theory of planned behaviour enabled the investigation of how the factors identified in the literature review as being associated with shoplifting behaviour (opportunities for shoplifting, the deterrent effect of shoplifting prevention measures, social influence, economic considerations and moral views) interacted with the attitudes and beliefs of the respondents, to influence the decision of whether or not to steal. The findings from both studies suggest that shoplifting behaviour cannot be attributed to one factor in isolation, but rather that a number of factors, acting in combination, influence consumers' decisions to steal. Consistent with the rational choice perspective, the findings suggest that shoplifting and its financial benefits) and an opportunity to commit the crime, either in terms of availability of attractive goods or perceptions of low risks of apprehension.

11.2.3 Research Objective 3: Shoplifting Attitudes and Beliefs

The theoretical framework provided by the theory enabled the identification of the attitudes and beliefs which influence both shoplifting and non-shoplifting behaviour. The elicitation process enabled the salient attitudes and beliefs about shoplifting to be obtained from a sample of the population to be surveyed. The attitudes from this elicitation process were then compared with previous shoplifting studies and applications of the theory of planned behaviour, in order to identify six areas which were felt to encapsulate attitudes toward shoplifting. The similarity in the beliefs obtained in all three elicitations suggests that these beliefs may be typical of the beliefs underlying shoplifting behaviour.

The research method used by this study enabled the respondents to be classified by their previous shoplifting behaviour into non-shoplifters, past shoplifters and recent shoplifters, and thus allowed any differences in attitudes, beliefs and perceptions between the three groups to be identified. The findings from the two surveys indicate that, with a few exceptions (notably beliefs about the severity of the penalties for shoplifting and evaluation of being caught and arrested for the crime), the recent shoplifters held significantly different views about shoplifting from the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters. It was initially hoped that it would be possible to identify some "clues" as to why those who had shoplifted in the past no longer did so, and analysis of the two surveys indicated that the non-shoplifting. This suggests that the past shoplifters have developed anti-shoplifting attitudes and beliefs in order to desist from the behaviour, possibly because of their previous experiences of shoplifting, and the findings indicate that the past shoplifters' attitudes and moral views were significantly associated with their previous shoplifting behaviour.

The research study indicates that non-shoplifters and shoplifters do hold different beliefs, attitudes and perceptions about shoplifting behaviour, and as discussed in the following section, it is likely that these differences may explain why some individuals shoplift and others do not. The study also demonstrates the utility of categorising attitudes into affective or experiential components and instrumental or knowledge-based components, and indicates that previous experiences of shoplifting are likely to play an important role in determining future shoplifting behaviour.

11.2.4 Research Objective 4: Factors which Inhibit or Encourage Customer Theft Applied to shoplifting, the rational choice perspective implies that the factors which inhibit or encourage customer theft are likely to relate to three areas: shoplifting motivation, opportunities for shoplifting and the risks and costs of apprehension. The findings from this study support this proposition, with attitudes, moral views, social influence, and perceptions of the costs and benefits of the crime being the factors identified as both inhibiting and facilitating shoplifting behaviour.

The non-shoplifters and past shoplifters in both surveys were inhibited from shoplifting behaviour by their anti-shoplifting attitudes and their strong moral views about the behaviour, with negative attitudes to shoplifting being the major predictors of shoplifting intentions for both groups of respondents. The consumer respondents were also influenced by the shoplifting views and attitudes of people important to them, whereas the student respondents were more likely to be influenced by the factors identified as controlling shoplifting behaviour (perceptions of the risks of shoplifting, retail security, and the influence of their friends). The discussion in section 11.2.1 suggests that shoplifting results from the coincidence of three factors: a motivated consumer (or in the case of customer theft, shoplifter), desirable products, and opportunity (either in terms of availability of the goods or perceptions of low risks of apprehension). Thus, for the nonshoplifters and past shoplifters, the first condition is not satisfied, as their strong moral views, negative attitudes to shoplifting and social pressure to refrain from the behaviour prevent these respondents from being motivated to shoplift. The small minority of consumer non-shoplifters who thought future shoplifting a possibility, indicated that although they held strong anti-shoplifting attitudes and moral views, these views may be

overridden if they were presented with a shoplifting opportunity where the risks of apprehension were low (thus satisfying the second and third conditions). As the question relating to unplanned shoplifting was omitted from the student survey, it was not possible to investigate this with the potential student shoplifters. The overwhelming majority of both the consumer and student non-shoplifters and past shoplifters viewed the shoplifting prevention measures used by retailers as being an effective deterrent to shoplifting. Although it is unlikely that the opinions of non-shoplifters provide a reliable measure of the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention, due to their non-experience of the behaviour, it seems likely that the presence of these measures may deter those non-shoplifters and past shoplifters who are tempted to shoplift.

Over half of the recent shoplifters in both studies thought it likely that they would shoplift in the future, and the main predictors of their shoplifting intentions were their favourable shoplifting attitudes and their perceptions of the economic benefits of the crime. Thus, this group of shoplifters could be regarded as motivated offenders. Consistent with rational choice approaches, the findings indicate that both the consumer and the student recent shoplifters stole from shops because they perceived the financial benefits of shoplifting to exceed the risks and costs of being caught. Although the majority of the recent shoplifters viewed shoplifting as a low risk crime and agreed that retailers' security measures are ineffective, there was considerable support for the effectiveness of the individual deterrence measures of CCTV, electronic tags and uniformed security guards. The findings also suggest that shoplifting is rather more than a rational calculation of the costs and benefits of the crime, and indicate that attitudes, a lack of moral concerns about the behaviour and peer pressure are also likely to play an important role in facilitating shoplifting. Peer pressure was particularly influential for the student respondents with peer influence being significantly associated with the intentions of all three groups of respondents. This suggests that friends are likely to play an important role in shoplifting behaviour, either in terms of discouraging the behaviour (for the non-shoplifters and the past shoplifters) or in terms of providing information about shoplifting and a supportive climate for the behaviour (for the recent shoplifters).

This research study also investigated the possibility that the retailers' marketing strategies encourage theft behaviour in shops. Although the overwhelming majority of consumer respondents agreed that it was likely that people shoplift because they are tempted by the displays of goods, because retailers' promotional strategies encourage them to want things they can't afford, and because they have easy access to the goods, as the questions relating to these areas were asked in an indirect manner, and were not included in the school surveys, it is possible that the findings are not reliable (as discussed in Chapter 10, section 10.9.4). Nevertheless, the questions implying that shoplifting may result from current retailing practices provide useful information for retailers.

11.3 Contribution to Knowledge

By taking the approach that shoplifting could be appropriately viewed as a form of consumer behaviour, and by applying a theory of consumer behaviour to situational crime prevention approaches in order to provide a greater understanding of the factors which inhibit or encourage customer theft, this thesis has made a contribution to knowledge in three areas: the theory of planned behaviour, shoplifting research and consumer behaviour and marketing theory.

263

11.3.1 Contribution to the Theory of Planned Behaviour

Although this study strengthens the already considerable empirical support for the theory of planned behaviour, the findings indicate problems with the perceived control measure. The degree of multicollinearity between the attitude and the perceived control measures suggests that these two measures do not represent different underlying dimensions of shoplifting intentions. The analysis indicates that in this study, the variables traditionally used to measure perceived control are more appropriately viewed as attitudes based on knowledge obtained from prior experience of shoplifting, rather than the factors perceived as controlling the behaviour. Thus, the perceived control measure requires further investigation, and the findings from this study suggest that the control beliefs may represent a more appropriate measure of perceived control. In addition, the findings indicate that the theory of planned behaviour provides a suitable method for investigating other types of criminal behaviour (for example, vandalism) through a large-scale quantitative survey of the general population.

11.3.2 Contribution to Shoplifting Research

This thesis has made two major contributions to shoplifting research. Firstly, it has demonstrated a method for investigating how the individual's beliefs and attitudes about shoplifting and shoplifting prevention interact with the retailers' shoplifting prevention strategies to influence the shoplifting decision. Secondly, it has demonstrated a method of operationalising rational choice theory in a large-scale quantitative survey.

This thesis contends that as shoplifting shares certain similarities with "normal" shopping behaviour, an appropriate method of researching shoplifting is to apply a consumer behaviour theory to situational crime prevention approaches, in order to understand the factors which influence shoplifting behaviour, and which inhibit or encourage customer theft. Cognitive theories of consumer behaviour, such as the theory of planned behaviour. are based on the premise that consumers are rational decision-makers who consider the implications of their actions. Thus, these theories are compatible with rational choice theories of crime on which situational crime prevention approaches are based. Although situational crime prevention approaches have been used as the basis for a number of studies into the effectiveness of shoplifting prevention measures, with a few exceptions (Beck and Willis, 1991; 1994; Gill and Turbin, 1997), this research has tended to ignore the perspective of the individual, in terms of how shoplifting prevention measures are perceived by the consumers using shops. Rational choice researchers (Tibbetts, 1997; Tibbetts and Herz, 1996) have used large-scale quantitative studies to investigate the factors influencing shoplifting behaviour. These studies, however, ignore perceptions of the financial benefits of shoplifting and the impact of retail security. Although the studies by Butler (1994) and Carroll and Weaver (1986) provide valuable insights into shoplifters' perceptions of the risks and costs of shoplifting, the small sample sizes limit the extent to which the findings can be generalised to the shoplifting population.

Although Cornish and Clarke (1986a) and Tuck and Riley (1986) suggested over ten years ago that the theory of reasoned action (from which planned behaviour theory was developed) provides an appropriate model for operationalising rational choice theories of crime, this study represents the first attempt to apply either theory to the rational choice perspective in order to investigate a criminal behaviour. In addition, this study represents the first attempt in the UK to investigate shoplifting from a rational choice perspective through the use of a quantitative survey administered to a large sample of randomly selected consumers. By integrating consumer behaviour and situational crime prevention approaches, this study has provided an additional dimension to previous shoplifting research, in that it attempts to understand how the beliefs, attitudes and perceptions of individual consumers interact with retailers' shoplifting prevention strategies to influence the decision of whether or not to steal from shops. Although the suggestion that shoplifting is a "rational" crime is not an entirely new finding, the major value of the approach taken by this study is that it enables the identification of the beliefs underlying shoplifting behaviour. As these beliefs are likely to influence attitudes, moral views and perceptions of social pressure and control, it should be theoretically possible to change these variables by identifying the beliefs which influence them, and formulating strategies to modify either the likelihood or evaluation component of the belief in question. The implications of this for shoplifting prevention are discussed in section 11.4.

This study has made a further contribution to shoplifting research. By categorising consumers by their previous shoplifting experiences, this study demonstrates a method of investigating the views of ex-offenders (the past shoplifters in this study). Although, it might have been assumed that people who have shoplifted in the past would have similar attitudes to current shoplifters, this study indicates otherwise.

11.3.3 Contribution to Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Theory

Despite the financial significance of shoplifting to retailers, and its impact on the shopping experiences of all consumers, little attention has been paid to shoplifting in either the consumer behaviour or the marketing literature. Although consumer researchers have become increasingly interested in deviant or aberrant consumption, and two consumer behaviour models of shoplifting have been hypothesised (Fullerton and Punj, 1993; Hoyer and MacInnis, 1997), there have only been a limited number of shoplifting studies conducted from a consumer behaviour perspective. In addition, although shoplifting has been attributed to modern retailing practices, little attempt has been made to investigate the effect of retailers' marketing strategies on shoplifting. This study represents the first attempt to operationalise a theory of consumer behaviour to research shoplifting and to investigate the impact of retailers' marketing and shoplifting prevention strategies on customer theft.

11.4 Implications of the Findings for Shoplifting Prevention

The findings suggest that a considerable proportion of consumers steal as part of their normal shopping activities, and indicate that shoplifting is perceived as a low risk, low cost crime, despite retailers' investment in shoplifting prevention measures. Although this study has identified the main factors which influenced the shoplifting intentions of the respondents surveyed, it has not identified "ten things retailers must do to prevent shoplifting". Instead, the findings suggest that the prevention of shoplifting is matter of communication, of changing peoples' perceptions about the behaviour, and of thinking about the interaction between marketing and shoplifting prevention strategies.

For the shoplifters in this study shoplifting is a rational crime, in that they perceived the economic benefits of shoplifting to exceed the risks and costs of being caught. This implies that retailers should be able to prevent shoplifting, either by reducing the opportunities for the crime, or by increasing the risks and costs to the offender. This strategy, however, will only be successful if prospective shoplifters believe that there are limited opportunities for shoplifting, and that shoplifting behaviour will result in apprehension and appropriate sanctions.
The overall perception of the shoplifters in this study was that shoplifting is an "easy" crime for which there are plenty of opportunities. Thus, retailers need (a) to consider the potential impact of store layout and merchandising on shoplifting, and (b) to communicate that shoplifting prevention measures are being employed in their stores, by increasing the visibility of these measures and by using signs and notices to make potential shoplifters aware of their presence. Although the shoplifters felt that there was little risk of being caught and punished for shoplifting, the 1996 survey of the British Retail Consortium (Wells and Dryer, 1997) indicates that shoplifting apprehensions have increased by 55% since 1992/93, and that in 1995/96, 65% of apprehended shoplifters were referred to the police. As this suggests that shoplifters' perceptions of the low risks of being caught and punished are not entirely accurate, retailers need to change the view that shoplifting is a low risk, low cost crime, by communicating that a substantial number of shoplifters are caught, and that the majority of apprehended shop thieves are referred to the police.

Being apprehended for shoplifting will only act as a deterrent if shoplifters believe that they will be punished for their criminal activity. The majority of respondents in this study, did not view the penalties for shoplifting as being severe. Consequently, more effective penalties for shoplifting are required. As imprisoning more shoplifters would impose a burden on a criminal justice system already stretched to the limit of its resources, retailers need to consider alternative solutions which inconvenience the offender. For example, increasing the practice of banning shoplifters from shops, displaying photographs of apprehended shoplifters in stores, or civil recovery (Bamfield, 1997), which enables retailers to take civil action against apprehended shop thieves.

Retailers also need to consider the balance between security and sales. Their marketing

communications strategies, which are directed at encouraging customers into their stores to purchase their products, are also attracting customers who steal. As strategies to deter shoplifters may also deter honest consumers, security and marketing communications need to be integrated. Retailers must avoid communicating that "we don't trust our customers" but, at the same time, must communicate to potential shoplifters that shoplifting will not be tolerated, and that shoplifters will be caught and punished. Although retailers' shoplifting prevention measures did not prevent the overwhelming majority of the nonshoplifters in this study from using their shops, any increase in retail security, or in communications to make consumers aware of the risks of shoplifting, must be balanced against the stores' marketing requirements.

The findings indicate that the views of the past shoplifters are more similar to those of the non-shoplifters than to those who are currently shoplifting. This suggests that they have undergone a change in attitudes and beliefs in order to desist from shoplifting behaviour. Thus, shoplifting prevention communication strategies should have two objectives. Firstly, to prevent first-time shoplifters from engaging in the behaviour and secondly, to convert current shoplifters into ex-shoplifters. As the majority of the shoplifters did not view shoplifting as morally wrong and felt little guilt about their behaviour, appeals emphasising the moral and harmful aspects of shoplifting are unlikely to be effective. Thus, anti-shoplifting campaigns should focus on changing the attitudes, beliefs and perceptions of prospective shoplifters by communicating to them that shoplifting is a difficult crime for which there are limited opportunities, and in addition should stress the risks and consequences of apprehension and arrest. The findings indicate that peer pressure plays an important role (particularly for the student respondents), both in

facilitating and inhibiting shoplifting behaviour, and that shoplifters appear to have little respect for the law, and even less for the police. Shoplifting education programmes in schools could be used to address these two areas. These programmes should emphasise that shoplifting is not "cool" and could utilise visits from the police in an attempt to change perceptions of their role, and of law-breaking behaviour in general.

11.5 Areas For Further Research

This research project is essentially an exploratory study to investigate the utility of integrating consumer behaviour and situational crime prevention approaches to provide a greater understanding of customer theft. Although the findings suggest that this is an effective method for researching shoplifting, this study has highlighted several areas which require further investigation, and in addition, further work is required, both in terms of corroborating the findings, and in terms of addressing the limitations of this study.

The findings indicate a low belief in the effectiveness of retail security, and there is limited evidence to suggest that merchandising and store layout may impact on customer theft decisions. Thus, further research is required into how the risks of apprehension can be communicated more effectively to potential customer thieves without deterring honest shoppers. Similarly, further research is required into how merchandise can be effectively protected without discouraging honest shoppers from handling the products. Technological innovations, for example, intelligent packaging, or new methods of benefit denial (eliminating the benefits of shoplifted items) may provide a solution to the latter, but research will be required into shoppers' perceptions of these devices. The findings also suggest that the attitudes and beliefs of the past shoplifters are more similar to those of the non-shoplifters, than of the current shoplifters. As this could have implications for the deterrence of shoplifting, further research is required into this area.

In order to support the reliability and validity of the approach taken by this study, further research could be undertaken. Firstly, a national study, using a cross-section of respondents (both shoppers and school students). Secondly, future research of this kind would also benefit from qualitative interviews with self-admitted shoplifters, both for the development of the questionnaire, and for verifying the results and conclusions.

Finally, the approach taken by this study, utilising the Theory of Planned Behaviour, appears to have considerable utility for investigating customer theft, thus a major area for future research could be the application of this approach to other forms of aberrant consumer behaviour (for example, credit card fraud and customer violence in shops) and other types of retail crime (for example, employee theft, vandalism and burglary).

11.6 Conclusion

Although the true extent of customer theft is not known, due to the problems inherent in researching the behaviour, retail crime surveys indicate that it presents a significant problem to UK retailers, both in terms of lost revenue and in terms of increased investment in retail security. Retailers, however, are not the only victims of shoplifting, honest consumers are also affected. Shoplifting is likely to result in increased prices through retailers attempting to cover the costs of shoplifting, and in addition increases in retail security may adversely impact on the shopping experience. Despite the problems imposed by shoplifting, very little academic attention has been focused in this area. Traditional methods of researching shoplifting, which have focused on the criminological, sociological or psychological aspects of the crime, have produced largely inconclusive

findings, and although researchers have investigated the effectiveness of retail security measures, little is still known about how these measures impact on both shoplifting and non-shoplifting behaviour, or about the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft.

This thesis takes the approach that although shoplifting is criminal behaviour, it could also be viewed as a form of consumer behaviour, in that it involves consumers' conduct in retail settings. It is argued that shoplifting can be understood in terms of "normal" consumer behaviour, as it results from decisions made in the retail environment and retail security measures are likely to impact on all consumers (both honest and dishonest). Thus, an appropriate method of researching the behaviour is to apply a theory used in consumer research to situational crime prevention approaches, in order to explore consumers' attitudes to shoplifting and shoplifting prevention.

Although the view of a shoplifter as a consumer is not entirely new, and several US consumer researchers have suggested that shoplifting should be viewed as a form of consumer behaviour, little attempt has been made either to develop, or to operationalise a consumer behaviour model of shoplifting. This study applies a theory of behaviour used successfully in consumer research to shoplifting, in order to gain an understanding of attitudes to shoplifting and shoplifting prevention, and the beliefs which influence these attitudes, and to identify the factors which encourage or inhibit customer theft. The theory of planned behaviour provides a framework for the systematic investigation of the factors identified as likely to be influential on shoplifting behaviour, and the interaction between these factors, and in addition allows the views of shoplifters to be compared with those who do not shoplift. Thus, the research method has enabled the investigation of the attitudes and beliefs of shoplifters and non-shoplifters, and how these attitudes and

beliefs combine to influence their future shoplifting intentions. The approach taken by this study has enabled a clearer picture of the factors which influence shoplifting behaviour to be obtained. The findings indicate that those who shoplift are relatively uncritical of rule-breaking behaviour, see little wrong in taking goods without paying for them, and are more likely to have peers who are neutral or favourable to shoplifting. They perceive shoplifting to be an exciting and rewarding activity, facilitated by a retail environment which provides opportunities for a behaviour which is believed to be relatively easy and risk-free. Conversely, non-shoplifters are prevented from engaging in the behaviour by their strong anti-shoplifting views and concerns about the views of people important to them who do not approve of shoplifting.

In conclusion, the application of a consumer behaviour research method to situational crime prevention theory represents a new approach to shoplifting research in the UK, and provides an additional dimension to previous research in that it attempts to understand how attitudes to shoplifting and perceptions of the risks and benefits of the behaviour influence the decision to shoplift. The findings from this study demonstrate that the consumer behaviour approach represents a useful strategy for understanding and explaining shoplifting motivation and perceptions of the risks and costs of the crime. The idea that shoplifting can be viewed as a form of consumer behaviour has implications for both shoplifting prevention and for retailers' marketing strategies. It suggests that a multiple prevention strategy, which makes shoplifting "difficult", reduces the benefits from shoplifting and which makes punishment count is required. The major challenge is to change the perception that shoplifting is a low risk, low cost crime by communicating to prospective shoplifters that they will be caught and punished, without

deterring honest consumers from using the shops. It could be argued that impact of security on sales requires a new research agenda which investigates the effect of consumers' perceptions of security on shopping behaviour, and this study represents the first step towards this.

APPENDIX A

THE SURVEY

CONTENTS

The Consumer Survey

A .1	The Elicitation Schedule	276
A.2	The Cover Letter to the Questionnaire	277
A.3	The Consumer Questionnaire	278

The Schools Survey

A .4	Letter to the schools	286
A .5	Letter to the parents	287
A .6	The cover letter to the school questionnaire	288
A.7	The school questionnaire	289

A.1 - THE ELICITATION OF BELIEFS SCHEDULE

- 1. What is your attitude to shoplifting?
- 2. What would be the possible benefits/advantages to you of shoplifting?
- 3. What would be the possible costs/disadvantages to you of shoplifting?
- 4. Are there any individuals or groups of people who would particularly approve or disapprove of you shoplifting?
- 5. What factors would encourage you to shoplift?

6. What factors would discourage you from shoplifting?

```
Sex: Male [] Female []
Age: Under 16 [] 16 - 19 [] 20 - 29 [] 30 - 44 [] 45 - 59 [] 60 - 74 []
Over 75 []
```

A.2 - THE COVER LETTER TO THE CONSUMER QUESTIONNAIRE

CONSUMER QUESTIONNAIRE ON SHOPLIFTING

Please read this letter before completing the attached questionnaire

As you are probably aware, retail crime is becoming an increasing problem to UK retailers, and is one of the areas that is currently being researched by Nene College, Northampton. As part of this research we are investigating the problem of shoplifting (taking something from a shop without paying for it), and in order for us to gain a better understanding of this problem, we would like to find out more about the attitudes of the general public to shoplifting and the anti-shoplifting measures currently being used by retailers.

We would be grateful if you could spare approximately twenty minutes of your time to complete the attached questionnaire. Please complete **all** the questions in the questionnaire, following the instructions at the start of each section. We would appreciate your answering the questions with complete honesty, as we believe that your answers could provide valuable insights into shoplifting behaviour. We would like to point out that there is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions, what we are interested in is your personal opinion. Please return the completed questionnaire to Nene College, using the stamped addressed envelope provided.

Some of the questions are of a personal nature, and we would therefore like to assure you of complete confidentiality and stress that no attempt will be made to associate questionnaires with individuals. None of the questionnaires contain an identifying number, and you are not required to disclose your name on the questionnaire. If you are under sixteen, please check that your parents have no objection to your completing this questionnaire.

Thank you for your time and co-operation

A.3 - THE CONSUMER QUESTIONNAIRE

Why do you think people shoplift? For each statement, please circle the number on the scale that best describes your opinion.

7 = extremely likely, 6 = quite likely, 5 = slightly likely, 4 = neither likely nor unlikely, 3 = slightly unlikely, 2 = quite unlikely, 1 = extremely unlikely.

	L	IKELY			U	ILIKEL	Y
	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite I	Extremely
People shoplift because:							
They can't afford the things they need	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They have psychological problems	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They are under stress	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think they won't get caught	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think they won't get punished if they are caught	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think the benefits from shoplifting are greater than the risks of being caug	g ht 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Retailers' promotional strategies encou them to want things they can't afford	rage 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They are tempted by the displays of goo in the shops	ods 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think that the prices charged by shops are too high	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think that the shops can afford th losses from shoplifting	e 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
As a way of earning a living	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
To get money for drugs and alcohol	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They like the feeling of beating the system	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They think shoplifting is exciting	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They have easy access to the goods they want to steal	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Their friends encourage them to	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

For each of the following statements, please circle the number on the scale that best describes your opinion.

7 = extremely likely, 6 = quite likely, 5 = slightly likely, 4 = neither likely nor unlikely, 3 = slightly unlikely, 2 = quite unlikely, 1 = extremely unlikely.

		Y	UNLIKELY				
	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Extremely
When people shoplift do you							
think that							
They weigh up the pros and cons of shoplifting before they decide to shopl	lift 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They decide to shoplift before they go into the shop	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They shoplift on the spur of the mome being tempted by something they like the shop	ent, in 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They shoplift because they have the opportunity to do so	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
They don't realise that they have shoplifted	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number on the scale.

7 = strongly agree, 6 = quite agree, 5 = slightly agree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 2 = quite disagree, 1 = strongly disagree

		Е	DISAGREE				
	Strongly	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Strongly
If I were a shoplifter, I would never steal from							
A small shop	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
A shop where I knew the manager	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
A shop where I had received good service	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
A shop that had treated me fairly	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Your personal shoplifting behaviour. For each question, please circle the number on the scale which best describes this.

How many tin	nes have you eve	r shoplifted?	ı	
0	1	2	3	4
never	once	twice	four times	more than four times
How many tin	nes have you sho	plifted withi	n the last 12	2 months?
0	1	2	3	4
never	once	twice	four times	more than four times
when was the		oplified?		3
0 never	1	2	 Within the	3
Have you even I have n I have t	r been caught shenever shoplifted meen caught once	oplifting? 1 _3	I have ne I have bee	ver been caught2 en caught more than once4

If you were a shoplifter, would being caught deter you from shoplifting in the future?

unlikely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 likely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

Your beliefs and feelings about shoplifting. For each of the following statements, please circle the number on the scale that best describes your beliefs or feelings about shoplifting.

I intend to shoplift in the future

If I have the opportunity I will shoplift in the future

likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

Most people who are important to me think that I should avoid shoplifting

Most people who are important to me would not approve of me shoplifting

For me, shoplifting is:

good 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 bad extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely right 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 wrong extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely wise 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 foolish extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely rewarding 7 6 5 4 3 2 punishing extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely exciting 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 boring extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely honest 7_6_5_4_3_2_1_dishonest extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely easy 7 6 5 4 3 2 difficult extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely There is plenty of opportunity for me to shoplift true___7___6___5__4___3__2___1_false extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely I can imagine times when I might shoplift even if I hadn't planned to likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely If I shoplift I will be able to get goods without paying for them likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely Getting goods without paying for them is good 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 bad extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely If I shoplift I will be able to save money likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely Saving money by shoplifting is good 7 6 5 4 3 2 bad extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely If I shoplift the shops will pass on the costs of my shoplifting to consumers likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

Shops passing on the costs of shoplifting to consumers is
good 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 bad
extremely quite sugnity netiner sugnity quite extremely
If I shoplift I will get caught by the retailers' security measures
likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
end enery function buginey hereice sugnity quite existency
Being caught by the retailers' security measures is
good/654321_bad extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
If I shoplift I will be arrested for committing a crime likely7654321 unlikely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
Being arrested for committing a crime is
good7654321bad
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
My family think I should avoid shoplifting
unlikely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 likely
extremely quile sugnity netiner sugnity quile extremely
Doing what my family thinks I should do is
good 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 bad
extremely quite sugnity neither sugnity quite extremely
My friends think I should avoid shoplifting
unlikely 7 6 5 4 2 1 likely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
Doing what my friends think I should do is
good7654321bad
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
The police think I should avoid shoplifting
unlikely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 likely
extremely quile slignily neither slignily quile extremely
Doing what the police think I should do is
$good_7$ 6 5 4 3 2 1 bad
extremely quite sugnity netiner sugnity quite extremely
I could shoplift more easily if I thought that there was little risk of being caught

likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely I do think that there is little risk of being caught

I could shoplift more easily if I thought that the security measures used by shops were ineffective

likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

I do think that security measures used by shops are ineffective

agree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly

I could shoplift more easily if I thought that the penalties for being caught shoplifting were not severe

likely 7 6 5 4 3 2 unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

I do think that the penalties for being caught shoplifting are not severe agree 7_____6___5___4___3__2___1__disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly I could shoplift more easily if I were short of money likely 7_____6___5___4___3__2___1___unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely I am often short of money agree 7____6___5___4___3__2___1___disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly I could shoplift more easily if my friends encouraged me to likely 7____6___5___4___3___2___1__unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely My friends often encourage me to shoplift agree 7____6___5___4___3___2___1__disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly Shoplifting is against my principles

disagree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly

I would feel guilty if I shoplifted disagree 7_6_5_4_3_2_1_agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly Security Measures Used by Shops. For each question please circle the number on the scale which best describes the likelihood of these measures deterring people from shoplifting. 7 = extremely likely, 6 = quite likely, 5 = slightly likely, 4 = neither likely nor unlikely, 3 = slightly unlikely, 2 = quite unlikely, 1 = extremely unlikely

	LIKELY						
	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Extremely
Closed circuit television cameras	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Uniformed security guards	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Store detectives	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Electronic tags on the articles	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Ink tags on the articles	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Alarms on the articles	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Friendly and helpful staff	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Anti-shoplifting notices	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Mirrors	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Locked display cases	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
In your opinion which of the	boya sacu	rits n	0.0611 PAG	are the	most of	Faatiwa	in

In your opinion, which of the above security measures are the most effective in deterring shoplifting? Please list the three most effective below.

1 = most effective,	2 = second most effective,	3 = third most effective.
1	2	3

In your opinion	, whic	h of the above se	curity measures	are the most effective in
catching shoplif	iters?	Please list the th	ree most effectiv	e below.
1 = most effective.	$2 = \sec^2$	ond most effective.	3 = third most effect	tive.

1	 2.	 3	·

When you enter a shop, would any of the above security measures make you feel apprehensive? Please tick the appropriate box.

- [] No, none of the security measures listed above would make me feel apprehensive
- [] Yes, the following security measures would make me feel apprehensive (please list the security measures below)

Have you ever no	t used a shop	because	of the security	measures	s used by the
retailer?					
Frequently1	Sometimes	2	Occasionally	<u>3</u> N	Jever4

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number on the scale.

7 = strongly agree, 6 = quite agree, 5 = slightly agree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 2 = quite disagree, 1 = strongly disagree.

	AGI Strongly	REE Ouite	Slightly	Neither	DISAGE Slightly	REE Ouite	Strongly
Shoplifters should be treated more severely	7		6	5 4	3	2	1
Retailers should report all shoplifters to the police	7		6	54	. 3	2	1
All shoplifters should be prosecuted	7		6	54	3	2	1
Shoplifters should be dealt with by the shop they have stolen from, and not by the police	7		6	5 4	3	2	1
The shops should be able to fine the shoplifters they catch	7		6	5 4	3	2	1
Shoplifters should be banned from shops	7		6	5 4	3	2	1
Anti-shoplifting campaigns in the press and on TV would help to reduce shoplifting	7		6	5 4	3	2	1
If I saw some one shoplifting I would report them to the shop	7		6	5 4	3	2	1

Please tick the box that applies to you Sex: Male []] Female []2

 Sex:
 Male []1
 Female []2

 Age:
 Under 16[]1
 16-19 []2
 20-29[]3
 30-44[]4 45-59[]5 60-74[]6 Over 75[]7

 Are you employed:
 Full time []1
 Part time []2
 Housewife/husband []3
 Student []4
 Unemployed []5
 Retired []6

 Please indicate your yearly income
 Under £10,000 []1
 £10,000 - £19,999 []2
 £20,000 - £29,999 []3
 £30,000 or over []4

 How frequently do you go into a shop:
 Image: Note: The second seco

More than once a day []1 Once a day []2 More than once a week []3 Once a week []4

Further Comments on Shoplifting

If you have any comments to make about shoplifting and how it can be prevented, or if you have any experiences of shoplifting please list them below

Thank you for your time and cooperation

A.4 - LETTER TO SCHOOLS

Dear Sir/Madam

I am a PhD student at Nene College of Higher Education Northampton, researching attitudes to shoplifting. I have recently conducted an attitude survey of shoppers in Northampton, and I would like to explore further the findings from my research by conducting a survey of students in Northampton Schools. I am writing to you to ask you if you would be prepared to give me permission to conduct the survey in your school. I enclose a copy of the proposed questionnaire, which would take the students approximately 15 minutes to complete. Completion of the questionnaire would be voluntary, and would, of course, require the permission of the students' parents/guardians, and I also enclose a copy of a draft letter requesting this permission.

As the questionnaire asks the students if they have ever shoplifted, their replies will be completely confidential and anonymous. They will not be required to disclose their name, and there will be no numbers or identifying marks on the questionnaire, which will be returned in a sealed envelope. If possible, I would like to conduct the survey at the beginning of March, and as I would like to spend a few minutes telling the students about the questionnaire, that completion of it is voluntary and that it is completely confidential and anonymous, I would be grateful if I could distribute the questionnaires during a class. Ideally, I would like to administer the questionnaire to approximately 250 students from your school (50 from each age group).

I would like to take this opportunity to assure you that the results from the survey will be completely confidential, and that if they are published your school will not be mentioned by name. I would be pleased to send you a copy of the research findings if you are interested in them.

I would be extremely grateful if you would give me permission to conduct the survey in your school, as I feel that the opinions and attitudes of students will provide important insights into shoplifting behaviour. If you are agreeable to the survey being conducted in your school, I would be pleased to come to the school and discuss the matter further with you. (I can be contacted by telephone on 01754 762077). If you would like to check my credentials as a researcher, please contact Nene College, and ask to speak to the secretary to the Director of the Nene Centre for Research.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

Michele Tonglet

A.5 - LETTER TO PARENTS

Dear Parent/Guardian

As you are probably aware, retail crime is becoming an increasing problem to UK retailers, and is one of the areas that is currently being researched by Nene College, Northampton. As part of this research we are investigating the problem of shoplifting (taking something from a shop without paying for it), and in order for us to gain a better understanding of this problem we would like to find out more about the attitudes of students to shoplifting and the anti-shoplifting measures currently being used by retailers.

We would be grateful if you would give permission for your son/daughter to take part in this research. This would involve them in completing a questionnaire about shoplifting and their attitudes to it during one of their classes at school. Completion of the questionnaire is voluntary, the children have the right to refuse to complete the questionnaire

As the questionnaire will ask your son/daughter if they have ever shoplifted we would like to take this opportunity to assure you that the questionnaire will be completely confidential and anonymous. Your child will not be asked to put his/her name on the questionnaire, and the questionnaire will not contain any identifying numbers or marks and will be returned to us in a sealed envelope.

The questionnaire will be administered in the presence of a class teacher (though the teacher will not have access to the information in the completed questionnaire); in the event of any child becoming upset the teacher will intervene.

We would appreciate your cooperation in allowing your child to take part in this survey as we feel that the attitudes of young people are extremely important to our research. If you agree to your child taking part in this survey please complete the tear- off slip below. Questionnaires will only be given to those children for whom we have received written consent from their parent/guardian.

To be completed by parent/guardian

I agree that my son/daughter can take part in the shoplifting survey

Son/daughters name	
0	

Parent/guardians signature_____

School			

Class	

A.6 - THE COVERING LETTER TO THE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY ON SHOPLIFTING

Please read this letter before completing the attached questionnaire.

Shoplifting, taking something from a shop without paying for it, is a problem for shopkeepers in the UK. We are conducting research into shoplifting at Nene College, and as part of this research we would like to found out more about what students think about shoplifting and the shoplifting prevention measures being used in the shops.

We would be grateful if you would complete the attached questionnaire as we believe that your opinions about shoplifting are very important to our research. However, completion of the questionnaire is voluntary, you do not have to fill it in if you don't want to. If you don't want to complete the questionnaire please return it to myself or the teacher.

As this questionnaire asks you if you have ever shoplifted, and asks for information about your opinions, it is completely confidential and anonymous. You do not have to fill in your name on the questionnaire, and the questionnaire does not have a number. When you have completed the questionnaire please put it in the attached envelope, and seal the envelope. We will then come round and ask you to put the questionnaire into a bag.

We would appreciate you answering all the questions as honestly as you can, as we believe that your opinions can provide us with valuable information about shoplifting behaviour. However, if there is a question you don't want to answer please leave it blank. We would like to point out that there is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions, what we are interested in is your personal opinion.

If there are any questions you don't understand, or you have any problems, please put your hand up, and either myself or the teacher will come and talk to you.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

A.7 - THE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each of the following questions by ticking the box that applies to you. If there are any questions you don't want to answer please leave them blank

1.	Sex:	Male []1	Fem	ale	[]2				
2.	Age:	Under 10 year 10 years old 11 years old	rs old	[]1 []2 []3	12 year 13 year 14 year	rs old rs old s old	[]4 []5 []6	15 years old 16 years old Over 16 years old	[]7 []8 []9
3.	How mone	much money do y from a part Less than £5 £5 to £10	o you ha time jol [] []	ave t b like 1 2	o spend e a paper	each v round £10 to Over	week (in d)? o £15 £15	ncluding pocket mone [] 3 [] 4	y and
4.	How often do you normally go into Less than once a week Once a week More than once a week			nto a sho k ek	p? []1 []2 []3		Once a day More than once a c	[]4 iay []5	
5.	Have	you ever shopl	ifted?	Y	es []1	N	0 []2		

If you answered yes to the above question please answer questions 6 to 11 ticking the box that applies to you, then complete the rest of the questionnaire. If you have never shoplifted please go to question 12 and complete the rest of the questionnaire.

- 6. How old were you when you first shoplifted? (Please write your age on the line below)
- 7. How many times have you shoplifted?
 Once []1 Three times []3
 Twice []2 Four times []4

More than four times []5

8. When was the last time you shoplifted?

Can't remember	[]1	1 to 5 years ago	[]3
Over 5 years ago	[]2	Within the last 12 months	[]4

9. How many times have you shoplifted within the last 12 months?

Never []1	Twice	[]3	Four times	[]5
Once []2	Three times	[]4	More than four times	[]6

- 10. Have you ever been caught shoplifting by the police or shopkeepers?No []1 I have been caught once []2 I have been caught more than once []3
- 11. Would being caught stop you from shoplifting in the future? Yes []1 No []2 I don't know []3

This section asks how you feel about shoplifting. Please answer each question by putting a circle around the number which best describes how you feel.

- 12. How likely is it that you will shoplift in the future likely 7 6 5 4 4 3 2 1 1 unlikely very quite slightly neither slightly quite very
 13. If I have the chance I will shoplift in the future agree 7 6 5 4 1 3 2 1 disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly
 14. Most people who are important to me think that I should avoid shoplifting disagree 7 6 5 4 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly
 14. Most people who are important to me think that I should avoid shoplifting disagree 7 6 5 4 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly
 15. Most people who are important to me would not approve of me shoplifting disagree 7 6 5 4 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly
- 16. I think shoplifting is:

good	7	6	5	4	3	2	_1	bad
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
right_	7	6	5	4	3	2	_1	wrong
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
honest	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	dishonest
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
rewarding	7	6	5	4	3	2	1_	punishing
	very	quite	slightl	y neithe	r slightly	y quite	ver	V
easy_	7	6	5	4	3	_2	1	difficult
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	

17. I think shoplifting is an exciting thing to do

18. I think shoplifting is a stupid thing to do.

disagree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly

19. I think that there are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting agree__7__6__5__4__3_2_1_disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly

	In I shopint I will be a		t times	······································	pujing K	Ji ulom		
	likely7_	6	5	4	3	2	1	unlikely
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	- 2
						-	2	
21.	If I shoplift I will be al	ole to sa	ve mone	v				
	likelv 7	6	5	4	3	2	1	unlikely
	verv	auite	slightly	neither	slightly	 mite		unning
	,	4	28		5	quite	very	
22	If I shoplift the shops	will out	un the n	rices to (other ous	tomore		
22.	unlikely 7		1 5			2 2	1	likely
	verv	 auite	slightly	neither	slightly	2 auite	verv	
		4			<i></i>	quite	very	
23	If I shoplift I will get a	aught						
23.	unlikely 7		1 5	1 4		2		liles]-
			S	4	S		I	
	very	quite	sugnity	neimer	sugniy	quite	very	/
24	If I shonlift I will be b	reaking	the law					
27.	unlikely 7			1 1		2	1	likolo
	uninkery/		_lJ	noithor	J		1	
	strongty	quite	sugnity	neimer	sugnity	quite	sirong	<i>siy</i>
25	TOT the self A Tassill has a							
25.	If I snopiiπ I will be a	rrested I	or comn	nitting a	спте	-		
	unlikely7	6	5	4	3	2	I	_likely
	very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
26.	Saving money by shop	olifting is	S					
26.	Saving money by shop good7	olifting is	s 5	4	3	2	1	_bad
26.	Saving money by shop good7 very	olifting is 6 <i>quite</i>	s 5 slightly	4 neither	3 slightly	2 quite	1 very	_bad
26.	Saving money by shop good7 very	olifting is 6 quite	s 5 slightly	4 neither	3 slightly	2 quite	1 very	_bad
26. 27.	Saving money by shop good7 <i>very</i> Getting things withou	blifting is 6 <i>quite</i> t paying	s 5 <i>slightly</i> for then	4 <i>neither</i> n is	3 slightly	2 quite	1 very	_bad
26. 27.	Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good 7	blifting is _l6 <i>quite</i> t paying 6	s _ 5 <i>slightly</i> for then 5	4 <i>neither</i> n is 4	3 slightly	2 quite 2	1 very	_bad
26. 27.	Saving money by shop good7 Getting things withou good7 verv	blifting is 6 <i>quite</i> t paying 6 <i>quite</i>	s 5 for then 5 slightly	neither	3 slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 very	_bad _bad
26. 27.	Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite	s _l5 <i>slightly</i> for then _l5 <i>slightly</i>	4 neither n is 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite _2 quite	1 very 1 very	_bad _bad
26. 27. 28	Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the s	blifting is <u>6</u> <i>quite</i> t paying <u>6</u> <i>quite</i> prices to	s <u>slightly</u> for then <u>5</u> <u>slightly</u> o other ci	4 neither n is 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite : of show	1 very 1 very	_bad _bad
26. 27. 28	Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p	blifting is <u>6</u> <u>quite</u> t paying <u>6</u> <u>quite</u> prices to	s <u>slightly</u> for then <u>5</u> <u>slightly</u> o other cu	n is neither n is <u>4</u> neither ustomers	3 slightly 3 slightly sbecause	2 quite 2 quite e of shop	1 very 1 very plifting	_bad _bad is
26. 27. 28.	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very 	blifting is <u>6</u> t paying <u>6</u> quite prices to <u>6_</u> avite	s slightly for then <u>5</u> slightly other cr <u>5</u> slightly	4 neither n is 4 neither ustomers 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly sbecause 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite cof shop 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _is _bad
26. 27. 28	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very 	blifting is <u>quite</u> t paying <u>quite</u> <u>quite</u> prices to <u>quite</u> <u>quite</u>	s slightly for then <u>5</u> slightly other cu <u>5</u> slightly	4 neither n is 4 neither ustomers 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly because 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite cof sho 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _is _bad
26. 27. 28	Saving money by shop good7 Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very Cotting cought shopli	blifting is <u>quite</u> t paying <u>quite</u> <u>quite</u> prices to <u>quite</u> quite	s slightly for them 5 slightly o other cu 5 slightly	4 neither n is 4 ustomers 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly sbecause 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite cof sho 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _is _bad
26. 27. 28 29	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the good7 very Getting caught shopling 	Diffing is	s slightly for then <u>5</u> slightly o other cu <u>5</u> slightly	neither n is <u>4</u> neither ustomers <u>4</u> neither	3 slightly 3 slightly sbecause 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite cof sho 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _bad
26. 27. 28 29	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the good7 very Getting caught shoplin good7 	Diffing is $quite$ quite quite quite quite quite quite quite quite	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other cu 5 slightly 5 5 5 5	neither n is <u>4</u> neither ustomers <u>4</u> neither	3 slightly 3 slightly slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite cof sho 2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _bad _bad
26. 27. 28 29	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very Getting caught shopling good7 very 	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other cr 5 slightly 5 5 5 5	4 neither n is 4 ustomers 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very	_bad _bad _bad _bad
26. 27. 28 29	 Saving money by shop good7	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite	s slightly for them 5 slightly o other cu 5 slightly slightly	neither n is <u>4</u> neither ustomers <u>4</u> neither neither	3 slightly slightly because 3 slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite cof shop 2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very 1 very	_bad _bad _bad _bad
26. 27 28 29 30	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very Getting caught shopling good7 very Breaking the law is 	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other ct 5 slightly slightly	4 n is 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very 1 very	_bad _bad _bad _bad
 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the good7 very Getting caught shoplin good7 very Breaking the law is good7 	Diffing is 6 quite t paying $6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite 6$	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other cu 5 slightly 5 _	4 neither n is 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very 1 very	_bad is _bad _bad
26. 27. 28 29 30	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very Getting caught shoplit good7 very Breaking the law is good7 very 	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite fting is 6 quite	s slightly for them 5 slightly o other cu 5 slightly 1 5 slightly 1 5 slightly	4 neither n is 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite	l very plifting l very l very	_bad _bad _is _bad bad
 26. 27. 28 29 30 	 Saving money by shop good7 very Getting things withou good7 very Shops putting up the p good7 very Getting caught shopling good7 very Breaking the law is good7 very 	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6_ quite 6_ quite	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other ct 5 slightly 1 5 slightly 1 5 slightly	4 neither n is 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite _2 quite _2 quite _2 quite _2 quite	1 very 1 very 1 very 1 very	_bad is bad _bad bad
 26. 27. 28 29 30 31 	 Saving money by shop good7	blifting is 6 quite t paying 6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite fting is 6 quite muiting	s slightly for then 5 slightly o other cc 5 slightly 1 5 slightly slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	4 neither n is 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly 3 slightly slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	_2 quite _2 quite 2 quite _2 quite _2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very 1 very 1 ver	_bad is bad _bad bad
 26. 27. 28. 29 30 31 	 Saving money by shop good7	Diffing is 6 quite t paying $6 quite prices to 6 quite fting is 6 quite mmitting 6$	s slightly for then <u>5</u> slightly o other cu <u>5</u> slightly <u>15</u> slightly <u>25</u> slightly <u>26</u> <u>26</u> <u>27</u> <u>26</u> <u>26</u> <u>27</u> <u>26</u> <u>27</u> <u>26</u> <u>27</u> <u>26</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u> <u>28</u>	4 n is 4 neither ustomers 4 neither 4 neither 4 neither	3 slightly slightly because 3 slightly 3 slightly 3 slightly	2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 quite 2 2 quite	1 very 1 plifting 1 very 1 very	_bad _bad _bad bad bad

,

32.	My family think I s	hould a	void sh	oplifting					
	unlikely_	_7	6	5	4	3	2	1	likely
	٢	rery	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
33.	My friends think I	should	avoid sl	noplifting	5				
	unlikely_	7	6	5	41	3	_2	1	likely
		very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
24		.1 1.1	1 . 1	1.0.					
<i>3</i> 4.	I ne police think I s	snould	avoid sr	iopliffing	5				
	unlikely	7	6	5	4	3	2	_1	likely
		very	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	very	
25			-1 T -1-	1					
33.	Doing what my far				.S			_	
	good	/	6)	4	3	2	l	_bad
		very	quite	sugnity	neither	sugnuy	quite	very	
36	Doing what my frid	ands th	ink I ch	wid do i	c .				
30.	Doing what my my				5	1 2 1	2	1	had
	good	<u> </u>	0	slightly	neither	slightly	L	1	
		very	quite	Singhing	nermer	Sugnity	quite	very	
37	Doing what the no	lice thi	nk I sho	uld do is					
27.	2011.9	1 7	6	5	1 4	3	2	1 1	had
	good	verv	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	 quite	verv	
		2		0.		0,	1		
38.	I would be more lik	ely to a	shoplift	if I thou	ight that	there wa	as little	risk o	of being
	caught	2	•		•				U
	agree	7	6	5	4	3	2	11	disagree
		strongly	, quite	slight	'y neither	r slightly	quite	stron	gly
39.	I would be more lik	ely to s	shoplift	if I thoug	ght that t	the securi	ity meas	sures in	n the shops
	weren't very good	at cate	hing sh	oplifters					
	agree	7	6_	5	4	3	2	1	disagree
		strongly	, quite	slightly	neither	r slightly	quite	strong	gly
40.	I would be more li	kely to	shoplift	if I thou	ght that	I would	not be s	severel	y punished
	if I were caught.	-							••
	agre	e/_		J	4	er slight			alsagree
		sirong	iy qui	ie sugmi	y nenn	er sugnu	y quite	51101	igiy
41	I would be more li	kelv to	shoplift	if I wer	e short c	of money			
чı.		ree 7		5			1 2	1	disagree
	ag	strong	lv auit	e slight	lv neithe	er slightly	ouite	 stroi	usugi oc
		20.018	., 1	8	,		7		-0-7
42	I would be more li	kelv to	shoplif	t if my fri	ends en	couraged	me to	do it	
	agre	æ 7	6	5	4	3	2	1	disagree
	-8-	strong	ly quite	slight	ly neithe	er slightly	quite	stro	ngly
		Ū	-	-		_			
43.	I do think that the	re is litt	le risk o	of being	caught s	shoplifting	g		
	agree_	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	_disagree
		strongly	quite	e slight	ly neith	er slightl	y quite	e str	ongly

44. I do think that security measures in the shops are good at catching shoplifters disagree___7___6__5__4___3__2__1_agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 45. I do think that I will be severely punished if I am caught shoplifting agree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 46. I am often short of money agree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 47. My friends often encourage me to shoplift agree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 disagree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 48. It would be morally wrong for me to shoplift disagree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 49. I would feel guilty if I shoplifted disagree 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 agree strongly quite slightly neither slightly quite strongly 50. Which of the following security measures do you think would stop people from shoplifting? Please circle the number which best describes your opinion. Very likely Quite likely Neither Quite unlikely Very unlikely CCTV (security cameras) 4 3 2 5 1 4 5 Security guards 3 2 1 Electronic tags on the goods 5 4 3 2 1 Store detectives 5 4 3 2 1 51. Would any of the above security measures make you feel worried? Yes_1___ No__2__ Don't know_3___

52. Have any of the above security measures ever stopped you from using a shop? Yes_1___ No___2__ Don't know__3___

If you want to say anything about shoplifting please use the space below

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

FINDINGS FROM THE ELICITATIONS

To obtain the beliefs salient to shoplifting, three elicitations were conducted. The numbers of respondents mentioning each belief are summarised in Table B1

Elicitation 1: 12 first year Business Studies Students, aged 18 - 20. 7 female and 5 male. Elicitation 2: 15 first year Business Studies Students, aged 18-20. 9 female and 6 male. Elicitation 3: 25 consumers interviewed in the shopping centre of Northampton. 12 males and 13 females. Under 16 Age range: 3 16-19 4 20-29 9 30-44 5 45-59 3 60-74 1

Economic beliefs include: free goods, cheap goods, saving money Consequences of being caught include: arrest, prison, fines, police record

Table B1 Summary of the Elicitation Beliefs

	Elicitation 1	Elicitation 2	Elicitation 3
Attitude clever/stupid bad wrong/against the law exciting easy boredom moral standards	8 7 4 4 4 2 5	5 9 6 2 4 1 8	2 14 16 2 5 0 13
Outcome beliefs Economic benefits consequences of being caught increased prices risks of being caught	11 9 7 4	13 12 5 10	21 18 8 13
Referent beliefs family friends police	10 7 5	14 6 4	19 12 9
Control beliefs shop security punishment being short of money peer pressure low risk of being caught	11 10 8 5 3	9 10 11 8 9	14 8 12 5 9

In addition to the beliefs detailed in the above table, the respondents also mentioned: friendly and unhelpful staff, revenge for being conned and the stupidity of the store, the shops deserve it, religious beliefs, drugs and alcohol.

APPENDIX C

THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE CONSUMER SURVEY

C .1	Shoplifting Motivation	296
C.2	The Decision to Shoplift	300
C.3	Attitudes to Retailers	302
C.4	Effectiveness of Retail Security	303
C.5	Controlling Shoplifters and Shoplifting	307
C.6	The Theory of Planned Behaviour - Global Measures	309
C.7	The Theory of Planned Behaviour -Belief Measures	313

C.1 SHOPLIFTING MOTIVATION

Table C.	<u>reop</u>	ie snopi	it becaus	se they can	<u>n't anor</u>	<u>i the th</u>	ings they n	leed	
]	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	16.1%	39.6%	25.9%	4.6%	6.2%	5.3%	2.2%	0.2%	
Non	13. 7%	40.0%	25.6%	4.6%	6.7%	6.7%	2.5%	0.4%	
Past	16.2%	40.0%	28.6%	4.8%	5.7%	2.9%	1.9%	-	
Recent	40.7%	33.3%	18.5%	3.7%	3.7%	-	-	-	

Table C1 People shoplift because they can't afford the things they need

Table C2	People shoplift beca	use they have	psychological problems
----------	----------------------	---------------	------------------------

]	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	5.0%	18.5%	31.2%	11.5%	15.8%	12.5%	5.5%	-	
Non	5.6%	20.0%	31.6%	10.2%	15.8%	12.3%	4.6%	-	
Past	4.8%	16.2%	28.6%	15.2%	14.3%	14.3%	6.7%	-	
Recent	-	11.1%	37.0%	11.1%	22.2%	7.4%	11.1%	-	

Table C3People shoplift because they are under stress

]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	2.6%	16.5%	31.4%	14.9%	17.0%	10.6%	7.0%	-
Non	3.5%	14.7%	34.0%	13.3%	16.1%	10.9%	7.4%	-
Past	-	22.9%	26.7%	18.1%	17.1%	11.4%	3.8%	-
Recent	3.7%	11.1%	22.2%	18.5%	25.9%	3.7%	14.8%	-

Table C4	People sho	olift because	they think	they won'	t get caught
----------	------------	---------------	------------	-----------	--------------

		LIKELY		}		UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	31.4%	31.4%	19.7%	7.9%	5.3%	3.1%	1.2%	-	
Non	32.6%	30.2%	20.7%	8.1%	3.9%	3.5%	1.1%	-	
Past	22.9%	36.2%	19.0%	9.5%	7.6%	2.9%	1.9%	-	
Recent	51.9%	25.9%	11.1%	-	11.1%	-	-	-	

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	16.1%	25.4%	21.8%	11.5%	9.1%	11.5%	4.6%	-	
Non	15.8%	28.1%	22.1%	11.9%	7.7%	10.5%	3.9%	-	
Past	9.5%	20.0%	21.9%	13.3%	14.3%	14.3%	6.7%	-	
Recent	44.4%	18.5%	18.5%	-	3.7%	11.1%	3.7%	-	

 Table C5
 People shoplift because they think they won't get punished if they are caught

Table C6People shoplift because they think the benefits from shoplifting are
greater than the costs of being caught

]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	25.9%	27.8%	18.7%	12.2%	7.9%	6.2%	1.0%	0.2%
Non	27.7%	27.0%	18.2%	12.3%	8.1%	5.6%	1.1%	-
Past	16.2%	28.6%	21.9%	15.2%	8.6%	7.6%	1.0%	1.0%
Recent	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	-	3.7%	7.4%	-	-

Table C7People shoplift because the retailers' promotional strategies
encourage them to want things they can't afford

]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	23.0%	24.0%	23.0%	12.5%	7.0%	6.0%	4.6%	-
Non	21.4%	23.9%	22.8%	10.9%	8.4%	7.0%	5.6%	-
Past	25.7%	23.8%	21.0%	18.1%	3.8%	4.8%	2.9%	-
Recent	29.6%	25.9%	33.3%	7.4%	-	3.7%	<u> </u>	-

Table C8People shoplift because they are tempted by the displays of goods in
the shops

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	14.9%	30.9%	28.5%	9.4%	7.2%	7.2%	1.9%	-
Non	16.8%	27.7%	28.8%	9.5%	7.7%	7.4%	2.1%	-
Past	8.6%	37.1%	27.6%	9.5%	7.6%	7.6%	1.9%	-
Recent	18.5%	40.7%	29.6%	7.4%	3.7%	-	-	-

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	10.6%	13.4%	25.9%	18.9%	11.5%	12.2%	7.0%	0.5%	
Non	10.5%	11.6%	24.9%	18.6%	11.9%	14.4%	8.1%	-	
Past	6.7%	19.0%	25.7%	19.0%	13.3%	9.5%	5.7%	1.0%	
Recent	25.9%	11.1%	37.0%	22.2%	-	-	-	3.7%	

 Table C9
 People shoplift because they think the prices charged by shops are too high

Table C10People shoplift because they think the shops can afford the losses

]	LIKELY		neither sl		missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	extremely	
All	24.5%	32.1%	21.1%	11.5%	5.5%	3.8%	1.4%	-
Non	24.2%	34.4%	21.4%	9.8%	5.3%	3.9%	1.1%	-
Past	26.7%	30.5%	16.2%	13.3%	5.7%	4.8%	2.9%	-
Recent	18.5%	14.8%	37.0%	22.2%	-	7.4%	-	-

Table C11People shoplift as a way of earning a living

]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	13.4%	23.0%	25.7%	11.8%	10.3%	10.8%	4.1%	1.0%
Non	12.6%	23.2%	26.3%	11.2%	10.9%	10.9%	3.9%	1.0%
Past	13.3%	21.0%	24.8%	13.3%	9.5%	12.4%	4.8%	2.0%
Recent	22.2%	29.6%	22.2%	11.1%	7.4%	3.7%	3.7%	-

Table C12People shoplift to get money for drugs and alcohol

]	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	29.3%	27.8%	24.5%	10.1%	6.0%	1.4%	1.0%	-	
Non	31.6%	25.3%	23.9%	10.9%	6.7%	1.4%	0.4%	-	
Past	23.8%	37.1%	22.9%	8.6%	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	-	
Recent	25.9%	18.5%	37.0%	7.4%	-	7.4%	3.7%	-	

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	18.9%	29.3%	30.5%	9.8%	7.0%	2.9%	1.4%	0.2%	
Non	20.4%	30.5%	29.1%	8.8%	6.7%	2.8%	1.4%	0.4%	
Past	15.2%	28.6%	32.4%	13.3%	5.7%	3.8%	1.0%	-	
Recent	18.5%	18.5%	37.0%	7.4%	14.8%	-	3.7%	-	

Table C13People shoplift because they like the feeling of beating the system

Table C14People shoplift because they think it's exciting

]					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	25.95	40.0%	24.7%	3.8%	2.6%	1.9%	0.7%	0.2%
Non	22.5%	42.5%	25.3%	4.6%	2.8%	1.4%	1.1%	-
Past	27.6%	37.1%	24.8%	2.9%	2.9%	3.8%	-	1.0%
Recent	55.6%	25.9%	18.5%	-	-	-	-	-

Table C15People shoplift because they have easy access to the goods they want
to steal

]]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	24.5%	37.9%	22.8%	10.6%	2.6%	1.7%	-	-
Non	24.6%	40.7%	23.5%	7.0%	1.8%	2.5%	-	-
Past	18.1%	30.5%	23.8%	21.9%	5.7%	-	-	-
Recent	48.1%	37.0%	11.1%	11.1%	-	3.7%	3.7%	-

 Table C16
 People shoplift because their friends encourage them to

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	23.3%	33.6%	28.1%	8.2%	3.6%	1.4%	1.9%	-	
Non	22.5%	33.3%	29.5%	8.1%	3.5%	1.1%	2.1%	-	
Past	22.9%	34.3%	27.6%	7.6%	3.8%	2.9%	1.0%	-	
Recent	33.3%	33.3%	14.8%	11.1%	-	3.7%	3.7%	-	

C.2 THE DECISION TO SHOPLIFT

Table C17People weigh up the pros and cons of shoplifting before deciding to
shoplift

	I	LIKELY		neither		ELY	missing	
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	5.0%	14.1%	23.5%	7.7%	15.8%	19.4%	14.1%	0.2%
Non	4.9%	14.0%	20.7%	8.1%	17.2%	19.6%	15.1%	0.4%
Past	6.7%	15.2%	21.9%	8.6%	14.3%	21.0%	12.4%	-
Recent	-	11.1%	59.3%	-	7.4%	11.1%	11.1%	-

 Table C18
 People decide to shoplift before they go into the shop

]	LIKELY		neither		missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	24.7%	36.9%	22.8%	4.8%	7.2%	2.9%	0.5%	0.2%
Non	27.4%	36.5%	21.1%	3.9%	7.4%	2.8%	0. 7%	0.4%
Past	21.0%	36.2%	23.8%	8.6%	7.6%	2.9%	-	-
Recent	11.1%	44.4%	37.0%	-	3.7%	3. 7%	-	-

Table C19People shoplift on the spur of the moment

]	LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	12.2%	30.2%	34.8%	8.6%	7.0%	4.8%	2.2%	0.2%
Non	11.9%	28.8%	34.0%	8.8%	7.7%	5.6%	2.8%	0.4%
Past	13.3%	28.6%	39.0%	8.6%	5.7%	3.8%	1.0%	-
Recent	11.1%	51.9%	25.9%	7.4%	3.7%	-	_	-

Table C20 Pee	ople shoplift be	ecause they l	have the opp	portunity to do so
---------------	------------------	---------------	--------------	--------------------

	[LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely]	
All	17.7%	41.2%	25.4%	8.2%	4.8%	1.7%	0.7%	0.2%	
Non	18.6%	36.5%	26.7%	9.8%	4.9%	2.1%	1.1%	0.4%	
Past	12.4%	52.4%	23.8%	5.7%	4.8%	1.0%	-	-	
Recent	29.6%	48.1%	18.5%	-	3.7%	-	-	-	

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	1.4%	2.6%	9.8%	11.5%	12.2%	18.7%	43.4%	0.2%
Non	2.1%	3.2%	10.9%	9.1%	11.6%	18.2%	44.6%	0.4%
Past	-	1.9%	8.6%	18.1%	11.4%	17.1%	42.9%	-
Recent	-	-	3.7%	11.1%	22.2%	29.6%	33.3%	-

 Table C21
 People don't realise they have shoplifted

C.3 ATTITUDE TO RETAILERS

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	26.1%	13.2%	14.1%	14.9%	8.4%	10.1%	12.5%	0.7%
Non	30.9%	13.7%	9.1%	15.1%	7.0%	11.2%	11.9%	1.1%
Past	19.0%	11.4%	22.9%	12.4%	12.4%	8.6%	13.3%	-
Recent	3.7%	14.8%	33.3%	22.2%	7.4%	3.7%	14.8%	-

 Table C22
 I would never steal from a small shop

 Table C23
 I would never steal from a shop where I knew the manager

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly]	
All	39.8%	15.6%	11.8%	11.5%	7.0%	5.5%	8.4%	0.5%	
Non	44.2%	13.3%	10.9%	10.5%	6.7%	6.0%	7.7%	0.7%	
Past	32.4%	21.9%	12.4%	11.4%	8.6%	4.8%	8.6%	-	
Recent	22.2%	14.8%	18.5%	22.2%	3.7%	3.7%	14.8%	-	

Table C24	I would never steal from	a shop where	I had received	good service
-----------	--------------------------	--------------	----------------	--------------

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	23.0%	11.8%	16.5%	16.1%	10.8%	9.8%	11.5%	0.5%
Non	28.1%	9.5%	15.1%	16.1%	8.4%	11.6%	10.5%	0.7%
Past	14.3%	16.2%	21.0%	15.2%	15.2%	6.7%	11.4%	-
Recent	3.7%	18.5%	14.8%	18.5%	18.5%	3.7%	22.2%	

Table C25	I would never steal	from a shop that	t had treated me fairly
	I Would heve been		

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	24.2%	12.5%	16.3%	15.6%	11.3%	9.4%	10.3%	0.5%	
Non	28.4%	10.9%	14.4%	15.4%	9.1%	10.9%	10.2%	0.7%	
Past	18.1%	17.1%	19.0%	14.3%	16.2%	7.6%	7.6%	-	
Recent	3.7%	11.1%	25.9%	22.2%	14.8%	-	22.2%	-	

C.4 - THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RETAIL SECURITY

]	LIKELY		neither		missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	extremely	
All	34.5%	43.9%	15.3%	2.4%	0.7%	2.2%	0. 7%	0.2%
Non	34.7%	45.6%	15.1%	1.8%	0.4%	1.8%	0.4%	0.4%
Past	34.3%	41.0%	16.2%	3.8%	1.0%	2.9%	1.0%	-
Recent	33.3%	37.0%	14.8%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	-

Table C26 Likelihood of CCTV deterring people from shoplifting

Table C27	Likelihood	of	uniformed	security	guards	deterring	people from
	shoplifting					-	

	LIKELY					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	26.1%	39.1%	21.6%	3.8%	4.6%	3.6%	1.0%	0.2%
Non	25.6%	41.4%	21.1%	4.6%	3.5%	3.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Past	23.8%	33.3%	24.8%	1.9%	8.6%	4.8%	2.9%	-
Recent	40.7%	37.0%	14.8%	3.7%	-	3.7%	-	-

 Table C28
 Likelihood of store detectives deterring people from shoplifting

	LIKELY					UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	23.0%	30. 7%	27.3%	7.2%	5.8%	4.3%	1.2%	0.5%	
Non	23.2%	31.2%	27.0%	8.1%	6.3%	3.2%	0.4%	0.7%	
Past	22.9%	32.4%	22.9%	4.8%	5.7%	7.6%	3.8%	-	
Recent	22.2%	18.5%	48.1%	7.4%	-	3.7%	-	-	

Table C29	Likelihood of e	lectronic tags	deterring	people from	shoplifting
-----------	-----------------	----------------	-----------	-------------	-------------

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	46.3%	31.7%	14.1%	2.9%	2.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.2%	
Non	48.4%	31.9%	13.0%	3.5%	2.1%	0. 7%	-	0.4%	
Past	41.9%	29.5%	18.1%	1.9%	3.8%	1.9%	2.9%	-	
Recent	40.7%	37.0%	11.1%	-	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	-	
	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing	
--------	-----------	-------	----------	--------------	----------	-------	-----------	---------	
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	30.2%	27.8%	19.7%	10.1%	7.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.5%	
Non	30.5%	26.0%	21.8%	9.1%	7.7%	2.5%	1.8%	0.7%	
Past	27.6%	29.5%	16.2%	14.3%	5.7%	1.9%	4.8%	-	
Recent	37.0%	40.7%	11.1%	3. 7%	3.7%	3.7%	-	-	

Table C30 Likelihood of ink tags deterring people from shoplifting

 Table C31
 Likelihood of alarms on articles deterring people from shoplifting

	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	7
All	49.6%	30.9%	12.2%	2.6%	2.4%	1.0%	1.0%	0.2%
Non	52.6%	30.2%	12.3%	1.8%	1.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Past	41.9%	35.2%	11.4%	3.8%	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	-
Recent	48.1%	22.2%	14.8%	7.4%	3.7%		3.7%	-

 Table C32
 Likelihood of friendly and helpful staff deterring people from shoplifting

	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	5.5%	8.6%	18.5%	19. 7%	14.9%	14.1%	18.0%	0.7%
Non	7.0%	8.4%	16.8%	19.3%	13.0%	16.1%	18.6%	0.7%
Past	2.9%	8.6%	20.0%	22.9%	17.1%	11.4%	17.1%	-
Recent	-	11.1%	29.6%	11.1%	25.9%	3.7%	14.8%	3.7%

Table C33Likelihood of anti-shoplifting notices deterring people from
shoplifting

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	2.9%	3.1%	12.0%	12.7%	17.3%	18.5%	33.3%	0.2%
Non	4.2%	2.8%	12.6%	14.0%	17.5%	18.2%	30.2%	0.7%
Past	-	3.8%	10.5%	11.4%	11.4%	18.1%	44.8%	-
Recent	-	3.7%	11.1%	3.7%	37.0%	22.2%	22.2%	-

	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	1
All	4.1%	9.4%	25.9%	13.4%	20.4%	15.3%	11.3%	0.2%
Non	5.3%	9.5%	27.0%	14.4%	21.1%	13.3%	9.1%	0.4%
Past	1.9%	8.6%	21.9%	13.3%	17.1%	21.9%	15.2%	-
Recent	-	11.1%	29.6%	3.7%	25.9%	11.1%	18.5%	-

 Table C34
 Likelihood of mirrors deterring people from shoplifting

Table C35	Likelihood of locked di	splay cases deterring	people from shoplifting
			people in our biropinicing

	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely]
All	36.2%	33.6%	15.3%	6.2%	2.9%	2.6%	2.4%	0.7%
Non	34.7%	34.7%	14.7%	5.6%	3.5%	3.5%	2.5%	0.7%
Past	37.1%	31.4%	18.1%	8.6%	1.0%	1.0%	1.9%	1.0%
Recent	48.1%	29.6%	11.1%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	-	-

Table C36 Three most effective security measures for DETERRIN	G shoplifters
---	---------------

Non-shoplifters		Past		Recent	
Security measure	% naming measure	Security measure	% naming measure	Security measure	% naming measure
CCTV	65%	CCTV	61%	Uniformed security	70%
Electronic tags	60%	Electronic tags	59%	CCTV	67%
Alarms	49%	Alarms	53%	Electronic tags	63%

Table (5) Thile most chechive security moustries for only on the operator	Table C37	Three most effective security measures for CA?	FCHING shoplifter
---	-----------	--	--------------------------

Non-shoplifters		Past		Recent		
Security measure	% naming measure	Security measure	% naming measure	Security measure	% naming measure	
CCTV	81%	CCTV	81%	CCTV	74%	
Store detectives	58%	Store detectives	60%	Electronic tags	70%	
Uniformed security	55%	Uniformed security	51%	Uniformed security	52%	

	All	Non	Past	Recent
CCTV	25.9%	21.8%	37.1%	25.9%
Guards	24.5%	19.3%	33.3%	44.4%
Detectives	8.4%	8.1%	10.5%	-
Electronic tags	9.1%	7.0%	12.4%	18.5%
Ink tags	1.4%	0.7%	2.9%	3.7%
Alarms	7.4%	4.6%	7.6%	7.4%
Staff	1.2%	1.0%	1.9%	-
Notices	0.5%	-	1.0%	3.7%
Mirrors	2.6%	1.8%	1.0%	11.1%
Locked displays	1.7%	1.4%	2.9%	-
All of them	5.5%	5.3%	5.7%	7.4%
None of them	56.4%	62.8%	42.9%	40.7%
Missing	1.2%	1.8%	-	-

Table C38% of respondents stating that the security measure would make them
feel apprehensive

Table C39Have you ever not used a shop because of the security measures used
by retailers?

	All	Non	Past	Recent	
Frequently	1.4%	0.7%	3.8%	-	
Sometimes	3.6%	2.8%	3.8%	11.1%	
Occasionally	9.4%	5.6%	14.3%	29.6%	
Never	85.4%	90.5%	78.1%	59.3%	

C.5 CONTROLLING SHOPLIFTERS AND SHOPLIFTING

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly]
All	40.8%	30.2%	16.8%	8.2%	1.7%	1.7%	0.7%	0.2%
Non	47.7%	30.2%	11.6%	7.4%	1.1%	1.4%	0.7%	-
Past	30.5%	30.5%	21.9%	11.4%	2.9%	2.9%	-	-
Recent	7.4%	29.6%	51.9%	3.7%	3.7%	-	3.7%	3.7%

 Table C40
 Shoplifters should be treated more severely

 Table C41
 Retailers should report all shoplifters to the police

	AGREE					missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	-
All	46.0%	22.3%	14.6%	7.0%	6.5%	1.9%	1.7%	-
Non	51.2%	23.2%	13.3%	6.3%	3.5%	1.8%	0.7%	-
Past	40.0%	23.8%	9.5%	8.6%	13.3%	1.9%	2.9%	-
Recent	14.8%	7.4%	48.1%	7.4%	11.1%	3.7%	7.4%	-

Table C42All shoplifters should be prosecuted

		AGREE		neither		DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly		
All	39.3%	20.6%	17.7%	8.2%	9.1%	2.4%	2.2%	0.5%	
Non	44.6%	21.1%	16.1%	6.3%	8.4%	2.1%	1.4%	-	
Past	32.4%	22.9%	14.3%	13.3%	9.5%	2.9%	3.8%	1.0%	
Recent	11.1%	7.4%	48.1%	7.4%	14.8%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	

Table C43	Shoplifters should be dealt with by the shop they have stolen from
and	not the police

		AGREE	;			DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	5.5%	8.9%	12.2%	12.9%	16.1%	12.7%	31.4%	0.2%	
Non	4.2%	8.4%	11.9%	14.0%	15.8%	14.0%	31.6%	-	
Past	6.7%	11.4%	14.3%	10.5%	17.1%	11.4%	28.6%	-	
Recent	14.8%	3.7%	7.4%	11.1%	14.8%	3.7%	40.7%	3.7%	

		AGREE		neither		DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly		
All	17.7%	21.8%	20.4%	8.2%	10.3%	6.2%	14.6%	0.7%	
Non	19.3%	22.8%	15.8%	7.7%	11.6%	6.7%	15.4%	0.7%	
Past	16.2%	24.8%	28.6%	6.7%	5.7%	5.7%	12.4%	-	
Recent	7.4%	-	37.0%	18.5%	14.8%	3.7%	14.8%	3.7%	

Table C44 The shops should be able to fine the shoplifters they catch

Table C45Shoplifters should be banned from shops

	AGREE					missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	36.9%	17.5%	14.9%	12.9%	7.0%	6.0%	4.6%	0.2%
Non	38.9%	19.3%	14.0%	12.6%	6.0%	5.6%	3.5%	-
Past	35.2%	17.1%	15.2%	16.2%	7.6%	2.9%	5.7%	-
Recent	22.2%	-	22.2%	3.7%	14.8%	22.2%	11.1%	3.7%

Table C46Anti-shoplifting campaigns in the media would help to reduce
shoplifting

	AGREE					missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	8.2%	10.8%	21.6%	15.1%	16.5%	14.9%	12.7%	0.2%
Non	9.8%	11.6%	23.9%	16.8%	15.8%	14.4%	7.7%	-
Past	4.8%	10.5%	16.2%	13.3%	15.2%	15.2%	24.8%	-
Recent	3.7%	3.7%	18.5%	3.7%	29.6%	18.5%	18.5%	3.7%

Table C47	If I saw someone shoplifting I would report them to the shop

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	26.2%	16.5%	15.3%	17.3%	9.8%	4.3%	9.8%	0.2%	
Non	33.3%	19.6%	17.2%	16.1%	8.1%	2.1%	3.5%	-	
Past	13.3%	12.4%	13.3%	22.9%	11.4%	9.5%	17.1%	-	
Recent	7.4%	-	3.7%	7.4%	22.2%	7.4%	48.1%	3.7%	

C.6 THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR - GLOBAL MEASURES

]	LIKELY		neither		UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	extremely		
All	1.7%	1.0%	4.1%	4.1%	2.4%	3.8%	83.0%	-	
Non	0.7%	-	1.8%	3.9%	1.4%	1.4%	90.9%	-	
Past	1.0%	-	5.7%	2.9%	1.9%	8.6%	80.0%	-	
Recent	14.8%	14.8%	22.2%	11.1%	14.8%	11.1%	11.1%	-	

Table C48I intend to shoplift in the future

Table C49I will shoplift if I have the opportunity

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	ly neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	2.4%	0.7%	3.8%	4.1%	3.8%	6.5%	78.7%	-
Non	1.1%	-	1.1%	4.2%	2.5%	4.2%	87.0%	-
Past	1.0%	-	7.6%	1.0%	4.8%	10.5%	75.2%	-
Recent	22.2%	11.1%	18.5%	14.8%	14.8%	14.8%	3.7%	-

Table C50 I	Most peop	ple impo	ortant to	me would	not ap	prove of	me sho	plifting
						-	-	

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	81.1%	6.5%	2.6%	4.3%	2.4%	0.2%	2.9%	-
Non	88.1%	3.2%	1.1%	4.6%	0.4%	-	2.8%	-
Past	76.2%	8.6%	1.9%	2.9%	6.7%	1.0%	2.9%	-
Recent	25.9%	33.3%	22.2%	7.4%	7.4%	-	3.7%	-

Table C51 N	Most peop	ple im	portant t	o me	think that	I should	avoid	shopliftin	g
									_

	AGREE					DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	79.1%	7.7%	3.6%	5.8%	1.0%	0.7%	2.2%	-
Non	86.0%	5.3%	2.5%	3.5%	-	0.4%	2.5%	-
Past	75.2%	7.6%	3.8%	8.6%	1.9%	1.0%	1.9%	-
Recent	22.2%	33.3%	14.8%	18.5%	7.4%	-	3.7%	-

	G	GOOD				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	0.5%	1.4%	2.2%	3.8%	5.5%	21.3%	64.5%	0.7%
Non	0.7%	-	-	2.1%	2.8%	18.6%	75.4%	0.7%
Past	-	-	3.8%	7.6%	10.5%	26.7%	50.5%	1.0%
Recent	3. 7%	22.2%	18.5%	7.4%	14.8%	29.6%	3.7%	-

Table C52Shoplifting is good/bad

 Table C53
 Shoplifting is right/wrong

	RIGHT					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	0.2%	1.7%	1.7%	3.6%	4.1%	17.0%	70.5%	1.2%
Non	0.4%	-	-	2.1%	1.4%	16.5%	78.2%	1.4%
Past	-	1.0%	3.8%	5.7%	6.7%	17.1%	64.8%	1.0%
Recent	-	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	-

Table C54Shoplifting is wise/foolish

		WISE				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	0.2%	1.4%	2.6%	4.3%	5.0%	12.7%	71.9%	1.7%
Non	0.4%	-	0.7%	2.5%	3.2%	11.9%	79.6%	1.8%
Past	-	1.0%	2.9%	7.6%	5.7%	16.2%	64.8%	1.9%
Recent	-	18.5%	22.2%	11.1%	22.2%	7.4%	18.5%	-

Table C55Shoplifting is rewarding/punishing

	F	REWARDING				PUNISHING			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	2.2%	4.1%	6.5%	27.8%	4.1%	10.1%	43.2%	2.2%	
Non	0.4%	1.8%	3.2%	28.4%	3.9%	9.8%	50.2%	2.5%	
Past	3.8%	3.8%	8.6%	30.5%	5.7%	11.4%	34.3%	1.9%	
Recent	14.8%	29.6%	33.3%	11.1%	-	7.4%	3.7%	-	

	EXCITING					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	6.0%	7.2%	10.6%	27.1%	2.9%	6.5%	37.6%	2.2%
Non	2.1%	3.9%	7.7%	28.4%	2.5%	5.6%	47.4%	2.5%
Past	8.6%	10.5%	15.2%	29.5%	3.8%	9.5%	21.0%	1.9%
Recent	37.0%	29.6%	22.2%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	-	-

Table C56Shoplifting is exciting/boring

 Table C57
 Shoplifting is honest/dishonest

	HONEST					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	0.5%	0.2%	2.2%	3.1%	3.1%	9.4%	80.1%	1.4%
Non	0. 7%	-	-	2.5%	1.8%	8.1%	85.3%	1.8%
Past	-	-	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	13.3%	77.1%	1.0%
Recent	-	3.7%	22.2%	11.1%	18.5%	7.4%	37.0%	-

 Table C58
 Shoplifting is easy/difficult

	E	EASY				DIFFICULT			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	5.5%	9.6%	9.1%	23.0%	7.4%	7.2%	36.0%	2.2%	
Non	2.8%	6.7%	8.1%	24.6%	6.0%	6.3%	43.2%	2.5%	
Past	5.7%	15.2%	7.6%	23.8%	10.5%	10.5%	24.8%	1.9%	
Recent	33.3%	18.5%	25.9%	3.7%	11.1%	3.7%	3.7%	-	

Table C59There is plenty of opportunity for me to shoplift

	1	RUE				missing			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	10.3%	19.9%	21.1%	16.1%	8.4%	8.9%	14.9%	0.5%	
Non	9.1%	18.9%	16.5%	16.8%	9.8%	8.8%	19.3%	0.7%	
Past	10.5%	20.0%	30.5%	17.1%	3.8%	11.4%	6.7%	-	
Recent	22.2%	29.6%	33.3%	3.7%	11.1%	-	-	-	

]	LIKELY				UNLIK	ELY	missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither s 10.1% 5 11.6% 5	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	3.4%	6.2%	9.6%	10.1%	5.8%	8.4%	56.1%	0.5%
Non	2.1%	4.9%	4.2%	11.6%	3.9%	9.1%	63.5%	0.7%
Past	2.9%	6.7%	17.1%	8.6%	9.5%	6.7%	48.6%	-
Recent	18.5%	18.5%	37.0%	-	11.1%	7.4%	7.4%	-

Table C60 I can imagine times when I might shoplift even if I hadn't planned to

Table C61Shoplifting is against my principles

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	73.9%	10.3%	5.0%	4.6%	1.7%	2.4%	1.9%	0.2%
Non	88.1%	6.3%	2.5%	1.8%	-	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%
Past	52.4%	18.1%	9.5%	12.4%	1.9%	4.8%	1.0%	-
Recent	7.4%	22.2%	14.8%	3.7%	18.5%	14.8%	18.5%	-

Table C62It would be morally wrong for me to shoplift

		AGREE				DISAG	REE	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	72.9%	13.4%	3.4%	4.8%	1.4%	2.4%	1.4%	0.2%
Non	85.6%	9.1%	1.1%	2.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%
Past	54.3%	21.0%	8.6%	9.5%	2.9%	1.9%	1.9%	-
Recent	11.1%	29.6%	7.4%	11.1%	7.4%	25.9%	7.4%	-

Table C63I would feel guilty if I shoplifted

		AGREE				missing		
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	76.5%	10.6%	4.1%	1.7%	1.7%	2.9%	2.4%	0.2%
Non	89.5%	6.7%	1.1%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Past	59.0%	15.2%	8.6%	2.9%	4.8%	6.7%	2.9%	-
Recent	7.4%	33.3%	18.5%	3.7%	3.7%	11.1%	22.2%	-

C.7 THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR - BELIEF MEASURES

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	1
All	27.3%	19. 7%	12.5%	9.6%	1.4%	5.5%	23.5%	0.5%
Non	21.8%	19.3%	9.5%	10.9%	1.4%	7.0%	29.5%	0.7%
Past	31.4%	21.0%	21.0%	8.6%	1.9%	2.9%	13.3%	-
Recent	70.45	18.5%	11.1%	-	-	-	-	-

Table C64 If I shoplift I will be able to get goods without paying for them

Table C65If I shoplift I will be able to save money

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
LIA	24.9%	17.5%	12.7%	13.9%	4.1%	5.8%	20.6%	0.5%
Non	20.7%	16.8%	11.6%	14.4%	3.5%	7.4%	24.9%	0.7%
Past	26.7%	16.2%	17.1%	16.2%	6.7%	2.9%	14.3%	-
Recent	63.0%	29.6%	7.4%	-	-	-	-	-

 Table C66
 If I shoplift the shops will pass on the costs of my shoplifting to consumers

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	58.5%	13.4%	5.5%	4.3%	5.0%	4.8%	7.7%	0. 7%
Non	64.6%	13.0%	2.8%	4.2%	3.5%	3.5%	7.7%	0.7%
Past	52.4%	16.2%	8.6%	2.9%	7.6%	6.7%	4.8%	1.0%
Recent	18.5%	7.4%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	18.5%	-

 Table C67
 If I shoplift I will get caught by the retailers security measures

		LIKELY				UNLIK	missing	
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	28.8%	24.7%	16.8%	5.8%	12.0%	7.9%	3.6%	0.5%
Non	35.1%	27.7%	17.9%	3.9%	7.7%	5.6%	1.4%	0.7%
Past	18.1%	21.9%	16.2%	8.6%	21.0%	11.4%	2.9%	-
Recent	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%	14.8%	22.2%	18.5%	29.6%	-

]					UNLIK	ELY	missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	y neither 9 3.4% 9 3.9% 9	slightly	quite	extremely	·
All	41.5%	24.2%	8.6%	3.4%	8.9%	7.2%	5.8%	0.5%
Non	44.6%	24.9%	9.1%	3.9%	6.3%	7.4%	3.2%	0.7%
Past	38.1%	26.7%	8.6%	1.9%	9.5%	7.6%	7.6%	-
Recent	22.2%	7.4%	3. 7%	3.7%	33.3%	3.7%	25.9%	-

 Table C68
 If I shoplift I will be arrested for committing a crime

Table C69Getting goods without paying for them is

	0	GOOD				BAD		missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	7.7%	3.1%	3.1%	3.6%	3.8%	15.3%	62.6%	0.7%
Non	2.5%	1.1%	1.4%	3.5%	1.8%	15.8%	73.0%	1.1%
Past	11.4%	5.7%	4.8%	4.8%	7.6%	17.1%	48.6%	-
Recent	48.1%	14.8%	14.8%	-	11.1%	3.7%	7.4%	-

Table C70Saving money by shoplifting is

	(GOOD				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither 8.6% 6.3% 16.2% 3.7%	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	4.6%	2.4%	2.9%	8.6%	3.8%	14.6%	62.4%	0.7%
Non	1.1%	-	0.7%	6.3%	2.8%	11.9%	76.1%	1.1%
Past	3.8%	3.8%	5.7%	16.2%	6.7%	22.9%	41.0%	-
Recent	44.4%	22.2%	14.8%	3.7%	3.7%	11.1%	-	-

 Table C71
 Shops passing on the costs of shoplifting to consumers is

	(GOOD				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	2.6%	3.1%	2.9%	16.5%	8.4%	18.9%	46.8%	0.7%
Non	3.2%	2.1%	2.5%	15.4%	6.7%	16.5%	53.0%	0.7%
Past	1.9%	5.8%	3.8%	12.4%	9.5%	28.6%	37.1%	1.0%
Recent	-	3.7%	3.7%	44.4%	22.2%	7.4%	18.5%	-

	C	GOOD				BAD		missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	24.7%	9.1%	3.1%	8.6%	2.6%	9.8%	41.5%	0.5%
Non	30.5%	9.5%	2.5%	6.7%	1.1%	8.8%	40.4%	0.7%
Past	15.2%	8.6%	4.8%	12.4%	4.8%	12.4%	41.9%	-
Recent	-	7.4%	3.7%	14.8%	11.1%	11.1%	51.9%	-

 Table C72
 Being caught by the retailers security measures is

 Table C73
 Being arrested for committing a crime is

	C	GOOD				BAD			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	17.5%	4.3%	2.6%	3.4%	2.4%	6.0%	63.3%	0.5%	
Non	22.8%	4.6%	0.4%	2.1%	1.8%	4.6%	63.2%	0. 7%	
Past	7.6%	2.9%	7.6%	5.7%	1.0%	9.5%	65.7%	-	
Recent	-	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%	14.8%	7.4%	55.6%	-	

Table C74My family think I should avoid shoplifting

]	LIKELY				UNLIKELY		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	88.0%	5.5%	2.2%	2.9%	0.7%	-	0.7%	-
Non	92.6%	3.9%	0.7%	2.5%	-	-	0.4%	-
Past	85.7%	4.8%	1.9%	3.8%	1.9%	1.9%	-	-
Recent	48.1%	25.9%	18.5%	14.8%	3.7%	-	-	-

Table C75My friends think I should avoid shoplifting

]	LIKELY				UNLI	KELY	missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	62.8%	11.5%	6.5%	9.4%	3.4%	2.6%	3.8%	-
Non	72.6%	11.9%	4.2%	6.0%	1.8%	1.1%	2.5%	-
Past	51.4%	10.5%	7.6%	14.3%	5.7%	5.7%	4.8%	-
Recent	3.7%	11.1%	25.9%	25.9%	11.1%	7.4%	14.8%	-

]	LIKELY				UNLI	KELY	missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	89.2%	5.5%	0.5%	1.2%	-	0.7%	2.9%	-
Non	91.2%	3.9%	0.7%	0.7%	-	1.1%	2.5%	-
Past	87.6%	6.7%	-	1.9%	-	-	3.8%	-
Recent	74.1%	18.5%	-	3.7%	-	-	3.7%	-

 Table C76
 The police think I should avoid shoplifting

Table C77Doing what my family thinks I should do is

	(GOOD			BAD			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	17.3%	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	43.2%	28.1%	7.9%	17.3%	1.2%	0.5%	1.9%	-
Non	49.5%	27.7%	4.6%	15.4%	0.7%	0.4%	1.8%	-
Past	36.2%	24.8%	10.5%	22.9%	1.9%	1.0%	2.9%	-
Recent	3.7%	44.4%	33.3%	14.8%	3.7%	-	-	-

Table C78Doing what my friends think I should do is

	(GOOD				BAD		missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	24.0%	15.1%	13.2%	34.5%	2.4%	4.6%	6.0%	0.2%
Non	29.1%	15.1%	10.2%	33.7%	2.5%	3.2%	6.0%	-
Past	15.2%	15.2%	18.1%	37.1%	1.0%	5.7%	7.6%	-
Recent	3.7%	14.8%	25.9%	33.3%	7.4%	14.8%	-	-

 Table C79
 Doing what the police think I should do is

	(юоd			BAD			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	48.7%	23.7%	7.0%	12.0%	0.7%	4.1%	3.8%	-
Non	57.5%	23.5%	4.2%	9.8%	0.7%	1.8%	2.5%	-
Past	35.2%	25.7%	9.5%	20.0%	1.0%	6.7%	1.9%	-
Recent	7.4%	18.5%	25.9%	3.7%	-	18.5%	25.9%	-

	LIKELY					missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	12.9%	11.5%	9.4%	14.6%	3.6%	7.4%	40.5%	-
Non	7.7%	10.2%	7.0%	14.4%	3.9%	7.7%	49.1%	-
Past	16.2%	14.3%	14.3%	17.1%	3.8%	7.6%	26.7%	-
Recent	55.6%	14.8%	14.8%	7.4%	-	3.7%	3.7%	-

 Table C80
 I could shoplift more easily if I thought there was little risk of being caught

Table C81I could shoplift more easily if I thought that the security measures
used by retailers were ineffective

		LIKELY				missing		
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	16.8%	16.8%	12.0%	12.5%	2.9%	6.2%	32.9%	-
Non	13.0%	15.8%	10.2%	11.6%	1.8%	6.3%	41.4%	-
Past	16.2%	18.1%	18.1%	16.2%	6.7%	6. 7%	18.1%	-
Recent	59.3%	22.2%	7.4%	7.4%	-	3.7%	-	-

Table C82I could shoplift more easily if I thought the penalties for being caught
were not severe

	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			missing
	extremely	quite	slightly	14.1%	slightly	quite	extremely	
All	12.7%	12.9%	11.5%	14.1%	4.1%	7.0%	37.6%	-
Non	9.1%	11.6%	8.4%	13.7%	3.5%	6.7%	47.0%	-
Past	12.4%	15.2%	20.0%	17.1%	6.7%	8.6%	20.0%	-
Recent	51.9%	18.5%	11.1%	7.4%	-	3.7%	7.4%	-

 Table C83
 I could shoplift more easily if I were short of money

	!	LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely]	
All	8.6%	8.4%	13.7%	13.7%	3.4%	8.4%	43.9%	-	
Non	5.6%	5.6%	11.2%	12.3%	2.1%	7.4%	55.8%	-	
Past	8.6%	13.3%	17.1%	18.1%	7.6%	12.4%	22.9%	-	
Recent	40.7%	18.5%	25.9%	11.1%	-	3.7%	-	-	

		LIKELY				UNLIKELY			
	extremely	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	extremely		
All	3.6%	3.6%	7.7%	15.3%	3.1%	8.4%	58.3%	-	
Non	1.8%	2.8%	4.6%	12.6%	3.5%	7.0%	67.7%	-	
Past	3.8%	2.9%	12.4%	21.0%	2.9%	12.4%	44.8%	-	
Recent	22.2%	14.8%	22.2%	22.2%	-	7.4%	11.1%	-	

 Table C84
 I could shoplift more easily if my friends encouraged me to

Table C85I do think there is little risk of being caught

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	11.3%	16.1%	16.1%	10.3%	9.1%	13.9%	23.3%	-	
Non	9.5%	15.1%	14.7%	9.8%	8.4%	16.1%	26.3%	-	
Past	10.5%	17.1%	17.1%	12.4%	13.3%	11.4%	18.1%	-	
Recent	33.3%	22.2%	25.9%	7.4%	-	-	11.1%	-	

 Table C86
 I do think that the security measures used by shops are ineffective

		AGREE				DISAG	REE	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly	
All	8.4%	17.3%	22.5%	12.5%	12.5%	14.9%	12.0%	-
Non	7.0%	16.1%	22.1%	12.3%	13.0%	15.4%	14.0%	-
Past	6.7%	19.0%	21.0%	14.3%	13.3%	16.2%	9.5%	-
Recent	29.6%	22.2%	33.3%	7.4%	3.7%	3.7%	-	-

 Table C87
 I do think that the penalties for being caught shoplifting are not severe

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	24.7%	24.2%	15.3%	12.2%	7.4%	5.3%	10.6%	0.2%	
Non	26.7%	23.9%	14.7%	11.2%	7.0%	4.9%	11.2%	0.4%	
Past	17.1%	26.7%	16.2%	14.3%	9.5%	6.7%	9.5%	-	
Recent	33.3%	18.5%	18.5%	14.8%	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%	-	

		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly		
All	17.7%	13.4%	14.6%	17.0%	6.5%	11.3%	19.2%	0.2%	
Non	14.4%	13.3%	13.3%	17.5%	6.7%	12.3%	22.1%	0.4%	
Past	21.0%	13.3%	17.1%	15.2%	7.6%	9.5%	16.2%	-	
Recent	40.7%	14.8%	18.5%	18.5%	-	7.4%	-	-	

Table C88I am often short of money

 Table C89
 My friends often encourage me to shoplift

<u>Table C</u>	<u>.89 My</u>	r friends	often enc	ourage n	ne to shop	<u>olift</u>			
		AGREE				DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly	neither	slightly	quite	strongly]	
All	1.7%	2.2%	2.9%	11.5%	2.4%	2.4%	77.0%	-	
Non	1.4%	1.8%	0.4%	8.4%	1.8%	2.5%	83.9%	-	
Past	1.0%	1.9%	2.9%	16.2%	3.8%	1.9%	72.4%	-	
Recent	7.4%	7.4%	29.6%	25.9%	3.7%	3.7%	22.2%	-	

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR THE CONSUMER SURVEY

D.1	The influence of the demographic variables on the consumers	321
D.2	Factor analysis for the consumer survey	325
D.3	The consumer past shoplifters	328
D.4	Comparison of the beliefs and attitudes of the consumer respondents	329

D.1 THE INFLUENCE OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON THE CONSUMERS

To investigate the influence of the demographic variables of age, gender and economic status, both one-way analysis of variance and the Kruskal-Wallis test were used. Only those results where both the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests have produced statistically significant findings are reported.

As the non-shoplifters do not have direct experience of shoplifting, their opinions as to why people shoplift have been excluded from the analysis.

The Influence of Age

The categories of 45-59, 60-74 and over 75 were combined into one overall category of over-45s. In view of the small numbers of recent shoplifters in the older age groups, the recent shoplifters were categorised into under 16s, 16-19s and over-20s.

n =417	Under 16	16-19	20-29	30-44	45+	F Ratio	F Prob	K-W sig
Non electronic tags staff fined by shop report to shop	5.9394 3.6061 5.2188 4.7879	5.7876 3.3438 5.1957 4.6304	6.3061 2.7551 4.4898 5.7347	6.3188 3.4203 4.5797 5.5217	6.3448 4.0930 3.7586 5.4555	3.4263 4.4766 5.2491 4.6261	.0044 .0016 .0004 .0012	.0444 .0027 .0024 .0014
Past encourage promo psycho punish stress	6.2727 6.0000 3.1818 2.7273 3.2727	6.1818 5.4091 3.3182 3.9545 3.7273	5.4118 4.4706 4.3529 4.5000 4.0294	5.1071 5.6429 4.5000 5.1429 4.7143	4.8000 5.5000 5.1000 3.5000 5.5000	4.5534 3.6291 4.0942 5.3258 5.4559	.0020 .0084 .0041 .0006 .0005	.0010 .0085 .0035 .0013 .0005
Recent beating proscons	under16 4.1429 4.5714	16-19 5.9091 4.8182	20+ 4.6667 3.1111			4.1667 3.6374	.0280 .0417	.0227 .0437

Table D1Comparison of mean scores by age for the motivation and shoplifting
prevention questions

n=417	Under 16	16-19	20-29	30-44	45+	F Ratio	F Prob	K-Wsig
Non								
good	1.4242	1.6957	1.2245	1.2794	1.1954	4.4755	.0016	.0001
reward	2.2727	2.9111	2.2917	2.2273	2.0349	25702	.0383	.0278
easy	3.5152	3.4000	2.7500	2.3788	2.5233	3.8716	.0045	.0046
plan	2.7879	2.7391	2.0204	1.9559	1.5402	5.9035	.0001	.0000
opportunity	4.0606	4.1739	3.4082	3.5735	4.4368	3.0647	.0171	.0128
caught g/b	2.5455	3.1522	3.5510	3.9559	4.1438	3.9109	.0042	.0053
pay g/b	1.9375	1.8478	1.7347	1.3824	1.3103	2.7438	.0289	.0030
friends g/b	4.5000	4.4783	4.7551	5.1159	5.5455	4.3963	.0018	.0009
friends	2.3636	2.1304	1.4898	1.3768	1.4432	5.4481	.0008	.0001
risk	3.2424	3.5652	2.1984	2.5362	2.5000	2.5720	.0381	.0281
morally	1.5152	1.5217	1.2587	1.1739	1.0805	3.2417	.0127	.0025
principles	1.5758	1.3043	1.2245	1.1449	1.1149	2.4309	.0479	.010
Past								
easy	4.0000	3.6667	3.7941	3.5556	1.3000	4.0272	.0046	.0059
plan	4.2727	3.0000	2.5000	2.2143	2.4000	2.6737	.0363	.0347
caught	4.0000	3.3182	3.5000	3.6429	1.7000	2.8960	.0258	.0239
costs	4.1000	2.7273	2.2353	1.8571	1.6000	3.5485	.0095	.0051
save	5.5455	5.6364	4.5882	4.3929	3.4000	3.0303	.0210	.0246
friends	3.6364	2.9545	2.8235	1.5714	1.6000	4.2910	.0030	.0010
friends g/b	3.9091	3.9091	4.3235	5.1429	6.2000	5.5478	.0004	.0011
Recent	under 16	16-19	20+					
excite	5.2857	6.6364	5.2222			4.7744	.0180	.0121
caught	5.8571	5.8182	4.0000			4.6116	.0202	.0382

Table D2Comparison of mean scores by age for the questions relating to the
Theory of Planned Behaviour

n=417	Male	Female	F Ratio	F Prob	K-W sig.
Non being caught would deter me	3.4235	2.4100	12.7398	.0004	.0001
shoplifters should be dealt with by	2.6471	3.1900	15.1530	.0240	.0110
shops	3.8241	4.7638	12.4265	.0005	.0031
shoplifters should be fined by shops					
Past					
people shoplift because of stress	3.7209	4.5484	8.7772	.0038	.0146
I would never steal from a small shop	3.7907	4.7097	5.6072	.0198	.0256
being caught would deter me	3.2791	1.9194	11.601	.0012	.0005
effectiveness of store detectives	4.7442	5.5806	6.7449	.0180	.0125
shoplifters should be fined by shops	4.1628	5.1129	6.6301	.0114	.0287
I would report a shoplifter to the shop	3.4186	4.3387	5.7604	.0182	.0207
Recent					
I would report a shoplifter to the shop	1.5833	3.0714	5.0616	.0337	.0462

Table D3Comparison of mean scores by gender for the motivation and
shoplifting prevention questions

Table D4Comparison of mean scores by gender for the questions relating to the
Theory of Planned Behaviour

n=417	Male	Female	F Ratio	F Prob	K-W sig.
Non					
opportunity	4.5119	3.7337	9.2746	.0025	.0017
caught	2.7619	2.2965	5.2661	.0225	.0184
family	1.0235	1.2000	4.7811	.0296	.0322
security	4.1294	3.1200	11.2809	.0009	.0012
penalties	3.4941	2.8050	5.8316	.0164	.0118
short	2.9294	2.3900	4.2891	.0393	.0083
short a/d	3.4405	4.0300	4.6066	.0327	.0364
Past					
intend	1.9769	1.1613	13.039	.0005	.0035
will	1.9767	1.3226	7.1498	.0087	.0275
approve	2.1163	1.4032	5.9009	.0169	.0474
avoid	2.0698	1.3548	7.5526	.0071	.0258
right	2.0233	1.4426	6.5691	.0118	.0424
wise	1.9762	1.4754	4.7661	.0313	.0492
easy	4.0000	3.1311	5.1403	.0255	.0389
caught	3.9535	2.9839	7.8581	.0060	.0060
security	4.9302	3.8387	7.5048	.0073	.0104
short	4.2326	3.3065	5.6237	.0196	.0216
guilty	2.5581	1.7903	5.1586	.0252	.0109
Recent					
intend	5.0833	3.6000	4.3389	.0476	.0483
pay g/b	6.3335	4.8000	4.5006	.0440	.0454
police g/b	2.6667	4.5333	5.6713	.0252	.0279
morally	4.9167	2.9333	8.0098	.0090	.0116

The Influence of Economic Status

The respondents were categorised into two groups: those with an income of less than $\pounds 10,000$ per year (low income), and those earning $\pounds 10,000$ p.a. or more (high income).

	Under £10,000 p.a.	£10,000 + p.a.	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W sig.
Past					
easy access	5.5536	5.0500	4.5687	.0352	.0367
friends encouragement	5.7143	5.1000	5.5536	.0250	.0108
prices to high	4.7273	3.8500	7.5337	.0073	.0056
think they won't be punished	3.8929	4.9750	9.8661	.0023	.0037
effectiveness of notices	1.4854	1.6672	4.5287	.0349	.0229
Recent					
easy access	6.5789	5.7500	6.4597	.0190	.0207
can't afford things	6.3158	4.7500	10.934	.0045	.0471
won't get caught	6.3158	5.0000	4.6020	.0438	.0322
weigh up the pros/cons	4.4211	2.2500	6.6234	.0177	.0314

Table D5Comparison of mean scores by economic status for the motivation and
shoplifting prevention questions

Table D6Comparison of mean scores by economic status for the questions
relating to the Theory of Planned Behaviour

	Under £10,000 p.a.	£10,000 + p.a.	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W sig.
Non					
will	1.4342	1.1420	5.6659	.0180	.0062
costs	2.3046	1.7642	4.9508	.0270	.0069
friends g/b	4.8344	5.3364	5.4839	.0200	.0212
friends	1.8224	1.3084	10.1252	.0016	.0003
short a/d	4.1447	3.3744	8.5919	.0037	.0038
Past					
plan	3.1964	1.9000	11.4328	.0011	.0025
costs	2.5455	1.8000	4.1841	.0436	.0102
save	5.2321	4.0250	8.8058	.0035	.0019
friends	2.7500	1.9000	5.3159	.0233	.0046
security	4.6964	3.6750	5.8885	.0171	.0250
short a/d	4.9821	3.3750	15.3796	.0002	.0001
Recent					
wise	3.9474	1.5000	7.0743	.0113	.0166
caught	5.5789	1.5000	14.8558	.0009	.0062
pay g/b	6.0526	3.0000	11.7681	.0025	.0470
security a/d	5.9474	4.2500	12.7359	.0018	.0083
risk	6.2632	4.0000	8.1360	.0095	.0107

D2 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE CONSUMER SURVEY

Factor Analysis for the Global Measures

A factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was performed on the 14 variables contained in the global measures of attitude, the subjective and moral norm, and perceived control. The figures shown below fulfill the criteria described by Kinnear and Gray (1994) as being indicative of a satisfactory factor analysis.

Determinant of the correlation matrix = 0.0002236Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.88948Significance of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity = .00000

The factor analysis produced an initial solution of four factors with an Eigenvalue of greater than one. Only those factors with an eigenvalue of greater than one are considered to be common factors. The scree plot, shown in Figure D1, indicates that these four factors explained 72.7% of the variance.





To provide a check on the robustness of the model, three alternative methods of factor extraction were utilised: unweighted least squares, generalised least squares, and maximum likelihood. Comparison of the factor matrices from the four extraction methods indicated that all four methods placed the original variables into the same factors, with similar but not identical values.

The varimax rotation loaded on the four factors shown Table D7. Factors three and four, the moral and subjective norm, contained the same variables as the original formulation of the global measures. The factor analysis indicated that the global measure of attitude should contain the four variables of *right*, *wise*, *good* and *honest*, the remaining two attitude variables of *excite* and *reward* were grouped with the perceived control variables.

FACTOR 1FACTOR 2attitudeperceived controlrighteasyhonestexcitegoodplentywiserewardplan	FACTOR 3 moral norm principles guilty morally	FACTOR 4 subjective norm avoid approve
--	---	---

Table D7Factor Analysis for the Global Measures

Factor Analysis for the Belief Measures

Following the procedures described for the global measures, factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was performed on the 13 variables contained in the measures of outcome beliefs, referent beliefs and control beliefs. The figures shown below fulfill the criteria described by Kinnear and Gray (1994) as being indicative of a satisfactory factor analysis.

Determinant of the correlation matrix = 0.0134386Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.79040Significance of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity = .00000.

The factor analysis produced an initial solution of four factors with an Eigenvalue of greater than one. The scree plot, shown in Figure D2, indicates that these four factors explained 64.2% of the variance.





The varimax rotation loaded on the four factors shown in the table D8. Factor 1 represents the control beliefs plus the outcome beliefs of pay and save. Factor 2 represents the referent beliefs contained in the original measure. Factor 3 contains the outcome beliefs relating to being caught. Factor 4 represents increased prices for other customers.

Table D8 Factor analysis for the defiel-based measure	able D8	s for the belief-based measures
--	---------	---------------------------------

FACTOR 1FACTOR 2Control beliefsReferent belriskpoliceineffective securityfamilypenaltiesfriendsshort of moneyfriendspaysave	FACTOR 3 iefs Apprehension beliefs arrest caught	FACTOR 4 Cost beliefs costs
---	---	-----------------------------------

D3 THE CONSUMER PAST SHOPLIFTERS

The past shoplifter category consists of two groups; those who had shoplifted over five years ago and those who had shoplifted between one and five years ago. It is recognised that these two groups may differ in their beliefs, attitudes and opinions about shoplifting, and to investigate this one-way analysis of variance was used. ANOVA was selected in preference to running t-tests for all possible pairs of means, as Diamantopolous and Schlegelmilch (1997) suggest that a multiple comparison procedure produces more reliable findings. The variables significant at the 0.5 level in both the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests are shown in Table D9.

	······	
Variable	Shoplifted over 5 years ago (n=71)	Shoplifted 1 to 5 years ago (n=34)
	Mean score	Mean score
good	1.6000	2.4118
reward	2.6087	3.6176
wise	1.4058	2.2353
plan	2.3380	3.4706
caught (evaluation)	3.6197	2.0882
pay (evaluation)	2.3380	3.2353
save (evaluation)	2.1127	3.2941
friends (likelihood)	4.9718	3. 794 1
friends (evaluation)	2.0282	3.4412
peers (evaluation)	1.6056	2.3529
guilty	1.7324	2.8824
principles	1.8310	2.7059

Table D9Significant differences between the past shoplifters (n=105)

As these differences affect the global and belief measures (with the exception of intention and subjective norm), a multiple regression analysis for the two groups of past shoplifters was conducted, as shown in Table D10.

Table D10 M	ultiple regression	for the two	groups of	past shoplifters
-------------	--------------------	-------------	-----------	------------------

	Shoplifted	Shoplifted over 5 years ago (n=71)		shoplifted 1-5 years ago (n=34)		
	Adj R ²	Beta W.	Adj R ²	Beta W.		
Attitude	.46**	.34*	.27 ns	.24		
Subjective norm		.36*		.15		
Perceived control		.36*		.07		
Moral norm		13		.20		
Past experience		07		15		
Economic beliefs		.19		.25		
Apprehension beliefs		01		.38		
Referent beliefs		19		17		
Control beliefs		15		21		

*significant at p < .05 **significant at p < .01

D4 COMPARISON OF THE BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES OF THE CONSUMER RESPONDENTS

To compare the views of the three groups of respondents, both one-way analysis of variance (parametric) and the Kruskal-Wallis test (non-parametric) were used. The results of the one-way analysis of variance are reported in full, as this technique enables the use of Tukey's HSD test to pin-point where the significant differences occur. For the Kruskal-Wallis, only the significance of the test is reported. Where the figures for all three groups of respondents are shown in bold, this indicates statistically significant differences between *all* three groups. Where only the figure for the recent shoplifters is shown in bold, this indicates that the recent shoplifters hold statistically significant different views from the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters.

For me shoplifting is:	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
good/bad	1.3286	1.8654	3.8889	97.3575	.0000	.0000
honest/dishonest	1.2357	1.3942	2.8519	40.4247	.0000	.0000
right/wrong	1.2811	1.6827	3.5556	76.3134	.0000	.0000
wise/foolish	1.3107	1.6796	3.6667	71.5665	.0000	.0000

Table D11Comparison of mean scores for attitude (n=417)

Questions scaled 1 to 7. 7 indicates that shoplifting is extremely exciting, good, honest, right, rewarding and wise. 1 indicates that shoplifting is extremely boring, bad, dishonest, wrong, punishing and foolish.

Table D12 Comparison of mean scores for the subjective norm (n=417)

Most people important to me	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F.Prob	K-W Sig
think I should avoid shoplifting	1.3719	1.6476	2.6667	14.682	.0000	.0000
would not approve of shoplifting	1.3719	1.6952	2.5185	10.924	.0000	.0000

questions scaled: 1 strongly agree to 7 strongly disagree

Table D13Comparison of mean scores for perceived control (n=417)

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
shoplifting is easy/difficult	2.7878	3.4854	5.3333	25.1517	.0000	.0000
plenty of opportunity to shoplift	3.9647	4.5524	5.4815	10.3245	.0000	.0000
unplanned shoplifting	2.0636	2.7048	4.8148	31.9417	.0000	.0000
shoplifting is exciting	2.6259	3.7573	5.8148	47.5532	.0000	.0000
shoplifting is rewarding	2.2950	2.9417	5.1111	40.9967	.0000	.0000

questions scaled: 1 extremely unlikely to 7 extremely likely

Shoplifting is:	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
against my principles	1.2254	2.1143	4.2222	99.7102	.0000	.0000
morally wrong	1.2606	1.9905	3.8148	72.2378	.0000	.0000
I would feel guilty if shoplifted	1.9011	2.1048	3.8519	74.1019	.0000	.0000

Table D14Comparison of mean scores for the moral norm (n=417)

questions scaled: 1 strongly agree to 7 strongly disagree

Table D15 Likelihood and evaluation of the economic beliefs (n=417)

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood get goods without paying to save money Shops will pass on costs	4.0954 4.1449 5.9011	5.0952 4.7429 5.6442	6.5926 6.5556 4.0370	20.0157 16.5684 11.6113	.0000 .0000 .0000	.0000 .0000 .0000
Evaluation Without paying good/bad Saving money good/bad Passing on costs good/bad	1.5603 1.4610 2.1625	2.6286 2.4952 2.4135	5.4815 5.6667 3.1852	83.1194 139.711 5.5294	.0000 .0000 .0043	.0000 .0000 .0000

Likelihood questions scaled: 7 extremely likely to 1 extremely unlikely Evaluation questions scaled: 7 extremely good to 1 extremely bad

Table D16	Likelihood and	evaluation of	apprehension	beliefs (n=417)	
-----------	----------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	--

If I shoplift	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F.Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood I will get caught I will be arrested	5.5654 5.6325	4.6190 5.2857	2.7778 3.6667	42.9454 13.9803	.0000 .0000	.0000 .0002
Evaluation caught good/bad arrested good/bad	3.7314 2.7668	3.1238 2.1905	2.2963 2.2593	5.3777 2.4821	.0049 .0848	.0144 .4093

likelihood questions scaled: 1 extremely unlikely to 7 extremely likely evaluation questions scaled: 7 extremely good to 1 extremely bad

n=4]7	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
People who think I should avoid shoplifting My family My friends The police	1.1474 1.6526 1.2737	1.3905 2.4857 1.3524	1.8889 4.1111 1.5185	11.9079 38.3616 0.6647	.0000 .0000 .5150	.0000 .0000 .0260
Doing what my family think is good/bad my friends think is good/bad the police think is good/bad	6.0175 5.0141 6.1228	5.5619 4.5905 5.4667	5.2963 4.2963 3.7037	6.9445 3.9926 34.7033	.0011 .0192 .0000	.0000 .0138 .0000

Table D17 Likelihood and evaluation of referent beliefs (n=417)

Likelihood scaled: 7 extremely unlikely to 1 extremely likely Evaluation questions scaled: 7 extremely good to 1 extremely bad

Table D18 Likelihood and evaluation of control beliefs (n=417)

I could shoplift more easily if $n=417$	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood little risk of being caught security measures ineffective penalties were not severe I were short of money my friends encouraged me to	2.8386 3.4211 3.0105 2.5509 1.9474	3.9238 4.2857 4.0381 3.6857 2.6762	5.9259 6.2222 5.7407 5.7776 4.7037	31.4748 22.3772 25.0458 39.9713 36.5292	.0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000	.0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
Evaluation little risk of being caught Security measures ineffective Penalties not severe I am often short of money Friends often encourage me	3.5368 3.8947 4.9225 3.8556 1.4982	3.9238 4.0476 4.6952 4.3143 1.8476	5.3704 5.5556 5.2222 5.5556 3.8889	10.0701 10.2182 0.9494 9.0233 37.8562	.0001 .0000 .3878 .0001.00 00	.0001 .0001 .2394 .0001 .0000

Likelihood questions scaled: 7 extremely likely to 1 extremely unlikely Evaluation questions scaled: 7 strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree

APPENDIX E

THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE SCHOOL SURVEY

E .1	The Theory of Planned Behaviour - Global Measures	333
E.2	The Theory of Planned Behaviour - Belief Measures	337
E.3	Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures	344

E1 THE THEORY OR PLANNED BEHAVIOUR - GLOBAL MEASURES

		LIKELY			ι	missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	4.7%	5.2%	6.3%	6.1%	4.5%	14.2%	59.0%	-
non	-	2.3%	1.8%	4.6%	3.7%	12.8%	74.9%	-
past	-	4.9%	7.0%	9.1%	2.8%	16.1%	60.1%	-
recent	25.6%	13.4%	17.1%	4.9%	9.8%	14.6%	14.6%	-

 Table E1
 How likely is it that you will shoplift in the future?

Table	E2	If	I	hav	e 1	the	op	po	rtuni	tv	I wil	l sho	plift	in	the	futu	re
			_														

	AGREE			neither	D	DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	5.9%	3.4%	6.8%	7.4%	5.4%	13.3%	57.9%	-
non	-	0.9%	1.8%	5.9%	4.1%	12.8%	74.4%	-
past	3.5%	1.4%	7.7%	9.8%	3.5%	17.5%	56.6%	-
recent	25.6%	13.4%	18.3%	7.3%	12.2%	7.3%	15.9%	-

Table E3	Most people	important	to me think	I should avoid	shoplifting

	AGREE			neither	L I	DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	71.6%	8.6%	1.6%	7.7%	2.7%	2.9%	4.7%	0.2%
non	80.4%	9.1%	1.8%	1.8%	0.5%	2.3%	3.7%	0.5%
past	75.5%	7.7%	0.7%	8.4%	2.1%	2.8%	2.8%	-
recent	41.5%	8.5%	2.4%	22.0%	9.8%	4.9%	11.0%	-

Table FA	Most neonle important to	me would not an	nrove of me	shoplifting
1 adle L4	Most people important to	me would not ap	prove of me	Suoburna

		AGREE			Ľ	DISAGRE	EE	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	73.4%	7.2%	2.9%	4.3%	1.8%	1.8%	7.4%	1.1%
non	83.6%	7.4%	0.5%	1.4%	-	1.4%	5.1%	0.9%
past	71.3%	5.6%	3.5%	4.9%	4.2%	1.4%	7.7%	1.4%
recent	50.0%	9.8%	8.5%	11.0%	2.4%	3.7%	13.4%	1.2%

		GOOD			B	BAD			
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very]	
all	4.1%	2.0%	2.0%	6.5%	6.6%	28.1%	50.6%	0.7%	
non	-	0.5%	-	3.2%	7.3%	28.8%	58.9%	1.4%	
past	2.1%	1.4%	-	5.6%	7.7%	28.0%	55.2%	-	
recent	18.3%	7.3%	11.0%	17.1%	2.4%	25.6%	18.3%	-	

Table E5Shoplifting is good/bad

Table E6Shoplifting is right/wrong

		RIGHT			W	RONG		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	1.8%	1.6%	0. 7%	4.1%	5.0%	18.9%	67.6%	0.5%
non	-	0.5%	-	1.8%	4.6%	17.4%	74.9%	0.9%
past	0. 7%	1.4%	0. 7%	4.2%	2.1%	20.3%	70.6%	-
recent	8.5%	4.9%	2.4%	9.8%	11.0%	20.7%	42.7%	-

 Table E7
 Shoplifting is honest/dishonest

	H	HONEST			DI	SHONEST		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	1.8%	0.9%	0.2%	4.3%	5.4%	14.0%	72.3%	1.1%
non	-	-	0.5%	2.3%	2.7%	11.4%	81.7%	1.4%
past	2.1%	0.7%	-	3.5%	5.6%	14.7%	72.0%	1.4%
recent	6.1%	3.7%	-	11.0%	12.2%	19.5%	47.6%	-

 Table E8
 Shoplifting is rewarding/punishing

	RE	WARDING	ł	neither	PU	NISHINC	}	missing
	very	quite	slightly]	slightly	quite	very	
all	10.7%	7.3%	8.0%	17.1%	6.3%	14.6%	35.1%	1.1%
non	2.3%	5.5%	5.9%	17.8%	6.8%	17.4%	42.9%	1.4%
past	10.5%	4.9%	9.8%	20.3%	6.3%	12.6%	34.3%	1.4%
recent	32.9%	15.9%	9.8%	9.8%	4.9%	11.0%	15.9%	-

		EASY			E	IFFICULT quite very 10.8% 9.2% 16.4% 11.0% 7.0% 9.8%		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	21.2%	22.3%	10.4%	16.7%	8.6%	10.8%	9.2%	0.9%
non	8.7%	19.6%	10.1%	23.3%	10.0%	16.4%	11.0%	0.9%
past	24.5%	28.0%	10.0%	10.5%	8.4%	7.0%	9.8%	1.4%
recent	48.8%	19.5%	11.0%	9.8%	4.9%	2.4%	3.7%	-

Table E9Shoplifting is easy/difficult

Table E10Shoplifting is exciting

Table E	Fable E10 Shoplifting is exciting											
	AGREE			neither	Ľ	missing						
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly					
all	6.5%	6.8%	13.5%	15.5%	6.8%	15.1%	35.8%	-				
non	0.9%	3.2%	10.0%	10.5%	8.7%	17.4%	49.3%	-				
past	2.8%	8.4%	16.1%	22.4%	4.9%	14.7%	30.8%	-				
recent	28.0%	13.4%	18.3%	17.1%	4.9%	9.8%	8.5%	-				

Table E11Shoplifting is stupid

		AGREE			D	ISAGRE	E	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	53.4%	16.9%	9.9%	8.8%	3.8%	3.2%	4.1%	-
non	67.6%	11.9%	8.7%	7.8%	1.8%	1.4%	0.9%	-
past	53.1%	19.6%	9.8%	9.1%	4.2%	2.8%	1.4%	-
recent	15.9%	25.6%	13.4%	11.0%	8.5%	8.5%	17.1%	-

Table E12There are plenty of opportunities for shoplifting

		AGREE			Γ	DISAGREE slightly quite strongly 7.7% 7.2% 6.8% 8.2% 10.0% 9.1% 7.7% 5.6% 5.6%		missing
	strongl y	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	27.5%	23.6%	18.9%	8.3%	7.7%	7.2%	6.8%	-
non	13.7%	24.7%	23.3%	11.0%	8.2%	10.0%	9.1%	-
past	36.4%	23.8%	16.1%	4.9%	7.7%	5.6%	5.6%	-
recent	48.8%	20.7%	12.2%	7.3%	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%	-

		AGREE			Ľ	DISAGREE	3	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	59.0%	12.6%	6.8%	10.1%	2.7%	2.7%	6.1%	-
non	75.3%	11.4%	3.2%	7.3%	1.8%	0.5%	0.5%	-
past	53.1%	16.1%	8.4%	10.5%	2.1%	1.4%	8.4%	-
recent	25.6%	9.8%	13.4%	17.1%	6.1%	11.0%	17.1%	-

Table E13It would be morally wrong for me to shoplift

Table E14I would feel guilty if I shoplifted

		AGREE			Ľ	ISAGRE	E	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	50.7%	11.3%	10.4%	9.7%	4.7%	4.3%	9.0%	-
non	72.1%	10.0%	7.3%	5.0%	4.1%	0.5%	0.9%	-
past	38.5%	16.1%	13.3%	12.6%	2.8%	7.0%	9.8%	-
recent	14.6%	6.1%	13.4%	17.1%	9.8%	9.8%	29.3%	-

E.2 THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOUR - THE BELIEF MEASURES

	LIKELY			neither	U	missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	41.5%	18.3%	8.6%	13.5%	3.6%	4.7%	9.7%	0.2%
non	25.1%	19.6%	11.0%	18.7%	4.6%	7.3%	13.2%	0.5%
past	51.0%	19.6%	8.4%	8.4%	4.2%	1.4%	7.0%	-
recent	68.3%	12.2%	2.4%	8.5%	-	3.7%	4.9%	-

Table E15 If I shoplift I will be able to get things without paying for them

Table E16If I shoplift I will be able to save money

					U	missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	43.7%	15.5%	12.8%	7.7%	4.5%	5.2%	10.4%	0.2%
non	27.4%	17.8%	18.3%	9.6%	3.7%	7.3%	15.5%	0.5%
past	55.9%	13.3%	9.1%	6.3%	7.0%	2.8%	5.6%	-
recent	65.9%	13.4%	4.9%	4.9%	2.4%	3.7%	4.9%	-

Table E17If I shoplift the shops will put up the prices to consumers

		LIKELY			U	NLIKELY	7	missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	23.6%	16.2%	14.4%	15.3%	6.8%	7.0%	16.2%	0.5%
non	24.2%	16.0%	19.2%	14.6%	5.0%	6.4%	14.2%	0.5%
past	22.4%	18.9%	10.5%	16.1%	6.3%	8.5%	16.9%	0.7%
recent	24.4%	12.2%	8.5%	15.9%	12.2%	6.1%	20.7%	-

Table E18If I shoplift I will be breaking the law

		LIKELY			τ	UNLIKELY			
	very	quite	slightly	7	slightly	quite	very		
all	84.0%	5.6%	0.9%	2.7%	1.1%	0.7%	5.0%	-	
non	88.1%	4.1%	0.9%	2.7%	1.4%	0.5%	2.3%	-	
past	85.3%	7.0%	0.7%	1.4%	0.7%	-	4.9%	-	
recent	70.7%	7.3%	1.2%	4.9%	1.2%	2.4%	12.2%	-	

		LIKEL	Y	neither	τ	JNLIKEL	ľ	missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	35.1%	22.1%	15.3%	9.0%	6.1%	5.6%	6.5%	0.2%
non	36.1%	22.8%	17.4%	7.8%	7.3%	4.6%	4.1%	-
past	35.7%	24.5%	12.6%	9.8%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	0.7%
recent	31.7%	15.9%	14.9%	11.0%	3.7%	8.5%	14.6%	-

 Table E19
 If I shoplift I will be arrested for committing a crime

Table E20If I shoplift I will be caught

		LIKELY			U	NLIKELY		missing
	very	very quite slightly			slightly	quite	very	
all	14.6%	20.5%	19.6%	18.0%	9.9%	7.2%	10.1%	-
non	22.4%	26.9%	21.0%	16.0%	7.3%	3.2%	3.2%	-
past	7.0%	16.8%	23.1%	20.3%	11.2%	12.6%	9.1%	-
recent	7.3%	9.8%	9.8%	19.5%	14.6%	8.5%	30.5%	-

Table E21Getting goods without paying is

		GOOD				BAD		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	19.6%	7.0%	6.5%	7.7%	4.3%	14.6%	40.3%	-
non	9.6%	5.0%	4.6%	9.6%	2.7%	16.0%	52.5%	-
past	18.2%	7.0%	8.4%	7.0%	4.9%	17.5%	37.1%	-
recent	48.8%	12.2%	8.5%	3.7%	7.3%	6.1%	13.4%	-

Table E22Saving money by shoplifting is

		GOOD				missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	11.0%	5.9%	4.7%	12.8%	5.4%	19.4%	40.8%	-
non	2.3%	1.8%	2.3%	11.0%	3.7%	21.0%	58.0%	-
past	10.5%	6.3%	5.6%	16.1%	8.4%	21.0%	32.2%	-
recent	35.4%	15.9%	9.8%	12.2%	4.9%	12.2%	9.8%	-

		GOOD				missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	6.5%	0.7%	1.4%	6.8%	4.1%	14.0%	66.4%	0.2%
non	7.3%	0.9%	0.9%	6.8%	3.7%	14.2%	65.8%	0.5%
past	5.6%	0.7%	1.4%	6.3%	4.9%	11.9%	69.2%	-
recent	6.1%	-	2.4%	7.3%	3.7%	17.1%	63.4%	-

 Table E23
 Getting caught shoplifting

Table E24Breaking the law is

	GOOD			neither		missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	3.8%	1.1%	0.9%	5.6%	3.6%	17.6%	67.3%	-
non	-	-	1.4%	3.7%	1.4%	16.9%	76.7%	-
past	4.2%	0.7%	-	5.6%	2.8%	16.8%	69.9%	-
recent	13.4%	4.9%	1.2%	11.0%	11.0%	20.7%	37.8%	-

Table E25	Shops	putting u	o their	prices	because	of she	oplifting	, is
-----------	-------	-----------	---------	--------	---------	--------	-----------	------

		GOOD				missing		
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	3.4%	2.0%	2.7%	8.6%	7.7%	19.4%	56.3%	-
non	0.5%	1.4%	2.3%	8.2%	6.8%	22.4%	58.4%	-
past	2.8%	0.7%	2.1%	9.1%	7.0%	15.4%	62.9%	-
recent	12.2%	6.1%	4.9%	8.5%	11.0%	18.3%	39.0%	-

Table E26Being arrested for committing a crime is

		GOOD				BAD			
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very		
all	6.3%	1.6%	1.6%	6.3%	2.0%	13.3%	68.9%	-	
non	5.5%	1.4%	1.4%	5.9%	1.4%	12.8%	71.7%	-	
past	7.0%	2.1%	0.7%	3.5%	2.1%	12.6%	72.0%	-	
recent	7.3%	1.2%	3.7%	12.2%	3.7%	15.9%	56.1%	-	
		LIKELY			τ	UNLIKELY			
--------	-------	--------	----------	-------	------	----------	----------	---	--
	very	quite	slightly		very	quite	strongly		
all	85.6%	5.0%	1.6%	3.6%	0.7%	0.7%	2.9%	-	
non	92.7%	4.1%	0.9%	1.4%	-	-	0.9%	-	
past	89.5%	3.5%	1.4%	2.8%	-	-	2.8%	-	
recent	59.8%	9.8%	3.7%	11.0%	3.7%	3.7%	8.5%	-	

 Table E27
 My family think I should avoid shoplifting

 Table E28
 My friends think I should avoid shoplifting

		LIKELY			UN	ILIKELY		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	40.3%	15.8%	12.6%	16.7%	3.8%	2.7%	8.1%	-
non	52.1%	18.7%	14.2%	11.0%	2.3%	0.9%	0.9%	-
past	36.4%	17.5%	10.5%	23.1%	4.2%	2.1%	6.3%	-
recent	15.9%	4.9%	12.2%	20.7%	7.3%	8.5%	30.5%	-

Table E29The police think I should avoid shoplifting

		LIKELY			U	NLIKELY		missing
	very	quite	slightly]	slightly	quite	very	
all	88.5%	3.6%	1.1%	2.3%	0.5%	0.5%	3.6%	-
non	92.7%	3.7%	1.4%	0.9%	0.5%	-	0.5%	-
past	90.2%	3.5%	-	2.8%	-	-	3.5%	-
recent	74.4%	3.7%	2.4%	4.9%	1.2%	2.4%	11.0%	-

Table E30Doing what my family think I should do is

		GOOD				BAD		missing
	very	quite	slightly]	slightly	quite	very	
all	35.8%	21.2%	13.8%	21.2%	1.8%	1.8%	4.3%	0.2%
non	35.2%	25.6%	15.1%	20.1%	0.5%	1.8%	1.4%	0.5%
past	40.6%	16.1%	14.7%	16.8%	4.2%	1.2%	6.3%	-
recent	29.3%	18.3%	8.5%	31.7%	1.2%	2.4%	8.5%	-

		GOOD				BAD		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	16.0%	20.0%	14.2%	35.1%	5.2%	4.5%	4.3%	0.2%
non	14.6%	22.8%	14.2%	36.5%	5.5%	4.1%	1.8%	0.5%
past	16.8%	18.2%	13.3%	30.8%	6.3%	6.3%	8.4%	-
recent	18.3%	18.3%	15.9%	39.0%	2.4%	2.4%	3.7%	-

Table E31 Doing what my friends think I should do is

Table E32Doing what the police think I should do is

		GOOD				BAD		missing
	very	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	very	
all	38.3%	18.7%	9.2%	22.1%	2.0%	0.9%	8.3%	0.5%
non	42.5%	25.6%	8.2%	20.5%	0.9%	0.5%	1.4%	0.5%
past	39.2%	11.2%	11.9%	22.4%	4.9%	1.4%	8.4%	0.7%
recent	25.6%	13.4%	7.3%	25.6%	-	1.2%	26.8%	-

 Table E33
 I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought there was little risk of being caught

		AGREE			I		missing	
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	22.5%	9.9%	16.2%	11.5%	2.3%	8.3%	29.1%	-
non	7.8%	6.8%	19.2%	11.4%	2.7%	11.4%	40.6%	-
past	30.1%	10.5%	16.1%	13.3%	2.8%	4.2%	23.1%	-
recent	48.8%	17.1%	8.5%	8.5%	-	7.3%	8.5%	-

Table E34I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought the retailers' security
measures were ineffective

		AGREE		neither	I	DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	23.2%	14.0%	16.9%	10.8%	3.4%	7.7%	23.9%	0.2%
non	8.7%	8.2%	20.1%	10.0%	3.2%	11.4%	38.4%	-
past	26.6%	19.6%	16.1%	14.7%	4.2%	4.9%	14.0%	-
recent	56.1%	19.5%	9.8%	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%	1.2%

		AGREE			DISAGREE			missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	19.4%	13.1%	13.3%	14.0%	4.7%	6.8%	28.8%	-
non	8.2%	7.8%	16.4%	12.8%	3.2%	11.0%	40.6%	-
past	18.9%	18.9%	11.9%	18.2%	5.6%	3.5%	23.1%	-
recent	50.0%	17.1%	7.3%	9.8%	7.3%	1.2%	7.3%	-

 Table E35
 I would be more likely to shoplift if I thought I would not be punished severely if caught

 Table E36
 I would be more likely to shoplift if I were short of money

		AGREE			L	DISAGRE	E	missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	19.4%	10.8%	18.9%	13.5%	6.3%	6.5%	24.5%	-
non	8.2%	6.4%	21.0%	11.4%	6.8%	7.8%	38.4%	-
past	22.4%	15.4%	21.0%	14.7%	5.6%	7.0%	14.0%	-
recent	43.9%	14.6%	9.8%	17.1%	6.1%	2.4%	6.1%	-

Table E37I would be more likely to shoplift if my friends encouraged me to

		AGREE			I	DISAGREE			
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly		
all	8.8%	8.8%	14.2%	19.4%	5.4%	9.7%	33.8%	-	
non	4.1%	3. 7%	11.0%	17.4%	5.0%	11.0%	47.9%	-	
past	9.1%	14.0%	18.9%	18.2%	4.9%	10.5%	24.5%	-	
recent	20.7%	13.4%	14.6%	26.8%	7.3%	4.9%	12.2%	-	

 Table E38
 I do think there is little risk of being caught

		AGREE			I	DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	15.8%	17.1%	18.0%	12.6%	10.4%	11.9%	14.2%	-
non	11.4%	15.5%	18.3%	13.7%	10.5%	13.7%	16.9%	-
past	14.0%	18.9%	16.8%	13.3%	10.5%	14.0%	12.6%	-
recent	30.5%	18.3%	19.5%	8.5%	9.8%	3.7%	9.8%	-

	AGREE			neither	E	DISAGREE		
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	12.6%	11.0%	18.9%	15.3%	13.7%	16.2%	12.2%	-
non	14.2%	11.9%	19.6%	17.4%	15.5%	15.1%	6.4%	-
past	11.9%	10.5%	21.0%	12.6%	12.6%	18.9%	12.6%	-
recent	9.8%	9.8%	13.4%	14.6%	11.0%	14.6%	26.8%	-

 Table E39
 I do think that security measures are good at catching shoplifters

Table E40I do think that I will be severely punished

	AGREE			neither	DISAGREE			missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	27.0%	16.9%	15.1%	12.4%	8.8%	8.1%	11.7%	-
non	9.1%	9.6%	10.0%	10.0%	16.4%	16.0%	28.8%	-
past	22.4%	19.6%	15.4%	12.6%	7.7%	7.7%	14.7%	-
recent	30.5%	14.6%	11.0%	18.3%	7.3%	4.9%	13.4%	-

Table E41I am often short of money

	AGREE			neither	DISAGREE			missing
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	16.4%	9.0%	15.5%	9.5%	7.7%	16.2%	25.5%	0.2%
non	13.2%	7.8%	20.5%	10.0%	6.8%	19.2%	22.4%	-
past	15.4%	10.5%	9.8%	9.8%	8.4%	18.2%	27.3%	0.7%
recent	26.8%	9.8%	12.2%	7.3%	8.5%	4.7%	30.5%	-

Table E42My friends often encourage me to shoplift

	AGREE		neither	DISAGREE			missing	
	strongly	quite	slightly		slightly	quite	strongly	
all	3.6%	1.8%	5.4%	12.6%	5.0%	7.7%	63. 7%	0.2%
non	0.9%	0.9%	1.8%	7.8%	4.1%	5.9%	78.5%	•
past	2.1%	2.1%	6.3%	11.9%	3.5%	12.6%	60.8%	0.7%
recent	13.4%	3.7%	13.4%	26.8%	9.8%	3.7%	29.3%	-

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SHOPLIFTING PREVENTION MEASURES

	very likely	quite likely	neither	quite unlikely	very unlikely	missing
all	45.3%	32.2%	7.9%	5.2%	5.2%	4.3%
non	45.7%	36.5%	6.4%	4.1%	3.7%	3.7%
past	44.1%	34.3%	7.0%	4.2%	5.6%	4.9%
recent	46.3%	17.1%	13.4%	9.8%	8.5%	4.9%

Table E43 CCTV would stop people shoplifting

Table E44Security guards would stop people shoplifting

	very likely	quite likely	neither	quite unlikely	very unlikely	missing
all	33.1%	38.5%	11.3%	6.8%	5.4%	5.0%
non	30.6%	46.6%	11.0%	5.5%	2.3%	4.1%
past	37.1%	37.1%	8.4%	6.3%	5.6%	5.6%
recent	32.9%	19.5%	17.1%	11.0%	13.4%	6.1%

Table E45Electronic tags would stop people shoplifting

	very likely	quite likely	neither	quite unlikely	very unlikely	missing
all	55.6%	22.3%	7.0%	3.6%	7.4%	4.1%
non	56.6%	27.4%	7.3%	2.3%	3.7%	2.7%
past	60.1%	19.6%	5.6%	3.5%	6.3%	4.9%
recent	45.1%	13.4%	8.5%	7.3%	19.5%	6.1%

Table E46 Store detectives would stop people shoplifting

	very likely	quite likely	neither	quite unlikely	very unlikely	missing
all	29.5%	34.2%	14.9%	10.4%	5.4%	5.6%
non	23.3%	44.7%	14.8%	11.5%	2.4%	4.6%
past	35.7%	27.3%	12.6%	11.9%	5.6%	7.0%
recent	35.4%	18.3%	20.7%	6.1%	13.4%	6.1%

	Yes	No	Don't know	Missing
all	56.3%	19.1%	18.5%	6.1%
non	55.7%	20.1%	20.1%	4.1%
past	65.7%	10.5%	16.1%	7.7%
recent	41.5%	31. 7%	18.3%	8.5%

Table E47Would any of these security measures make you feel worried?

Table E48	Have any of	these measures ever stoppe	d you from using a shop?

	Yes	No	Don't know	Missing
all	12.2%	671%	13.5%	7.2%
non	11.4%	73.5%	10.5%	4.6%
past	14.0%	63.6%	14.0%	8.4%
recent	18.3%	56.1%	13.4%	12.2%

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR THE SCHOOL SURVEY

F.1	Comparison of the two school samples	347
F.2	The school past shoplifters	350
F.3	Factor analysis for the school survey	353
F.4	Comparison of the beliefs and attitudes of the student respondents	356
F.5	The influence of the demographic variables on the students	359

F.1 COMPARISON OF THE TWO SCHOOL SAMPLES

	chi square	đf	significance	Cramer's V	significance
Age	63.31710	5	.00000	.37763	.00000
money	37.17882	3	.00000	.29135	.00000
gender	0.20869	1	.64779	02168	.64779
shopping	6.20365	4	.18445	.11834	.18445

Table F1Demographic Variables

Table F2Shoplifting history

	chi square	df	significance	Cramer's V	significance
frequency of shoplifting	4.20752	5	5.1994	.09746	.51994
recency of shoplifting	16.17848	4	.00279	.19089	.00279
frequency of shoplifting in last 12 months	16.34869	6	.01200	.19189	.01200
Have you ever been caught	.67997	3	.87791	.03918	.87791
Would being caught stop you from shoplifting	9.22688	3	.02642	.14416	.02642

Table F3 The Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures

effectiveness of shop security	chi square	đf	significance	Cramer's V	significance
CCTV	11.41778	4	.02225	.16391	.02225
Security guards	4.50362	4	.34212	.10331	.34212
electronic tags	11.00608	4	.02650	.16704	.02650
Store detectives	5.78773	4	.21557	.11753	.21557
Would any of these make you feel worried	.99819	2	.60708	.04893	.60708
have any of these stopped you from using a shop	1.48415	2	.47613	.06002	.47613

	School A	School B	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
will	2.0484	2.5097	6.3496	.0121	.0701
chance	2.1038	2.5355	5.4474	.0200	.0836
approve	1.7754	2.0649	2.5696	.1097	.0372
avoid	1.8299	1.9935	0.9204	.3379	.4857
good	1.9510	2.2000	2.6396	.1049	.4832
honest	1.5810	1.4774	0.7810	.3773	.6863
right	1.5854	1.7032	0.9181	.3385	.4469
stupid	2.1107	2.3226	1.6084	.2054	.5504
excite	3.0242	3.0194	0.0006	.9804	.8389
reward	3.1268	3.1097	0.0066	.9353	.6965
easy	4.6678	4.5065	0.6635	.4158	.7156
opportunity	5.1038	4.9871	0.3968	.5291	.9823
guilty	2.5260	2.6065	0.1606	.6888	.8254
morally	2.0346	2.4323	4.9740	.0262	.0599

Table F4Global Measures

Table F5Outcome Beliefs

	School A	School B	F Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
I will be arrested	2.6493	2.8452	1.1216	.2902	.3516
I will be caught	3.3910	3.7097	3.0337	.0822	.1559
I will be breaking the law	1.5467	1.5032	0.0869	.7683	.3549
Shops will pass on costs	3.4306	3.6688	1.2605	.2622	.1635
I will get goods free	5.2431	5.3355	0.2129	.6448	.5928
I will save money	5.2743	5.3290	0.0714	.7894	.6828
arrested good/bad	1.8235	1.9935	0.9969	.3186	.2833
caught good/bad	1.9446	1.8312	0.4546	.5005	.6039
law good/bad	1.5848	2.0258	9.5730	.0021	.0093
costs good/bad	1.9965	2.0516	0.1273	.7214	.9503
free goods good/bad	3.1349	3.4581	1.8157	.1785	.2832
save money good/bad	2.9677	2.7578	1.0071	.3161	.7330

.

	School A	School B	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
family	1.4083	1.4581	0.1568	.6923	.2353
friends	2.5294	2.9742	5.6993	.0174	.0441
police	1.4291	1.2968	1.0882	.2974	.1417
family good/bad	5.4931	5.3871	0.4381	.5084	.6445
friends good/bad	4.8839	4.6979	1.4246	.2333	.2130
police good/bad	5.4042	5.2000	1.2543	.2633	.7661

Table F6Referent Beliefs

Table F7Control Beliefs

	School A	School B	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig
friends encouraged me	3.2007	3.5419	2.7347	.0989	.1125
ineffective security	4.2431	4.2387	0.0004	.9849	.9804
penalties not severe	3.9308	3.9226	0.0013	.9715	.9624
little risk of being caught	4.0625	3.8129	1.1252	.2894	.3225
short of money	4.0035	4.1548	0.4706	.4931	.5588
friends often encourage me	1.8576	2.4903	14.4632	.0002	.0004
security is ineffective	4.1419	3.8452	2.4392	.1191	.1179
penalties not severe	4.6713	4.7484	0.1410	.7075	.6569
little risk of being caught	4.2699	4.1484	0.3628	.5472	.6355
often short of money	3.5208	3.9290	3.4311	.0646	.0756

.

F.2 THE SCHOOL PAST SHOPLIFTERS

	chi square	df	significance	Cramer's V	significance
Age ·	10.91919	10	.36385	.19539	.36385
money	5.14651	6	.52516	.13462	.52516
gender	6.72935	5	.03457	.21693	.03457
shopping	6.57977	8	.58257	.15168	.58257

Table F8Demographic Variables

Table F9Shoplifting History

	chi square	df	significanc e	Cramer's V	significance
frequency of shoplifting	10.78347	8	.21427	.19486	.21427
Have you ever been caught	5.2442	4	.26312	.13589	.26312
Would being caught stop you from shoplifting	10.25952	4	.03628	.18940	.03628

Table F10 Effectiveness of Shoplifting Prevention Measures

effectiveness of shop security	chi square	đf	significance	Cramer's V	significance
CCTV	1.21734	8	.99647	.06690	.99647
Security guards	10.10367	8	.25782	.19345	.25782
electronic tags	8.87222	8	.35319	.18061	.35319
Store detectives	13.69851	8	.08997	.22693.	.08997
Would any of these make you feel worried	7.94467	4	.09363	.17347	.09363
have any of these stopped you from using a shop	2.72658	4	.60457	.10201	.60457

	can't remember	over 5 years	1-5 years ago	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
will	2.2564	1.8276	1.9600	0.7234	.4869	.6883
chance	2.1282	2.2759	2.0667	0.1623	.8503	.8629
approve	2.2051	1.7857	1.9459	0.4360	.6475	.6681
avoid	2.0513	1.5862	1.6267	1.1419	.3222	.3827
good	2.2821	1.7586	1.5600	4.4837	.0130	.4408
honest	1.6667	1.5296	1.4400	0.5243	.5931	.3651
right	1.7692	1.6552	1.3200	2.7034	.0705	.1787
stupid	2.2308	2.1034	1.9467	0.4903	.6315	.7571
excite	3.1795	3.1379	3.1333	0.0082	.9918	.9917
reward	3.2821	3.2963	3.0400	0.2499	.7792	.7879
easy	5.3333	4.7037	4.7333	1.3220	.2700	.0625
opptny	5.2308	5.3448	5.4533	0.1921	.8255	.9045
guilty	3.0513	2.4138	2.9200	0.9001	.4088	.6215
morally	2.5128	1.8966	2.3467	0.9550	.3873	.5922

Table F11Global Measures

Table F12Outcome Beliefs

	can't remember	over 5 years ago	1-5 years ago	F Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
I will be arrested	2.7692	2.7857	2.5200	0.3481	.7066	.8101
I will be caught	3.7949	4.3103	3.7200	1.2719	.2835	.1852
I will be breaking the law	1.5897	3.3103	1.4267	0.3545	.7022	.4987
Shops will pass on costs	3.3846	3.5357	3.6933	0.2655	.7672	.7970
I will get goods free	5.3846	5.7586	5.8933	1.0346	.3581	.7878
I will save money	5.7436	6.1379	5.5867	0.9525	.3882	.1472
arrested good/bad	2.2308	1.6522	1.6800	1.4731	.2327	.1032
caught good/bad	2.0513	1.7241	1.7600	0.4930	.6118	.1552
law good/bad	2.2051	1.5862	1.4400	3.9469	.0215	.0082
costs good/bad	2.2564	1.5862	1.7467	2.2930	.1047	.4149
free goods good/bad	3.8718	3.1724	2.9733	1.9064	.1524	.1583
save money good/bad	3.6154	2.6652	2.8667	2.3854	.0958	.2455

	can't remember	over 5 years ago	1-5 years ago	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
family	1.5128	1.2414	1.2400	0.8338	.4365	.1931
friends	2.7179	2.6897	2.7467	0.0133	.9888	.9382
police	1.5641	1.1379	1.2800	1.1754	.3117	.6602
family good/bad	5.0769	5.4483	5.6000	1.1405	.3226	.2655
friends good/bad	4.5128	4.3103	4.6800	0.4686	.6268	.5919
police good/bad	4.8974	5.3103	5.3108	0.6720	.5124	.6931

Table F13Referent Beliefs

Table F14Control Beliefs

	can't remember	over 5 years ago	1-5 years ago	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig
friends encouraged me	3.8718	3.8276	3.6533	.1709	.8431	.8641
ineffective security	4.7692	4.7931	4.8000	0.0029	.9971	.9742
penalties not severe	4.2821	4.2759	4.2133	0.0160	.9841	.9812
little risk of being caught	4.3077	4.5862	4.5067	0.1396	.8689	.8012
short of money	4.5641	5.0000	4.4133	0.8696	.4214	.4043
friends often encourage me	2.0256	2.0000	2.0676	0.0210	.9792	.8273
security is ineffective	3.6923	4.7241	4.0800	2.4362	.0912	.0920
penalties not severe	4.1795	4.4828	4.7600	1.0010	.3701	.3530
little risk of being caught	4.3333	4.2069	4.1333	0.1279	.8801	.8352
often short of money	3.2821	3.1429	3.7467	1.0009	.3702	.3312

F.3 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE SCHOOL SURVEY

Factor Analysis for the Global Measures

A factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was performed on the twelve variables contained in the global measures of attitude, the subjective and moral norm, and perceived control. The figures shown below fulfill the criteria described by Kinnear and Gray (1994) as being indicative of a satisfactory factor analysis

> Determinant of the correlation matrix = .0052365 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .89801 Significance of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity = .00000

The factor analysis produced an initial solution of three factors with an Eigenvalue of greater than one Only those factors with an eigenvalue of greater than one are considered to be common factors. The scree plot, shown in Figure F1, indicates that these three factors explained 64.3% of the variance.





To provide a check on the robustness of the model, three alternative methods of factor extraction were utilised; unweighted least squares, generalised least squares, and maximum likelihood. Comparison of the factor matrices from the four extraction methods indicated that all four methods placed the original variables into the same factors, with similar but not identical values.

The varimax rotation loaded on the three factors shown in table F15. Factor one, attitude, contains four of the original attitude variables, *honest*, *right*, *good* and *stupid*, plus the two moral norm variables of *morally* and *guilty*. Factor two, perceived control, contains the two original perceived control variables of *easy* and *opportunity* plus the attitude variables of *exciting* and *rewarding*. Factor three, the subjective norm, retained its original formulation.

Table F15	Factor	Analysis	for the	Global	Measures
-----------	--------	----------	---------	--------	----------

FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
attitude	perceived control	subjective norm
honest morally right guilty good stupid	easy opportunity exciting rewarding	approve avoid

Factor Analysis for the Belief Measures

Following the procedures described for the global measures, factor analysis, using principal components extraction and varimax rotation, was performed on the 14 variables contained in the measures of outcome beliefs, referent beliefs and control beliefs. The figures shown below fulfill the criteria described by Kinnear and Gray (1994) as being indicative of a satisfactory factor analysis.

Determinant of the correlation matrix = .0064279 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .82973 Significance of the Bartlett Test of Sphericity = .00000

The factor analysis produced an initial solution of three factors with an Eigenvalue of greater than one. The scree plot, shown in Figure F2, indicates that these three factors explained 56.4% of the variance.





The varimax rotation loaded on the three factors shown in Table F16. Factor one, outcome/control, contained the original five control beliefs, plus the outcome beliefs of 'pay' and 'save' and the referent belief 'friends'. Factor two, apprehension, contained the outcome beliefs of 'arrest', 'caught' and 'law'. Factor three, the subjective norm, contained the beliefs relating to 'family' and 'the police'.

Table F16 Factor Analysis for the Belief Measures

FACTOR 1 outcome/control ineffective security	FACTOR 2 apprehension arrest	FACTOR 3 referent family
save	caught	police
pay	law	
risk		
punish		
short		
friends (control)		
friends (referent)		

F.4 COMPARISON OF THE BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES OF THE STUDENT RESPONDENTS

To compare the views of the three groups of respondents, both one-way analysis of variance (parametric) and the Kruskal-Wallis test (non-parametric) were used. The results of the one-way analysis of variance are reported in full, as this technique enables the use of Tukey's HSD test to pin-point where the significant differences occur. For the Kruskal-Wallis, only the significance of the test is reported. Where the figures for all three groups of respondents are shown in bold, this indicates statistically significant differences between *all* three groups. Where only the figure for the recent shoplifters is shown in bold, this indicates that the recent shoplifters hold statistically significant different views from the non-shoplifters and past shoplifters.

I think shoplifting is	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
good/bad	1.5602	1.7972	3.7195	84.1982	.0000	.0000
honest/dishonest	1.2593	1.5319	2.3171	27.0455	.0000	.0000
right/wrong	1.3456	1.5105	2.5732	35.0865	.0000	.0000
wise/stupid	1.7215	2.0559	3.6463	48.3385	.0000	.0000

Table F17Attitude (n=444)

Questions scaled 1 to 7. 7 indicates that shoplifting is extremely, good, honest, right, and wise and 1 indicates that shoplifting is extremely bad, dishonest, wrong, and stupid

Table F18Subjective norm (n=444)

most people important to me	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
would not approve	1.4977	1.9858	2.7037	14.3023	.0000	.0000
think I should avoid	1.5367	1.7343	3.0854	28.3202	.0000	.0000

Questions scaled: 7 strongly disagree to 1 strongly agree

Table F19Perceived control (n=444)

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
exciting	2.2785	3.1469	4.7927	61.4720	.0000	.0000
rewarding	2.5139	3.1560	4.6585	35.8283	.0000	.0000
easy	3.9954	4.8936	5.7561	28.8680	.0000	.0000
opportunity	4.5799	5.3706	5.8171	17.2665	.0000	.0000

Questions scaled: 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree

Table F20	Moral norm	(n=444)
-----------	------------	---------

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
I would feel guilty if Ishoplifted	1.6393	2.8531	4.4756	84.5532	.0000	.0000
Shoplifting is morally wrong	1.5205	2.3007	3.6951	54.8397	.0000	.0000

questions scaled: 1 strongly agree to 7 strongly disagree

Table F21Economic beliefs (n=444)

	Non	Past	Recent	F Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood Shops will pass on costs I will get goods free I will save money	4.6376 4.6697 4.7156	4.4225 5.7273 5.7413	4.1951 6.0976 6.0488	1.3867 22.3556 19.0112	.2510 .0000 .0000	.3180 .0000 .0000
Evaluation costs good/bad free goods good/bad save money good/bad	1.7945 2.5114 1.9315	1.8531 3.2587 3.0280	2.8902 5.1951 4.8902	17.2717 44.1736 82.0312	.0000 .0000 .0000	.0000 .0000 .0000

Likelihood questions scaled: 7 very likely to 1 very unlikely. Evaluation questions scaled: 7 very good to 1 very bad

Table F22Apprehension beliefs (n=444)

	Non	Past	Recent	F Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood I will be arrested I will be caught I will be breaking the law	5.4247 5.1782 6.6438	5.3592 4.1399 6.5524	4.7683 3.2805 5.8537	3.9599 42.7177 9.1669	.0197 .0000 .0001	.1060 .0000 .0006
Evaluation arrested good/bad caught good/bad law good/bad	1.7854 1.9450 1.3607	1.8252 1.8322 1.6783	2.2439 1.9268 2.853 7	2.2770 0.2008 37.2381	.1038 .8181 .0000	.0206 .7163 .0000

likelihood questions scaled: 1 very likely to 7 very unlikely evaluation questions scaled: 7 very good to 1 very bad

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-W Sig.
Likelihood						
family	1.1553	1.3147	2.3415	30.8799	.0000	.0000
friends	1.9909	2.7273	4.4634	66.9382	.0000	.0000
police	1.1644	1.3287	2.0610	15.9801	.0000	.0000
Evaluation	}					
family	5.6422	5.4266	5.0122	4.6980	.0096	.0435
friends	4.8464	4.5594	4.8902	1.8144	.1642	.3718
police	5.8165	5.1972	4.2805	23.8050	.0000	.0000

Table F23Referent beliefs (n=444)

Likelihood questions scaled: 7 very unlikely to 1 very likely.

Evaluation questions scaled: 7 very good to 1 very bad

	Non	Past	Recent	F. Ratio	F. Prob	K-WSig.
Likelihood						
friends encouraged me	2.5982	3.7486	4.5000	51.790	.0000	.0000
ineffective security	3.2146	4.7902	6.0494	5.3995	.0000	.0000
penalties not severe	3.0959	4.2448	5.5976	0.5878	.0000	.0000
little risk of being caught	3.0868	4.4685	5.5062	8.50863	.0000	.0000
short of money	3.2100	4.5734	5.4146	1.4927	.0000	.0000
Evolution						
Evaluation	1 5 4 7 0	2 0 4 2 2	2 5610	51 7004	0000	0000
mends often encourage me	1.54/9	2.0423	3.5010	51.7904	.0000	.0000
security is ineffective	3.7900	4.1049	4.5884	5.3995	.0048	.5387
penalties not severe	4.7808	4.5455	4.7439	.5878	.5560	.0047
little risk of being caught	3.9498	4.2028	5.0122	8.5083	.0002	.0002
often short of money	3 6347	3 5200	4 0244	1.4927	2259	.3311

Table F24Control beliefs (n=444)

often short of money3.63473.52004.02441.49likelihood questions scaled: 7 = extremely likely to 1 = extremely likely
evaluation questions scaled: 7 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree

F.5 THE INFLUENCE OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON THE STUDENTS

To investigate the influence of the demographic variables of age, gender and economic status, both one-way analysis of variance and the Kruskal-Wallis test were used. Only those results where both the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests have produced statistically significant findings are reported.

Under 16	16 and over	F Prob.	F Ratio	K-W Sig
				Ū.
1.6822	1.2556	9.1393	.0028	.0059
1.7597	1.1889	14.3421	.0002	.0008
2.3095	2.8000	4.2947	.0394	.0182
3.7188	4.3933	7.1015	.0083	.0092
1.2481	1.0222	5.4319	.0207	.0146
5.8125	5.4000	4.8910	.0280	.0045
1.7054	1.3222	5.3721	.0214	.0074
3.5349	4.1556	6.4442	.0118	.0169
2.0496	1.9129	8.0768	.0049	.0015
2.8837	3.5439	4.4346	.0370	.0326
5.3953	6.2281	7.7121	.0062	.0324
4.2791	4.9825	5.5576	.0198	.0399
2.3647	1.5614	9.0201	.0032	.0077
2.8023	1.5439	17.4062	.0001	.0033
4.0875	4.6071	6.8603	.0098	.0096
	Under 16 1.6822 1.7597 2.3095 3.7188 1.2481 5.8125 1.7054 3.5349 2.0496 2.8837 5.3953 4.2791 2.3647 2.8023 4.0875	Under 16 16 and over 1.6822 1.2556 1.7597 1.1889 2.3095 2.8000 3.7188 4.3933 1.2481 1.0222 5.8125 5.4000 1.7054 1.3222 3.5349 4.1556 2.0496 1.9129 2.8837 3.5439 5.3953 6.2281 4.2791 4.9825 2.3647 1.5614 2.8023 1.5439 4.0875 4.6071	Under 1616 and overF Prob. 1.6822 1.2556 9.1393 1.7597 1.1889 14.3421 2.3095 2.8000 4.2947 3.7188 4.3933 7.1015 1.2481 1.0222 5.4319 5.8125 5.4000 4.8910 1.7054 1.3222 5.3721 3.5349 4.1556 6.4442 2.0496 1.9129 8.0768 2.8837 3.5439 4.4346 5.3953 6.2281 7.7121 4.2791 4.9825 5.5576 2.3647 1.5614 9.0201 2.8023 1.5439 17.4062 4.0875 4.6071 6.8603	Under 16 16 and over F Prob. F Ratio 1.6822 1.2556 9.1393 .0028 1.7597 1.1889 14.3421 .0002 2.3095 2.8000 4.2947 .0394 3.7188 4.3933 7.1015 .0083 1.2481 1.0222 5.4319 .0207 5.8125 5.4000 4.8910 .0280 1.7054 1.3222 5.3721 .0214 3.5349 4.1556 6.4442 .0118 2.0496 1.9129 8.0768 .0049 2.8837 3.5439 4.4346 .0370 5.3953 6.2281 7.7121 .0062 4.2791 4.9825 5.5576 .0198 2.3647 1.5614 9.0201 .0032 2.8023 1.5439 17.4062 .0001 4.0875 4.6071 6.8603 .0098

Table F25The influence of age

Table F26The influence of gender

GENDER	Male	Female	F Prob.	F Ratio	K-W Sig
Non-shoplifters					_
reward	2.8214	2.3182	4.4234	.0366	.0456
caught (likelihood)	4.6667	5.5111	16.5412	.0001	.0007
friends (likelihood)	2.3214	1.7852	9.1509	.0028	.0027
security (evaluation)	4.2500	3.5037	9.2101	.0027	.0030
guilty	1.8810	1.4889	5.2571	.0228	.0003
Past shoplifters					
chance	2.3951	1.7742	4.9943	.0270	.0428
will	2.2593	1.6935	4.7627	.0307	.0186
Recent shoplifters					
will	4.8571	3.6667	6.0209	.0163	.0159
stupid	4.1429	2.9091	7.2171	.0088	.0196
police (evaluation)	3.7755	5.0303	6.1558	.0152	.0356
security (evaluation)	6.4167	5.5152	7.9513	.0061	.0206

ECONOMIC	Under £10	Over £10	F Prob.	F Ratio	K-W Sig
Non-shoplifters					
will	1.8041	1.2991	10.9507	.0011	.0014
right	1.4688	1.2414	5.2248	.0233	.0118
arrest (likelihood)	5.1546	5.6410	4.2380	.0408	.0145
prices (evaluation)	2.0619	1.5470	9.9797	.0018	.0061
friends (likelihood)	2.2268	1. 78 63	6.2924	.0129	.0185
peers (evaluation)	1.8454	1.2821	12.2022	.0006	.0001
short (evaluation)	4.2577	3.0342	19.5164	.0000	.0000
morally	1.7526	1.3419	7.5137	.0066	.0032
Past shoplifters					
opportunity	4.8333	5.6818	7.5526	.0068	.0162
pay (likelihood)	5.3704	6.0000	4.3951	.03 78	.0274
punish (evaluation)	4.0741	4.8409	4.5652	.0344	.0339
risk (evaluation)	3.7593	4.5114	4.9642	.0275	.0341
short (evaluation)	4.0370	3.1954	4.8703	.0290	.0148
Recent shonlifters					
short (evaluation)	4 9167	3.3261	9.3563	.0030	.0047
	1				

Table F27The influence of economic status

.

REFERENCES

Abelson, E S (1989a) When Ladies Go A-thieving: Middle-class Shoplifters in the Victorian Department Store Oxford University Press, New York

Abelson, E S (1989b) 'The invention of kleptomania', Signs, 15 (1) 123-143

Achen, C H (1982) Interpreting and Using Regression: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Sage Publications Inc, Beverly Hills

Adams, K and Cutshall, C R (1984) 'Refusing to prosecute minor offences: the relative influence of legal and extralegal factors', *Justice Quarterly*, 4 (4) 595-609

Adley, R (1978) An Independent Study of the Cause and Effect of the Increase in Shoplifting Report of a Study Group on Shoplifting, House of Commons, London

Agnew, R (1992) 'Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency', Criminology, 30(1) 47-87

Agnew, R and Peters, A A R (1986) 'The techniques of neutralisation: an analysis of predisposing and situational factors', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, **13** (1) 81-97

Ahtola, O T (1985) 'Hedonic and utilitarian aspects of consumer behaviour', Advances in Consumer Research, 12 7-10

Ajzen, I (1985) 'From intentions to actions: a theory of planned behaviour' in Kuhl, J and Bickman, I (eds) Action Control: From Cognition to Behaviour Springer, Heidelberg, 11-39

Ajzen, I (1987) 'Attitudes, traits and actions: dispositional theory of behaviour in personality and social psychology' in Berkowitz, L (ed) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Academic Press, New York, 1-63

Ajzen, I (1988) Attitudes, Personality and Behaviour Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Ajzen, I (1991) 'The theory of planned behaviour', Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 50 179-211

Ajzen, I and Driver B L (1992) 'Application of the theory of planned behaviour to leisure choice', Journal of Leisure Research, 24 (3) 207-224

Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M (1970) 'The prediction of behaviour from attitudinal and normative variables', Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 6 466-487

Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M (1974) 'Factors influencing intentions and the intentionbehaviour relation', *Human Relations*, 27 (1) 1-15 Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M (1977) 'Attitude-behaviour relations: a theoretical analysis and review of empirical research', *Psychological Bulletin*, **84** (5) 888-918

Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M (1980) Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour Prentice-Hall Inc, New Jersey

Ajzen, I and Madden, T J (1986) 'Prediction of goal-directed behaviour: attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioural control' *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **22** 454-474

Akers, R L, Krohn, M D, Lanza-Kaduce, L and Radosevich, M (1979) 'Social learning and deviant behaviour: a specific test of a general theory', *American Sociological Review*, 44 636-655

Albanese, J S (1984) 'A systematic approach to the prevention of shoplifting and employee theft', *Journal of Security Administration*, 7 (1) 23-30

Andenaes, J (1966) 'The general preventive effects of punishment', University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 114 (May) 949-983

Anderson, D R, Sweeney, D J and Williams, T A (1993) Statistics for Business and Economics West Publishing Company, New York

Anderson, L, Chiricos, T G and Waldo, G P (1977) 'Formal and informal sanctions: a comparison of deterrent effects', *Social Problems*, **25** 103-114

Anderson, P (1983) 'Marketing, scientific progress and scientific method', Journal of Consumer Research, 47 (Fall) 18-31

Anderson, P F (1986) 'On method in consumer research: a critical behaviourist perspective', Journal of Consumer Research, 13 (Sept) 155-173

Angenent, H (1981) 'Shoplifting: a review' Criminology and Penology Abstracts, 21 (3) i-vii

Applebaum, A W and Klemmer, H (1974) 'Shoplifting', *Menninger Perspectives*, 5 (Fall) 16-19.

Arboleda-Florez, J, Durie, H and Costello, J (1977) 'Shoplifting - an ordinary crime?' International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21 (3) 201-207

Arndt, J (1985) 'On making marketing more scientific; the role of orientations, paradigms, metaphors and puzzle solving', *Journal of Marketing*, **49** 11-23

Arieff, A J and Bowie, C G (1947) 'Some psychiatric aspects of shoplifting', Journal of Clinical Psychology, 8 (Jan) 565-576

Astor, S (1969) 'Shoplifting: far greater than we know?' Security World, 6 (1) 12-13

Astor, S D (1971) 'Shoplifting survey', Security World, 8 (3) 34-35

Aust, A (1987) 'Gaining control of compulsive shop theft', *Probation Journal*, **34** (4) 145-146

Axelrod, A D and Elkind, T (1976) 'Merchants responses to shoplifting: an empirical study', *Stanford Law Review*, **28** (Feb) 589-612

Babin, B J and Babin, L A (1996) 'Effects of moral cognitions and consumer emotions on shoplifting intentions', *Psychology and Marketing*, 13 (8) 785-802

Babin, B J and Darden, W R (1995) 'Consumer self-regulation in a retail environment', Journal of Retailing, 71 (1) 47-70

Babin, B J, Darden, W R and Griffin, M (1994) 'Work and/or fun: measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20 (March) 644-656

Babin, B J and Griffin, M (1995) 'A closer look at the influence of age on consumer ethics', Advances in Consumer Research, 22 668-673

Babin, B J, Robin, D P and Pike, K (1994) 'To steal or not to steal? Consumer ethics and shoplifting' in Park, C W and Smith, D C (eds) *Marketing Theory and Applications* American Marketing Association, Chicago, 200-205

Bachman, R, Paternoster, R and Ward, S (1992) 'The rationality of sexual offending: testing a deterrence/rational choice conception of sexual assault', *Law and Society Review*, **26** 343-372

Badonnel, Dr. (1968) 'Le vol dans les grands magasins', Revue Penitentiare et de Droit Penale, 92 (1) 103-106

Bagozzi, R P (1981) 'Attitudes, intentions and behaviour: a test of some key hypotheses', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41 (4) 607-627

Bagozzi, R P (ed) (1994a) Principles of Marketing Research Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Bagozzi, R P (1994b) 'Measurement in marketing research: basic principles of questionnaire design' in Bagozzi, R P (ed) Principles of Marketing Research Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1-49

Bagozzi, RP (1994c) 'Structural equation models in marketing research: basic principles' in Bagozzi, RP (ed) Principles of Marketing Research Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 317-385

Bagozzi, R P, Baumgartner, H and Yi, Y (1992) 'State versus action orientation and the theory of reasoned action: an application to coupon usage', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (4) 505-529

Bagozzi, R P and Warshaw, P R (1990) 'Trying to consume', Journal of Consumer Research, 17 127-140

Baldwin, J and Bottoms, A E (1976) The Urban Criminal Tavistock Publications, London

Bales, K B (1982) 'Contrast and complementarity in three theories of criminal behaviour', *Deviant Behaviour*, 3 (2) 155-174

Bamfield, J (1988) 'Fighting retail theft', Retail and Distribution Management, 16 (6) 23-26

Bamfield, J (1994a) National Survey of Retail Theft and Security 1994 Nene College, Northampton

Bamfield, J (1994b) 'Electronic article surveillance: management learning in curbing theft' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester, 155-173

Bamfield, J (1997a) Making Shoplifters Pay: Retail Civil Recovery Social Marketing Foundation, Paper No. 28, London

Bamfield, J (1997b) Fighting Retail Crime: How Major Multiples Curb Theft from Stores ICL Retail Systems, Maidenhead

Bamfield, J (1998) 'A breach of trust: employee collusion and theft from major retailers' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders Volume II Perpetuity Press, Leicester

Bamfield, J and Hollinger, R C (1996) 'Managing losses in the retail store: a comparison of loss prevention activity in the United States and Great Britain', Security Journal, 7 61-70

Bandura, A (1977) 'Self-efficacy: towards a unifying theory of behaviour change', *Psychological Review*, **84** (2) 191-215

Bannister, J P (1979) 'Illegal consumer activity: an exploratory study of shoplifting', *Quarterly Review of Marketing*, (Summer)13-22

Barlow, H (1996) Introduction to Criminology 7th edn Harper Collins, USA

Barnett, J (1998) 'Sensitive questions and response effects; an evaluation', Journal of Management Psychology, 13 (1) 63-76

Barr, R and Pease, K (1990) 'Crime Placement, displacement and deflection' in Tonry, M and Morris, N (eds) Crime and Justice 12 University of Chicago, Chicago, 277-318

Baumer, T L and Rosenbaum, D P (1984) Combatting Retail Theft: Programs and Strategies Butterworth, Boston

Ba-Yunus, I and Allen, D E (1979) 'Shoplifting and residence in college', Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 7 (1) 82-86

Beaumont, G (1984) 'Psychiatry and shoplifting', Psychiatry in Practice, 5 (Oct) 5

Beck, A and Willis, A (1991) Selling and Security: Addressing the Balance Centre for the Study of Public Order, University of Leicester

Beck, A and Willis, A (1994) 'Customer and staff perceptions of the role of closed circuit television in retail security' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester, 185-201

Beck, A and Willis, A (1995) Crime and Security: Managing the Risk to Safe Shopping Perpetuity Press, Leicester

Beck, A and Willis, A (1998) 'Sales and security: striking the balance' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders Volume II Perpetuity Press, Leicester

Beck, E A and McIntyre, S C (1977) 'MMPI pattern of shoplifters within a college population', *Psychological Reports*, **41** (2) 1035-1040

Beck, L and Ajzen, I (1991) 'Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behaviour,' *Journal of Research in Personality*, **25** (3) 285-301

Becker, G S (1962) 'Irrational behaviour and economic theory', Journal of Political Economy, 70 1-13

Becker, G S (1968) 'Crime and punishment: an economic approach', Journal of Political Economy, **76** 169-217

Becker, H S (1963) Outsiders Free Press, New York

Belk, R W (1974) 'An exploratory assessment of situational effects in buyer behaviour', Journal of Marketing Research, 11 (May) 153-163

Belk, R W (1975) 'Situational variables and consumer behaviour', Journal of Consumer Research, 1 157-164

Bellenger, D, Robertson, D and Hirschman, E (1978) 'Impulse Buying Varies by Product', Journal of Advertising Research, 18 15-18

Belson, W (1975) Juvenile Theft: The Causal Factors Harper and Row, New York

Belson, W (1976) 'Juvenile stealing: getting the record straight', Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 29 113-116

Bennett, H M (1968) 'Shoplifting in Midtown', Criminal Law Review, 413-425

Bennett, T (1986a) 'Situational crime prevention from the offenders' perspective' in Heal, K and Laycock, G (eds) Situational Crime Prevention: From Theory into Practice HMSO, London, 41-53

Bennett, T (1986b) 'A decision-making approach to opiod addiction' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 83-102

Bentler, P M and Speckart, G (1979) 'Models of attitude-behaviour relations', *Psychological Review*, **86** (5) 452-464

Bentler, P M and Speckart, G (1981) 'Attitudes cause behaviour: a structural equation analysis', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40 (2) 226-238

Berlin, P (1992) The Peter Berlin Report on Shrinkage Control (April) The Peter Berlin Retail Consulting Group, Inc., Jericho, NY

Berry, W.D. and Feldman, S. (1985) *Multiple Regression in Practice* Sage Publications Inc., Beverly Hills

Bettman, J R (1979) An Information Processing Theory of Consumer Choice Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA

Bickman, L and Helwig, H (1979) 'Bystander reporting of a crime', Criminology, 17 (3) 283-300

Bickman, L and Rosenbaum, D P (1977) 'Crime reporting as a function of bystander encouragement, surveillance and credibility', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **35** 577-586

Bitner, MJ (1992) 'Servicescapes: the impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees', *Journal of Marketing*, **56** 57-71

Blair, E, Sudman, S, Bradbury, N and Stocking, C (1977) ' How to ask questions about drinking and sex: response effects in measuring consumer behaviour', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14 (Aug) 316-321

Blankenburg, E (1976) 'An empirical investigation of shoplifting', Law and Society Review, 109-130

Block, MK and Heineke, JM (1975) 'A labour theoretic analysis of criminal choice', American Economic Review, 65 314-325

Bonger, W (1916) 'Criminality and economic conditions' in Muncie, J, McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 40-46.

Bottomley, A K and Coleman, C A (1980) 'Police effectiveness and the public: the limitations of official crime rates' in Clarke, R V G and Hough, M (eds) *The Effectiveness of Policing* Gower, Aldershot, 70-97

Bottoms, A E (1990) 'Crime prevention facing the 1990s', *Policing and Society*, 1 (1) 3-22

Bowers, D (1991) Statistics for Economics and Business MacMillan Education Ltd, Hampshire

Box, S (1983) Power, Crime and Mystification Tavistock, London

Boyd, J A and Harrell, J (1975) 'University Shoplifting Study', Stores, (Sept) 9-10

Bradford, J and Balmaceda, R (1983) 'Shoplifting: is there a specific psychiatric syndrome?' Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 28 (4) 248-258

Brady, J F and Mitchell, J G (1971) 'Shoplifting in Melbourne', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 4 (Sept) 154-162

Braithwaite, J (1981) 'The myth of social class and criminology reconsidered', American Sociological Review, 46 (Feb) 36-57

Braithwaite, J (1989) Crime, Shame and Reintegration Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Brantingham, P J and Brantingham, P L (1991) Environmental Criminology Waveland Press Inc., Illinois

Brantingham, P J and Faust, F L (1976) 'A conceptual model of crime prevention', Crime and Delinquency, 22 284-296

Briar, S and Piliaven, I (1965) 'Delinquency, situational inducement and commitment to delinquency', Social Problems, 13 35-45

Brodt, S J (1994) 'Shoplifting and amateur shoplifters in the 90's: a case study', Journal of Security Administration, 17 (2) 11-20

Brodsky, SL, Bernatz, ML and Beidleman, WB (1981) 'The perfect crime', British Journal of Criminology, 21 350-353

Brooks, C and Cross, C (1996) Retail Crime Costs: 1994/5 Survey British Retail Consortium, London.

Bryman, A (1988) Quantity and Quality in Social Research Routledge, London

Bryman, A (1989) Research Methods and Organisation Studies Unwin Hyman, London

Buckle, A, Farrington, D P, Burrows, J, Speed, M, and Burns-Howell, T (1992) 'Measuring shoplifting by repeated systematic counting', *Security Journal*, **3** 137-146

Buckle, A and Farrington, D P (1984) 'An observational study of shoplifting', British Journal of Criminology, 24 63-73

Buckle, A and Farrington, D P (1994) 'Measuring shoplifting by systematic observation', *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 1 (2) 133-141

Budden, M C and Griffin III, T F (1996) 'Explorations and implications of aberrant consumer behaviour', *Psychology and Marketing*, **13** (Dec) 739-740

Burgess, R L and Akers, R L (1966) 'A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behaviour', Social Problems 14 (2) 128-147

Burrell, G and Morgan, G (1979) Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis Heineman, London

Burrows, J. (1988) Retail Crime: Prevention Through Crime Analysis Crime Prevention Unit Paper 11, Home Office, London

Burrows, J. (1991) Making Crime Prevention Pay: Initiatives from Business Crime Prevention Unit Paper 27, Home Office, London

Burrows, J and Lewis, A (1987) 'Stereotyping shoplifters', Policing, 3 226-232

Burrows, J and Speed, M (1994) Retail Crime Costs: 1992/3 Survey British Retail Consortium, London

Burrows, J and Tarling, R (1987) 'The investigation of crime in England and Wales', British Journal of Criminology, 27 (3) 229-251

Butler, G (1994) 'Shoplifter's views on security: lessons for crime prevention' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester, 56-71

Buttle, F (1995) 'Shopping motives constructionist perspective' in Akehurst, G and Alexander, N (eds) *Retail Marketing* Frank Cass, London, 215-233

Buttle, F A (1996) 'Hotel marketing strategy and the theory of reasoned action', International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 8 (3) 5-10

Buttle, F and Bok, B (1995) 'Explaining hotel choice using the theory of reasoned action' in Teare, R and Armistead, C G (eds) Services Management: New Directions and New Perspectives Cassell, London

Buttle, F and Coates, M (1995) 'Shopping motives' in Akehurst, G and Alexander, N (eds) *Retail Marketing* Frank Cass, London, 204-214

Cameron, MO (1964) The Booster and the Snitch Free Press, Glencoe, IL

Campbell, A (1981) Girl Delinquents Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Caplan, J (1988) 'Visual evidence', Security Gazette, (Nov) 33-34

Carlen, P (1988) Women, Crime and Poverty Open University Press, Milton Keynes

Carolin, J P (1992) 'Survey of shoplifters', Security Management Supplement, (March) 11a-12a

Carpenter, C, Glassner, B, Johnson, B D and Loughlin, J (1988) Kids Drugs and Crime Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass

Carroll, J S (1978) 'A psychological approach to deterrence: the evaluation of criminal opportunities', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **36** (12) 1512-1520

Carroll, J and Weaver, F (1986) 'Shoplifters' perceptions of crime opportunities: a process-tracing study' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer-Verlag, New York, 19-37

Carter, N (1995) 'Increased theft as a side effect of sales promotion activities: an exploratory study', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, (Autumn) 57-63

Carter, N, Hansson, L, Holmberg, B and Melin, L (1979) 'Shoplifting reduction through the use of specific signs', *Journal of Organisation Behaviour Management*, 2 73-84

Carter, N and Holmberg, B (1992) 'Theft reduction in a grocery store through product identification', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour Management*, **13** 129-136

Carter, N, Holstrom, A, Simpanen, M, and Melin, L (1988) 'Theft reduction in a grocery store through product identification and graphing of losses for employees', *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, **21** 385-389

Carter, N, Kindstedt, A and Melin, L (1995) 'Increased sales and thefts of candy as a function of sales promotion activities', *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, 28 (Spring) 81-82

Casey, L R and Shuman, J L (1979) 'Police/probation shoplifting reduction program in San Jose, California: a synergetic approach', Crime Prevention Review, 6 (2) 1-9

Chamblis, W J (1967) 'Types of deviance and the effectiveness of legal sanctions', Wisconsin Law Review, 703-719

Chisnall, P M (1992) Marketing Research 4th edn. McGraw-Hill Book Co., London

Christensen, L B (1997) *Experimental Methodology* Allyn and Bacon, Newton, Mass Curchill, Jr. G A (1979) 'A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs', *Journal of Marketing Research*, XVI (Feb) 64-73

Churchill, Jr. G A (1995) Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations 6th edn. Dryden Press, Orlando, FL

Clarke, R (1980) 'Situational crime prevention; theory and practice', British Journal of Criminology, **20** (2) 136-147

Clarke, R V (1983) 'Situational crime prevention: its theoretical basis and practical scope' in Tonry, and Morris, N (eds) Crime and Justice, Vol 4 University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 225-256

Clarke, R V (1984) 'Opportunity-based crime rates', British Journal of Criminology, 24 (1) 74-83

Clarke, R V (1995) 'Situational Crime Prevention' in Tonry, M and Farrington, D P (eds) Building a Safer Society, Crime and Justice Series, Vol. 19 University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 91-150

Clarke, R V and Cornish, D B (eds) (1983) Crime Control in Britain: A Review of Policy Research Albany, New York

Clarke, R V and Cornish, D B (1985) 'Modelling offenders' decisions: a framework for research and policy', *Crime and Justice*, 6 147-185

Clarke, R V and Felson, M (1993) Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory Volume 5 Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ

Clarke, R V and Weisburd, D (1994) 'Diffusion of crime control benefits: observations on the reverse of displacement' in Clarke, R V (ed) Crime Prevention Studies Volume 3 Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 165-181

Cleary, J (1986) Prosecuting the Shoplifter: A Loss Prevention Strategy Butterworth, Stoneham, Ma

Clinard, M B and Quinney, R (1973) Criminal Behaviour Systems: A Typology Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Toronto

Cloward, R and Ohlin, L (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity Free Press, New York

Cobb, W E (1973a) 'The economics of shoplifting', Dissertation Abstracts International, 34/04-A:1447

Cobb, W E (1973b) 'Shoplifting' in Savitz, L D and Johnston, N (eds) Contemporary Criminology John Wiley and Sons, New York, 369-376

Cohen, A K (1955) Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang Free Press, New York

Cohen, L E and Felson, M (1979) 'Social change and crime rate trends', American Sociological Review, 44 (4) 588-607

Cohen L E and Stark, R (1974) 'Discriminatory labelling and the five-finger discount', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, (Jan) 25-39

Coid, J (1984) 'Relief of diazepam-withdrawal syndrome of shoplifting', British Journal of Psychiatry, 552-554

Cole, C A (1989) 'Deterrence and consumer fraud', Journal of Retailing, 65 (Spring) 107-120

Converse, J M and Presser, S (1986) Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardised Questionnaire Sage Publications Inc, Beverley Hills

Cook, P J (1980) 'Research in criminal deterrence: laying the groundwork for the second decade', *Research in Criminal Deterrence*, 2 211-268

Coolican, H (1994) Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology 2nd edn. Hodder & Stoughton, London

Cornish, D (1994) 'The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational prevention' in Clarke, R V (ed) Crime Prevention Studies Volume 3 Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 151-196

Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) (1986a) The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending Springer-Verlag, New York

Cornish, DB and Clarke, RV (1986b) 'Situational prevention, displacement of crime and rational choice' in Heal, K and Laycock, G (eds) Situational Crime Prevention: from Theory into Practice HMSO, London, 1-16

Cox, A D, Cox, D, Anderson, R D and Moschis, G P (1993) 'Social influences on adolescent shoplifting - theory, evidence and implications for the retail industry', *Journal of Retailing*, **69** (2) 234-246

Cox, D, Cox, A D, and Moschis, G P (1990) 'When consumer behaviour goes bad: an investigation of adolescent shoplifting', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (2) 149-159

Craft, M and Spencer, M (1984) 'Shoplifting' in Craft, M and Craft, A (eds) Mentally Abnormal Offenders Bailliere Tindall, London, 50-59

Crowne, D and Marlowe, D (1964) The Approval Motive Wiley, New York

Cunningham, B A (1975) 'Absent mind versus guilty mind in cases of shoplifting', Medico-Legal Journal, 43 101-106 Cupchick, W (1992) 'Kleptomania and shoplifting', American Journal of Psychiatry, 149 (8) 1119

Cupchick, W and Atcheson, J D (1983) 'Shoplifting: an occasional crime of the moral majority', Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 11 (4) 343-354

Currie, E (1989) 'Confronting crime: looking toward the twenty-first century', Justice Quarterly, 6 (1) 5-25

Cusson, M and Pinsonneault, P (1986) 'The decision to give up crime' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending Springer Verlag, New York, 72-82

D'Alto, J (1992) 'A lock on the market: the growing demand for security systems in Europe', Journal of European Business, 3 (5) 46-50

Darley, J and Latane, B (1968) 'Bystander intervention in emergencies: diffusion of responsibility', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8 (4) 377-383

Davis, M G, Lundman, R J and Martinez, R (1991) 'Private corporate justice: store police, shoplifters and civil recovery', *Social Problems*, **38** (Aug) 395-411

Dawson, S (1993) 'Consumer responses to electronic article surveillance alarms', Journal of Retailing, 69 (3) 353-362

Dawson, S, Bloch, P and Ridgway, NM (1990) 'Shopping motives, emotional states and retail outcomes', *Journal of Retailing*, **66** (4) 408-427

Deng, X G (1997) 'The deterrent effects of initial sanction on first-time apprehended shoplifters', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, **41** (3) 284-297

Denner, B (1968) 'Did a crime occur? Should I inform anyone? A study of deception', *Journal of Personality*, **36** 454-468

Denzin, N K (1989) The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods 3rd edn. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Denzin, NK and Lincoln, YS (1994) Handbook of Qualitative Research Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Department of the Environment (1994) Vital and Viable Town Centres: Meeting the Challenge HMSO, London

Derkte, M C, Penner, L A, and Ulrich, K (1974) 'Observer's reporting of shoplifting as a function of thief's race and sex', *Journal of Social Psychology*, 94 213-221

Desphande, R (1983) 'Paradigms lost: on theory and method in research and marketing', Journal of Marketing, 47 (Fall) 101-110

Diamantopoulos, A and Schlegelmilch, B B (1997) Taking the Fear out of Data Analysis Dryden Press, London

Dickens, B M (1969) 'Shops, shoplifting and law enforcement', Criminal Law Review, 464-472

Dickenson, S (1970) 'Theft and the retailer', Police Journal, 63 171-176

DiLonardo, R L (1993) 'Fluid tag deterrents', Retail Business Review, (June) 26-27

DiLonardo, R L and Clarke, R V (1996) 'Reducing the rewards of shoplifting: an evaluation of ink tags', Security Journal, 7 11-14

Dingle, J (1977) 'Youth and shoplifting' in Challinger, D (ed) Studies in Shoplifting Australian Crime Prevention Council, 6-58

Dodge, H R, Edwards, E A and Fullerton, S (1996) 'Consumer transgressions in the marketplace: consumers' perspectives', *Psychology and Marketing*, **13** (8) 821-835

Downey, H K and Ireland, R D (1983) 'Quantitative versus qualitative; the case of environmental assessment in organisational studies' in Van Maanen, J (ed) *Qualitative Methodology* Sage, London, 179-190

Durkheim, E (1895) 'The normal and the pathological' in Muncie, J McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 47-50

Eagly, A H and Chaiken, S (1992) The Psychology of Attitudes Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich College Publishers, Fort Worth

East, R (1990) Changing Consumer Behaviour Cassell Educational Ltd, London

East, R (1992) 'The effects of experience on the decision making of expert and novice buyers', Journal of Marketing Management, 8 167-176

East, R (1993) 'Investment decisions and the theory of planned behaviour', Journal of Economic Psychology, 14 337-375

East, R (1996) 'Redress seeking as planned behaviour', Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behaviour, 9 27-34

East, R (1997) Consumer Behaviour: Advances and Applications in Marketing Prentice-Hall, London

Easterby-Smith, M, Thorpe, R and Lowe, A (1991) Management Research: An Introduction Sage Publications, London

Edwards, L E (1970) Shoplifting and Shrinkage Protection for Stores Charles C. Thomas, Springfield IL

Edwards, W (1954) 'The theory of decision making', Psychological Bulletin, 51 380-417

Edwards, W (1961) 'Behavioural decision theory', Annual Review of Psychology, 12 473-498

Ehrenberg, A S C (1986) 'Reading a table: an example', Applied Statistician, 35 (3) 237-244

Eiser, J R and Van der Plight, (1979) 'Beliefs and values in the nuclear debate', Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9 (6) 524-536

Ekblom, P (1986) The Prevention of Shop Theft: An Approach Through Crime Analysis Crime Prevention Unit Paper 5, Home Office, London

Ekblom, P (1988) Getting the Best Out of Crime Analysis Crime Prevention Unit Paper 10, Home Office, London

Ekblom, P, Simon, F and Birdi, S (1988) Crime and Racial Harassment in Asian-run Small Shops: the Scope for Prevention Crime Prevention Unit Paper 15, Home Office, London

Elder, A (1989a) Shrinkage in UK Multiple Retailing Institute of Retail Studies, University of Stirling

Elder, A (1989b) Retail theft: the hidden crime', Retail and Distribution Management, May/June, 39-41

El-Dirghami, A (1974) 'Shoplifting among students', Journal of Retailing, 50 (3) 33-42

Elliott, R (1998) 'A model of emotion-driven choice', Journal of Marketing Management, 14 95-108

Elliott, R and Jobber, D (1995) 'Expanding the market for market research: changing beliefs, attitudes and corporate culture', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, **37** (2) 143-158

Elliott, R, Eccles, S and Gournay, K (1996) 'Revenge, existential choice and addictive consumption', *Psychology and Marketing*, **13** (8) 753-768

Elliott, R, Jobber, D and Sharp, J (1995) 'Using the theory of reasoned action to understand organisational behaviour: the role of belief salience', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **34** (2) 161-172

Engel, J F, Kollatt, D T and Blackwell, R D (1968) Consumer Behaviour Holt Rinehart Winston, New York Engel, J F, Blackwell, R D and Kollatt, D T (1978) Consumer Behaviour 3rd edn. Dryden Press, Hinsdale, IL

Engel, J F, Blackwell, R D and Miniard, P W (1995) Consumer Behaviour 8th edn. Dryden Press, USA

Epps, P (1961) 'A review of 200 shoplifters', Bulletin of the Society of International Criminology, 2 388-395

Erez, E (1979) Situational Analysis of Crime: Comparison of Planned and Impulsive Offences PhD Dissertation University Microfilms International, London

Erickson, M L and Empey, L T (1969) 'Court records, undetected delinquency and decision-making' in Cressey, D R and Ward, D A (eds). *Delinquency, Crime and Social Process* Harper and Row, New York, 131-153

Erikson, K (1962) 'Notes on the sociology of deviance', Social Problems, 9 (Spring) 307-314

Espinosa, D C (1989) 'Shoplifters: no sale', Security Management, 33 64-68

Everitt, B (1980) Cluster Analysis 2nd edn. Heinemann Educational Books, London

Eysenck, H J (1987) 'Personality theory and the problem of criminality' in Muncie, J. McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 81-98

Faber, R J and O'Guinn, T C (1988) 'Compulsive consumption and credit abuse', Journal of Consumer Policy, 11 (1) 97-109

Faria, A J (1977) 'Minimising shoplifting losses: some practical guidelines', Journal of Small Business Management, 15 37-43

Farrell, K L and Ferrara, J A (1985) Shoplifting: The Anti-shoplifting Guidebook Praegar, New York

Farrington, D P (1973) 'Self reports of deviant behaviour: predictive and stable?' Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 64 99-110

Farrington, DP (1977) 'The effects of public labelling', British Journal of Criminology, 17 (2) 112-125

Farrington, D P (1992) 'Criminal career research in the United Kingdom', British Journal of Criminology 32 (4) 521-536

Farrington, D P (1994) 'Human development and criminal careers' in Maguire, M, Morgan, R and Reiner, R (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 511-584
Farrington, D P (1999) 'Measuring, explaining and preventing shoplifting: a review of British research', Security Journal, 12 (1) 9-27

Farrington, D P, Bowen, S, Buckle, A, Burns-Howell, T, Burrows, J and Speed, M (1994) 'An experiment on the prevention of shoplifting' in Clarke, R (ed) Crime Prevention Studies. Vol. 3 Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 93-119

Farrington, D P and Burrows, J N (1993) 'Did shoplifting really decrease?' British Journal of Criminology, 33 (1) 57-69

Faupel, C E (1986) 'Heroin use, street crime and the main hustle: implications for the validity of official crime data', *Deviant Behaviour*, 7 (1) 31-45

Fear, R W G (1974) 'An analysis of shoplifting - in a West Country retail group', Security Gazette, (July) 262-263

Feeney, F (1986) 'Robbers as decision-makers' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 53-71

Felson, M. (1987) 'Routine activities and crime prevention in the developing metropolis', *Criminology*, **25** (4) 911-931

Felson, M (1994) Crime and Everyday Life Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, CA

Ferri, E (1901) 'Causes of criminal behaviour'' in Muncie, J, McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 34-39

Feuerverger, A and Shearing, C (1982) 'An analysis of the prosecution of shoplifters', Criminology An Interdisciplinary Journal, 20 (2) 273-289

Filstead, W (1979) 'Qualitative methods: a needed perspective in evaluation research' in Cook, T D and Reichardt, C S (eds) *Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Evaluation Research* Sage Publications, 33-48

Finch, J (1986) Research and Policy: The Uses of Qualitative Methods in Social Educational Research Falmer Press, Lewes, East Sussex

Firestone, W A (1990) "Accommodation; toward a paradigm-praxis dialectic' in Guba, E G (ed) *The Paradigm Dialog* Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA 105-124

Fishbein, DH(1990) 'Biological perspectives in criminology', Criminology, 28(1)27-72

Fishbein, M and Ajzen, I (1975) Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour: An Introduction to Theory and Research Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA

Fishbein, M and Coombes, F S (1974) 'Basis for decision: an attitudinal analysis of voting behaviour', Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4 (2) 95-124

Fishbein, M and Stasson, M (1990) 'The role of desires, self-predictions and perceived social control in the prediction of training session attendance', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **20** (3) 173-198

Foxall, G R (1992) 'The consumer situation: an integrative model for research in marketing', Journal of Marketing Management, 8 383-404

Foxall, G R (1993) 'Consumer behaviour as an evolutionary process', European Journal of Marketing, 27 (8) 46-57

Foxall, G R (1995) Consumer Behaviour and Organisational Response: From Social Cognition to Environmental Control Department of Commerce, University of Birmingham

Foxall, G R (1998) 'Intention versus context in consumer psychology', Journal of Marketing Management, 14 29-62

Francis, D B (1980) Shoplifting: The Crime That Everybody Pays For Elsevier/Nelson, New York

Fredericks, A J and Dossett, D L (1983) 'Attitude-behaviour relations: a comparison of the Fishbein-Ajzen and Bentler-Speckart models', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **45** (3) 501-512

French, P (1996) 'Inside the offenders mind', CCTV, 3 (3) 16-19

French, W A, Crask, M R and Mader, F H (1984) 'Retailer's assessment of the shoplifting problem', Journal of Retailing, 60 (4) 108-115

Fugere, R, Delia, A, and Phillipe, R (1995) 'Consideration on the dynamics of fraud and shoplifting in adult female offenders', *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, **40** (3) 150-153

Fullerton, S, Kerch, K B, and Dodge, H R (1996) 'Consumer ethics: an assessment of individual behaviour in the market place', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **15** 805-814

Fullerton, R A and Punj, G (1993) 'Choosing to misbehave: a structural model of aberrant consumer behaviour', Advances in Consumer Research, 20 570-574

Fullerton, R A and Punj, G (1997a) 'What is consumer misbehaviour', Advances in Consumer Research, 24 336-339

Fullerton, R A and Punj, G (1997b) 'Can consumer misbehaviour be controlled? A critical analysis of two major control techniques', *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24 340-343

Gabor, T (1981) 'The crime displacement hypothesis: an empirical investigation', Crime and Delinquency, **26** (July) 390-404

Gabor, T (1990) 'Crime displacement and situational prevention', Canadian Journal of Criminology, **32** 41-73

Gagnon, J P and Osterhause, J T (1985) 'Effectiveness of floor displays on the sales of retail products', *Journal of Retailing*, **61** (1) 104-116

Gamman, L (1996) Gone Shopping: The Story of Shirley Pitts - Queen of Thieves Penguin, London

Gardner, M P G (1985) 'Mood states and consumer behaviour: a critical review', Journal of Consumer Research, 12 (Dec) 281-300

Garofalo, J (1987) 'Reassessing the lifestyle model of criminal victimisation' in Gottfredson, M R and Hirschi, T (eds) *Positive Criminology* Sage, London, 23-42

Gauthier, J and Pellerin, D (1982) 'Management of compulsive shoplifting through covert sensitisation', Journal of Behaviour Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 13 3-75

Geertz, C (1973) The Interpretation of Cultures Basic Books, New York

Geurts, M D, Andrus, R R, and Reinmuth, J (1975-76) 'Researching shoplifting and other deviant customer behaviour using the randomised response research design', *Journal of Retailing*, **51** 43-48

Gibbens, T C N (1962) 'Shoplifting', Medico-Legal Journal, 6-19

Gibbens, T C N (1963) 'The causes of shoplifting', New Society, 23 (7 Mar) 15-16

Gibbens, T C N (1981) 'Shoplifting', British Journal of Psychiatry, 138 346-347

Gibbens, T C N, Palmer, C and Prince, J (1971) 'Mental health aspects of shoplifting', British Medical Journal, 3 (Sept) 612-615

Gibbens, T C N and Prince, J (1962) Shoplifting Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquents, London

Gibbons, D C (1968) Society, Crime and Criminal Careers Prentice-Hall Inc, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Gibbs, JP (1975) Crime Punishment and Deterrence Elsevier Scientific Publishing, New York

Giddens, A (1976) New Rules of Sociological Method Hutchinson, London

Giges, N (1984) 'Coupon loss put at \$500 million', Advertising Age, 55 (February) 75-77

Giles, M and Cairns, E (1995) 'Blood donation and the Ajzen theory of planned behaviour - an examination of perceived behavioural control', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **34** (2) 173-188

Gill, J and Johnson, P (1991) Research Methods for Managers Paul Chapman Publishing, London

Gill, M (ed) (1994) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester

Gill, M and Turbin, V (1997) An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of CCTV in Two Retail Stores University of Leicester, Centre for the Study of Public Order, Leicester

Gilling, D (1994) 'Multi-agency crime prevention in Britain: the problem of combining situational and social strategies', in Clarke, R V (ed) Crime Prevention Studies Volume 3 Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 231-248

Glaser, B G and Strauss, A L (1968) The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London

Glaser, D (1978) Crime in our Changing Society Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York

Glasscock, S, Rapoff, M, and Christophersen, E (1988) 'Behaviour methods to reduce shoplifting', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **2** (3) 272-278

Glueck, S and Glueck, E (1950) Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency Commonwealth Fund, New York

Gold, M (1970) Delinquent Behaviour in an American City Brooks/Cole, Belmont, Calif.

Goldkamp, J S (1987) 'Rational choice and determinism' in Gottfredson, M R and Hirschi, T (eds) *Positive Criminology* Sage, London, 125-137

Gorsuch, R L and Ortberg, J (1983) 'Moral obligation and attitudes: their relation to behavioural intentions', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **44** (5) 1025-1028

Gottfredson, M R and Hirschi, T (1990) A General Theory of Crime Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA

Graham, J and Bowling, B (1995) Young People and Crime Home Office, London

Grasmick, H G and Bryjack, G J (1980) 'The deterrent effect of perceived severity of punishment', Social Forces, 59 (2) 471-491

Grasmick, H and Bursik, R (1990) 'Conscience, significant others and rational choice: extending the deterrence model', *Law and Society Review*, **24** (3) 837-61

Green, D (1989) 'Measures of illegal behaviour in individual-level deterrence research', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, **26** (3) 253-275

Griffin, R K (1970) 'Shoplifting: a statistical survey', Security World, 10 21-25

Groombridge, N and Murji, K (1994) 'As easy as AB and CCTV', Policing, 10 (4) 283-290

Gross, R D (1992) Psychology: The Science of Mind and Behaviour 2nd edn. Hodder and Stoughton, London

Gross, R (1995) Themes Issues and Debates in Psychology Hodder and Stoughton Educational, London

Guba, E G (1990a) The Paradigm Dialog Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA

Guba, E G (1990b) 'The alternative paradigm dialog' in Guba, E G (ed) *The Paradigm Dialog* Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA 17-27

Guba, E G and Lincoln, Y S (1994) 'Competing paradigms in qualitative research' in Denzin, N K and Lincoln, Y S (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Gudjonsson, G H (1982) 'The nature of shoplifting in Iceland', Forensic Science International, 19 209-216

Gudjonsson, GH (1987) 'The significance of depression in the mechanism of compulsive shoplifting', *Medicine, Science and Law*, **27** (3) 171-176

Gudjonsson, G H (1990) 'Psychological and psychiatric aspects of shoplifting', *Medicine, Science and Law*, **30** (1) 45-51

Guthrie, J (1997) 1996 New Zealand Survey of Retail Theft and Security University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

Guy, C (1994) The Retail Development Process: Location, Property and Planning Routledge, London

Hair, J F, Anderson, R E, Tatham, R L and Black, W C (1998) Multivariate Data Analysis 5th edn. Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Hall, S (1980) Drifting into a Law and Order Society Cobden Trust, London

Hammersley, M (1993) Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice Sage Publications, London Handford, M (1994) 'Electronic tagging in action: a case study in retailing' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester, 174-184

Harding, R W (1993) 'Gun use in crime, rational choice and social learning theory' in Clarke, R V and Felson, M (eds) Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 5 Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ, 85-102

Harris, B (1979) 'What is a shoplifter?' The Magistrate, 35 (9) 134-135

Hartman, D R, Gelfand, D M, Page, B, and Walder, P (1972) 'Rates of bystander observation and reporting of contrived shoplifting incidents', *Criminology*, 10 247-267

Hassard, J and Pym, D (1990) The Theory and Philosophy of Organisations: Critical Issues and New Perspectives Routledge, London

Hastings, G B (1980) 'Customer attitudes toward security devices in shops and preparedness to report shoplifting', *Abstracts on Criminology and Penology*, 639-42

Heal, K and Laycock, G (eds) (1986) Situational Crime Prevention: From Theory into Practice HMSO, London

Heathcote, F (1981) 'Social disorganisation theories' in Fitzgerald, M, McLennan, G and Pawson, J (eds) Crime and Society: Readings in History and Theory Routledge, London, 341-370

Hedderson, J and Fisher, M (1993) SPSS Made Simple Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, CA

Heidensohn, F (1985) Women and Crime MacMillan Educational Ltd, London

Heidensohn, F (1994) 'Gender and crime' in Maguire, M. Morgan, R and Reiner, R (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 997-1043

Henwood, K L and Pidgeon, N F (1993) 'Qualitative research and psychological theorising' in Hammersley M (ed) Social research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice Sage, London, 14-32

Hesseling, R P B (1994) 'Displacement: a review of the empirical literature', in Clarke, R V (ed) Crime Prevention Studies Volume 3 Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 197-230

Hiew, C (1981) 'Prevention of shoplifting - a community action approach', Canadian Journal of Criminology, 23 57-68

Hindelang, M J (1974) 'Decisions of shoplifting victims to invoke the criminal justice process', Social Problems, 21 580-598

Hindelang, M J (1978) 'Race and involvement in common law personal crimes', American Sociological Review, 43 93-109

Hindelang, M J, Hirschi, T and Weiss, J G (1979) 'Correlates of delinquency: the illusion of discrepancy between self-report and official measures', *American Sociological Review*, **44** 995-1014

Hirschi, T (1969) Causes of Delinquency University of California Press, Berkeley, CA

Hirschi, T (1986) 'On the compatibility of rational cnoice and social control theories of crime' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 105-118

Hirschi, T and Gottfredson, M (1983) 'Age and the explanation of crime', American Journal of Sociology, 89 (3) 552-584

Hirschi, T and Hindelang, M J (1977) 'Intelligence and delinquency: a revisionist view', *American Sociological Review*, **42** (Aug) 572-587

Hirschman, E C (1985) 'Scientific style and the conduct of consumer research', Journal of Consumer Research, 12 225-239

Hirschman, EC (1986) 'Humanistic inquiry in marketing research philosophy, method and criteria', Journal of Marketing Research, 23 (Aug) 237-249

Hirschman, E C (1992) 'The consciousness of addiction: toward a general theory of compulsive consumption', *Journal of Consumer Research*, **19** (Sept) 155-179

Holbrook, B and Hirschman, E C (1982) 'The experiential aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (Sept) 132-140

Hollinger, RC (1991) 'Neutralisation in the work place: an empirical analysis of property theft and production deviance', *Deviant Behaviour*, **12** 169-202

Hollinger, R and Dabney, D (1994) 1994 National Retail Security Survey: Final Report University of Florida, Florida

Hollinger, R, Dabney, D, Lee, G and Hayes, R (1996) 1996 National Retail Security Survey: Final Report University of Florida, Florida

Home Office (1968) Theft Act HMSO, London

Home Office (1973) Shoplifting and Thefts by Shop Staff. Report of a Working Party on Internal Shop Security HMSO, London

Home Office (1983) Shoplifting and Thefts by Shop Staff. Review by the Home Office Standing Committee on Crime Prevention Home Office, London

Home Office (1986) Report of the Working Group on Shop Theft Home Office Standing Conference on Crime Prevention Home Office, London

Home Office (1998) Criminal Statistics England and Wales 1997 HMSO, London

Hood, R and Sparks, R (1970) Key Issues in Criminology Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London

Honess, T and Charman, E (1992) Closed Circuit Television in Public Places Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper 35, Home Office, London

Hope, T (1991) 'Crime information in retailing: prevention through analysis', Security Journal, 2 240-245

Hough, J M, Clarke, R V G and Mayhew, P (1980) 'Introduction to designing out crime', in Clarke, R V G and Mayhew, P (eds) *Designing Out Crime* HMSO, London, 1-17

Howard, J A (1994) Consumer Behaviour in Marketing Strategy Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Howard, J A and Sheth, J N (1967) 'A theory of buyer behaviour' in Enis, B M and Cox, K K (eds) *Marketing Classics*, 6th edn. Allyn and Bacon Inc, 105-123

Hoyer, WD and MacInnis, DJ (1997) Consumer Behaviour Houghton Mifflin Company, New York

Hudson, L A and Ozanne, J L (1988) 'Alternative ways of seeking knowledge in consumer research', Journal of Consumer Research, 14 (March) 508-521

Hughes, J (1990) The Philosophy of Social Science Longman, London

Hui, M K and Bateson, J G (1991) 'Perceived control and the effects of crowding and consumer choice on the service encounter', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (Sept) 174-184

Huizinga, D and Elliott, D S (1986) 'Reassessing the reliability and validity of self-report measures', Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 2 (4) 293-327

Hunt, S (1983) 'General theories and the fundamental explanada of marketing', Journal of Marketing, 47 (Fall) 9-17

Hunt, S D (1991) 'Positivism and paradigm dominance in consumer research: toward critical pluralism and rapprochement', Journal of Consumer Research, 18 (June) 32-44

Inciardi, J A (1979) 'Heroin use and street crime', Crime and Delinquency, 25 335-346

Iverson, G R and Norpoth, H (1987) Analysis of Variance Sage Publications Inc, Beverley Hills

Jaccard, J J and Davidson, A R (1972) 'Towards an understanding of family planning behaviours: an initial investigation', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2 228-235

Jacob, H (1979) 'Rationality and criminality', Social Science Quarterly, 59 (3) 584-585

Jain, D (1994) 'Regression analysis for marketing decisions' in Bagozzi, R P (ed) *Principles of Marketing Research* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 162-194

Jarvis, G and Parker, H (1989) 'Young heroin users and crime: how do the new users finance their habits?' British Journal of Criminology, 29 (2) 175-185

Jeffery, C R (1971) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Beverly Hills: Sage

Jensen, G F and Erickson, M L (1978) 'The social meaning of sanctions' in Krohn, M D and Akers, R L (eds) Crime, Law and Sanctions Sage, California, 119-136

Jensen, G, Erickson, M and Gibbs, J (1978) 'Perceived risk of punishment and self-reported delinquency', Social Forces, 57 (1) 57-78

Jick, T D (1983) 'Mixing qualitative and quantitative method; triangulation in action' in Van Maanen, J (ed) *Qualitative Methodology* Sage Publications, London 135-148

Johnson, E and Payne, J (1986) 'The decision to commit a crime: an informationprocessing analysis' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 170-185

Johnson, R (1979) Juvenile Delinquency and its Origins Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Johnson, SL, Sommer, R and Martino, V (1985) 'Consumer behaviour at bulk food bins', Journal of Consumer Research, 12 (June) 114-117

Jolson, M (1974) 'Consumers as offenders', Journal of Business Research, 2 (Jan) 89-98

Jones, P, Hillier, D and Turner, D (1997) 'Exploring the role of CCTV surveillance in town centre management', *Management Research News*, **20** (10) 35-43

Jones, T, Maclean, B and Young, J (1986) The Islington Crime Survey: Crime, Victimisation and Policing in Inner-city London Gower, Aldershot

Jupp, V. (1989) Methods of Criminological Research Routledge, London

Kallis, M and Vanier, D (1985) 'Consumer shoplifting: orientations and deterrents', Journal of Criminal Justice, 13 (5) 459-473

Katz, J (1988) Seduction of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil Basic Books, USA

Kimiecik, J (1992) 'Predicting vigorous physical activity of corporate employees: the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour', *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 14 192-206

Kinnear, P R and Gray, C D (1994) SPSS for Windows Made Simple Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, East Sussex

Kinnear, T C and Taylor, J R (1991) Marketing Research: An Applied Approach 4th edn. McGraw-Hill Inc, New York

Kinsey, R (1986) 'Crime in the city', Marxism Today (May) 6-11

Kitsuse, J (1962) 'Societal reactions to deviant behaviour', Social Problems, 9 (Winter) 247-257

Kitsuse, J I and Cicourel, A V (1963) 'A note on the official use of statistics', Social Problems, 11 131-139

Klein, D (1973) 'The etiology of female crime: a review of the literature' in Muncie, J, McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 160-186

Klein, G. (1991) "The hidden benefits of EAS', Security Management, 35 (June) 56-60

Klemke, L W (1978a) 'Does apprehension for shoplifting amplify or terminate shoplifting activity?' Law and Society, 12 391-403

Klemke, L W (1978b) 'Reassessment of the adolescent crime wave model', *California* Sociologist, 1 (2) 183-192

Klemke, L W (1982) 'Exploring adolescent shoplifting', Sociology and Social Research, 67 (1) 59-75

Klemke, L W (1992) The Sociology of Shoplifting: Boosters and Snitches Today Praeger, Westport

Klentze, B and Beaman, A (1981) 'The effects of type of information and method of dissemination on the reporting of a shoplifter', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 11 64-82

Kline, P (1993) Personality: The Psychometric View Routledge, London

Klokis, H (1985) 'Confessions of a shoplifter', Chain Store Age Executive, 61 15-18

Knox, S D and de Chernatony, L (1989) 'Attitude, personal norms and intentions: an evaluation of their interactions in the mineral water industry', *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the Marketing Education Group*, Glasgow, 31-49

Knox, S and Walker, D (1996) Understanding Consumer Decision Making in Grocery Markets: New Evidence from the Fishbein Model Cranfield University School of Management, Cranfield

Kollatt, D T (1967) 'Customer impulse purchasing behaviour', Journal of Marketing Research, 4 (Feb) 21-31

Kolman, A S and Wasserman, C (1991) 'Theft groups for women: a cry for help', *Federal Probation*, 55 (1) 48-54

Kraut, R E (1976) 'Deterrent and definitional influences on shoplifting', Social Problems, 23 358-368

Kreppein, JF (1957) 'Probation for the female shoplifter' Crime and Delinquency, **3** 58-60

Kuhn, T S (1970) The Structure of Science University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Kurland, N B (1995) 'Ethical intentions and the theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **25** (4) 297-313

Lamontagne, T, Carpentier, N and Hetu, C (1994) 'Shoplifting and mental illness', Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 39 (5) 300-302

Landsheer, J A, Hart'T, H and Kox, W (1994) 'Delinquent values and victim damage: exploring the limits of neutralisation theory', *British Journal of Criminology*, **34** (1) 44-53

Leaver, D (1993) 'Legal and social changes affecting UK retailers' response to customer theft', Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 21 (8) 29-33

Lemert, E M (1969) 'Primary and secondary deviation' in Cressey, D R and Ward, D A (eds) *Delinquency Crime and Social Process* Harper Row, New York, 603-607

Lilley, J R, Cullen, F T and Ball, R A (1989) Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences Sage, London

Lilley, J R, Cullen, F T and Ball, R A (1995) Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences 2nd edn. Sage, London

Lin, B, Hastings, D A, and Martin, C (1994) 'Shoplifting in retail clothing outlets: an exploratory research', *International Journal of Retailing and Distribution*, **22** (7) 24-29

Liska, A E (1984) 'A critical examination of the causal structure of the Fishbein/Ajzen attitude-behaviour model', Social Psychology Quarterly, 47 (1) 61-74

Litwark, D (1991) 'Playing tag with the shoplifter', Supermarket Business, 46 (July) 34-39, 82

Lo, L (1994) 'Exploring teenage shoplifting behaviour: a choice and constraint approach', *Environment and Behaviour*, **26** (5) 613-639

Lombroso, C (1911) 'Introduction to the criminal man' in Glueck, S (ed) (1959) The Problem of Delinquency Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass, 44-47

Lundman, R J (1978) 'Shoplifting and police referral: a re-examination', Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 69 (3) 395-401

Madden, T J, Ellen, P S and Ajzen, I (1992) 'A comparison of the theory of planned behaviour and the theory of reasoned action', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **18** 3-9

Maguire, M (1994) 'Crime statistics, patterns and trends: changing perceptions and their implications' in Maguire, M, Morgan, R and Reiner, R (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 233-291

Manstead, A S R, Proffitt, C and Smart, J L (1983) 'Predicting and understanding mothers' infant-feeding intentions and behaviour: testing the theory of reasoned action', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **44** (4) 657-671

Marks, D A (1975) 'Retail store security in Ireland', Top Security, (Sept) 204-206

Marsden, H (ed) (1998) Whitaker's Almanack 1997 The Stationery Office, London

Masterman, M (1970) 'The nature of the paradigm' in Lakatos, I and Musgrave, A (eds) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 59-89

Matsueda, RL (1992) 'Reflected appraisals, parental labelling and delinquency: specifying a symbolic interactionist theory', *American Journal of Sociology*, 97 (6) 1577-1611

Matthews, R and Young, J (1986) Confronting Crime Sage Publications, London

Matthews, R and Young, J (1992) Issues in Realist Criminology Sage, London

Matza, D (1964) Delinquency and drift Wiley, New York

Mawby, R (1980) 'Sex and crime: the results of a self-report study', British Journal of Sociology, **31** (4) 525-543

Maxfield, M G (1987) 'Lifestyle and routine activity theories of crime: empirical studies of victimisation, delinquency and offender decision-making', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, **3** (4) 275-282

May, D (1978) 'Juvenile shoplifters and the organisation of store security: a case study in the social construction of delinquency', *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, **6** 137-160

Mayhew, P (1977) 'Crime in a man's world', New Society, (16 June) 560-561

Mayhew, P and Maung, N A (1992) Surveying Crime: Findings from the 1992 British Crime Survey Home Office, London

Mayhew, P, Mirrless-Black, C and Maung, N A (1994) Trends in Crime: Findings from the 1994 British Crime Survey Home Office, London

McCarthy, B and Hagan, J (1991) 'Homelessness: a crimogenic situation', British Journal of Criminology, **31** (4) 393-410

McNees, M P, Egli, D S, Marshall, R S, Schnelle, J F, and Risley, T (1976) 'Shoplifting prevention: providing information through signs', *Journal of Applied Behaviour* Analysis, 9 399-405

McNees, P M, Schnelle, J F, Kirchner, R E and Thomas, M M (1980) 'An experimental analysis of a program to reduce retail theft', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **8** (3) 379-385

McQuarrie, E F (1988) 'An alternative to purchase intentions: the role of prior behaviour in consumer expenditure on computers', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, **30** 407-437

McShane, F J, Lawless, J and Noonan, B A (1991) 'Personal meaning in the lives of the shoplifting population', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, **35** (3) 190-204

McShane, F J and Noonan, B A (1993) 'Classification of shoplifters by cluster analysis', International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 37 (1)29-40

Mednick, S A, Gabrielli Jr, W F and Hutchings, B (1987) 'Genetic factors in the etiology of criminal behaviour' in Muncie, J, McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (eds) (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London, 67-80

Meier, R F (1978) 'The deterrence doctrine and public policy: a response to the utilitarians' in Cramer, J A (ed) *Preventing Crime* Sage, Beverley Hills, 233-247

Meier, R F and Johnson, W T (1977) 'Deterrence as social control: the legal and extralegal production of conformity', *American Sociological Review*, **42** (April) 292-304

Merrick, B (1970) 'Shoplifting: a microcosm', The Criminologist, 5 (18) 68-81

Merton, R K (1938) 'Social Structure and Anomie', American Sociological Review, 3 672-682

Meyers, T G (1970) 'A contribution to the psychopathology of shoplifting', Journal of Forensic Science, 15 (3) 295-310

Miller, BL, Darby, A, Benson, DF, Cummings, JL and Miller, MH (1997) 'Aggressive, socially disruptive and anti-social behaviour associated with fronto-temporal dementia', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **170** 150-155

Miller, G A (1956) 'The magical number seven, plus or minus two: some limits on our capacity for processing information', *The Psychological Review*, **63** (2) 81-97

Miller, W B (1958) 'Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency', Journal of Social Issues, 14 (3) 5-19

Miniard, P W and Cohen, J B (1981) 'An examination of the Fishbein-Ajzen behavioural intentions model's concepts and measures', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (May) 309-339

Minor, W W (1978) 'Deterrence research: problems of theory and method' in Cramer, J A (ed) *Preventing Crime* Sage, Beverly Hills, 21-45

Minor, W W (1981) 'Techniques of neutralisation: a reconceptualisation and empirical examination', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18 295-318

Minor, W W (1984) 'Neutralisation as a hardening process: considerations in the modelling of change', *Social Forces*, **62** 995-1019

Mintzberg, H (1983) 'An emerging strategy of direct research' in Van Maanen, J (ed) Qualitative Methodology Sage, London, 105-116

Mirrlees-Black, C and Ross, A (1995) Crime Against Retail and Manufacturing Premises: Findings from the 1994 Commercial Victimisation Survey Home Office, London

Montmarquette, C, Nerlove, M and Forest, P (1985) 'Deterrence and delinquency: an analysis of individual data', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 1(1) 37-58

Moore, R (1983) 'College shoplifters: a rebuttal of Beck and McIntyre', *Psychological Reports*, **53** (Dec) 1111-1116

Moore, R H (1984) 'Shoplifting in Middle America: patterns and motivational correlates', International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 28 53-64 Morgan, G (1983a) 'Research as engagement' in Morgan, G (ed) Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1-18

Morgan, G (1983b) 'Research strategies: modes of engagement' in Morgan, G (ed) Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 19-42

Morgan, G and Smircich, L (1980) 'The case for qualitative research', Academy of Management Review, 5 (4) 491-500

Mortimer, A (1991a) 'Making sense of shoplifting - a new classification', Medicine, Science and Law, **31** (2) 123-126

Mortimer, A (1991b) 'Alleged shoplifters and psychiatric outpatients: drugs, absentmindedness and mental states compared', *Medicine, Science and Law*, **31** (2) 119-122

Moschis, G (1985) 'The juvenile shoplifter', Retail Control, 54 (4) 36-39

Moschis, GP(1987) Consumer Socialisation: A Life-cycle Perspective Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass

Muncie, J, McLaughlin, E and Lanagan, M (1996) Criminological Perspectives: A Reader Sage, London

Munday, R (1986) 'Who are the shoplifters', New Society, 75 274-276

Murphy, D J I (1986) Customers and Thieves: An Ethnography of Shoplifting Gower, Aldershot

Murphy, D and Iles, S (1983) *Dealing with Shoplifters* Home Office Research Bulletin No. 15, Home Office, London

Nagin, D and Paternoster, R (1993) 'Enduring individual differences and rational choice theories of crime', *Law and Society Review*, **27** (3) 467-496

Nataraajan, R and Goff, B G (1991) 'Compulsive buying: toward a reconceptualisation', Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6 (6) 307-328

Nelson, AL, Bromley, RDF and Thomas, CJ (1996) 'The geography of shoplifting in a British city: evidence from Cardiff', *Geoforum*, 27 (3) 409-423

Netemeyer, R G, Burton, S and Johnston, M (1991) 'A comparison of two models for the prediction of vocational and goal-directed behaviours: a confirmatory analysis', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54 (2) 87-100

Nettler, G (1978) Explaining Crime McGraw-Hill, New York

Neustatter, W L (1954) 'The psychology of shoplifting', Medico-Legal Journal, 22 (4) 118-130

Newburg, P (1968) 'A study in deviance: shoplifting', International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 9 (Oct) 132-136

Nicosia, F M (1966) Consumer Decision Processes Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Normandeau, A (1971) 'Quelques faits sur le vol dans les grands magasins a Montreal', Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 13 251-265

Norusis, M J (1988) SPSS-X Advanced Statistics Guide 2nd edn. SPSS Inc, Chicago

Norusis, M J (1992) SPSS Introductory Guide: Basic Statistics and Operations McGraw-Hill Book Company, USA

Nunnally, J C (1978) Psychometric Theory 2nd edn. McGraw-Hill, New York

Nye, F I (1958) Family Relationships and Delinquency Behaviour John Wiley, New York

O'Brien, P (1983) 'Bourgeois women and theft', Journal of Social History, 17 (Fall) 65-77

Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (1992) 1991 Census: County Report Northamptonshire HMSO, London.

O'Guinn, T and Faber, R (1989) 'Compulsive buying: a phenomenological exploration', Journal of Consumer Research, 16 (Sept) 147-157

Orbach, S (1993) 'Psychological process of consuming', British Journal of Psychotherapy, 10 (2) 196-201

Ordway, J A (1977) 'Successful court treatment of shoplifters', Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 53 (March) 344-347

Ornstein, A, Gropper, C and Bogner, J (1983) 'Shoplifting: an expression of revenge and restitution', *Annual of Psychoanalysis*, **11** 331-311

Osgood, W D, O'Malley, P M, Bachman, G G and Johnston, L D (1989) 'Time trends and age trends in arrests and self-reported illegal behaviour', *Criminology*, 27 (3) 380-415

Osgood, J F, Suci, G J and Tannenbaum, P H (1957) The Measurement of Meaning University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL

Parker, D (1995) 'Extending the theory of planned behaviour: the role of personal norm', British Journal of Social Psychology, **35** 127-137

Parker, H and Newcombe, R (1987) 'Heroin use and acquisitive crime in an English community', British Journal of Sociology, **38** (3) 331-350

Parker, D, Manstead, A S R, Strading, S G, Reason, J T and Baxter, J S (1992) 'Intentions to commit driving violations: an application of the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 94-101

Paternoster, R (1989) 'Absolute and restrictive deterrence in a panel study of youth: explaining the onset, persistence, desistence and frequency of delinquent offending', *Social Problems*, **36** (3) 289-309

Paternoster, R, Saltzman, L, Chiricos, T and Waldo, G (1983) 'Estimating perceptual stability and deterrent effects: the role of perceived legal punishment in the inhibition of criminal involvement', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, **74** (1) 270-297

Peter, J P and Olson, J C (1983) 'Is science marketing?' Journal of Marketing, 47 (Fall) 111-125

Peterson, R A (1994) 'A meta-analysis of Cronbach's alpha', Journal of Consumer Research, 21 (Sept) 381-391

Phillips, S and Cochrane, R (1988) Crime and Nuisance in the Shopping Centre: A Case Study in Crime Prevention Crime Prevention Unit Paper 16, Home Office, London

Piliaven, I, Gartner, R, Thornton, C and Matsueda, R L (1986) 'Crime deterrence and choice', American Sociological Review, 51 (Feb) 101-119

Pomazal, R J and Jaccard, J J (1976) 'An informational approach to altruistic behaviour', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33 (3) 317-326

Popper, K R (1957) 'The unity of method' in Bynner, J and Stribley, K M (eds) (1978) Social research: Principles and Procedures Longman, Group, London, 17-24

Poyner, B (1983) Design Against Crime Butterworth, London

Poyner, B and Woodall, R (1987) Preventing Shoplifting: A Study in Oxford Street The Police Foundation, London

Premuroso, R (1988) 'Keeping tabs on tagging', Security Gazette, (Nov) 24

Prestwich, L W (1978) 'Consumer attitudes toward shoplifting', Journal of Consumer Affairs, 12 292-299

Pretious, M, Stewart, R and Logan, D (1995) 'Retail security: a survey of methods and management in Dundee', *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, **23** (9) 28-35

Prince, J (1980) 'Shoplifting', The Police Surgeon, 17 31-36

Randall, D M and Gibson, A M (1991) 'Ethical decision making in the medical profession: an application of the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **10** (2) 111-122

Ray, J (1987) 'Every twelfth shopper: who shoplifts and why?' Social Casework, 68 234-239

Ray, J and Briar, K H (1988) 'Economic motivators for shoplifting', Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 15 (4) 177-189

Reason, J and Lucas, D (1984) 'Absent-mindedness in shops: its incidence, correlates and consequences', British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23 (2) 121-131

Reckless, W C (1967) The Crime Problem 4th edn. Meredith, New York

Redding, R G (1976) 'The social evil', Justice of the Peace, 10th Jan 17-18

Reichardt, C S and Cook T D (1979) 'Beyond qualitative versus quantitative methods' in Cook, T D and Reichardt, C S (eds) *Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Evaluation Research* Sage Publications, Beverley Hills, 7-32

Reinmuth, J E and Guerts, M D (1975) 'The collection of sensitive information using a two stage randomised response model', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12 (4) 402-407

Reiss, A J (1951) 'Delinquency as the failure of personal and social controls', American Sociological Review, 16 196-207

Reppetto, T J (1976) 'Crime prevention and the displacement phenomenon', Crime and Delinquency, (April) 166-177

Retail Week (1999) 'Latest research: Northampton', May 7, p19

Reynolds, N, Diamantopoulos, A and Schlegelmilch, B(1993) 'Pretesting in questionnaire design; a review of the literature and suggestions for further research', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, **35** (2) 171-181

Richards, P, Berk, R and Forster, B (1979) Crime as Play: Delinquency in a Middle Class Suburb Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass

Riley, D and Shaw, M (1985) Parental Supervision and Juvenile Delinquency HMSO, London

Robin, G D (1963) 'Patterns of department store shoplifting', Crime and Delinquency, 9 163-172

Robin, G D (1964) "The American customer: shopper or shoplifter', Police, 8 (3) 6-14

Rosenblatt, J (1981) 'Shoplifting', Editorial Research Reports, 2 (20) 879-892

Roshier, B (1989) Controlling Crime: The Classical Perspective in Criminology Open University Press, Milton Keynes, UK

Rouke, FL (1957) 'Shoplifting: its symbolic motivation', Crime and Delinquency, **3** 54-58

Rouke, FL (1960) 'Psychology of the retail criminal', Police, (March-April) 23-32

Royse, D and Buck, S A (1991) 'Evaluating a diversion program for first-time shoplifters', Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17 (1-2) 147-158

Russell, D H (1973) 'Emotional aspects of shoplifting', Psychiatric Annals, 3 (May) 77-86

Russell, M (1978) 'Groups for women who shoplift', Canadian Journal Of Criminology, 20 73-74

Rust, J and Golombok, S (1989) Modern Psychometrics: The Science of Psychological Assessment Routledge, London

Ryan, M J and Bonfield, E H (1975) 'The Fishbein extended model and consumer behaviour', Journal of Consumer Research, 2 (9) 118-136

Sacco, VF (1985) 'Shoplifting prevention: the role of communication-based intervention schemes', *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, **27** 15-29

Saltzman, L, Patternoster, R and Chiricos, W G (1982) 'Deterrent and experiential effects: the problems of causal order in perceptual deterrent research', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, **19** (July) 172-189

Sapsford, R and Jupp, V (1996) Data Collection and Analysis Sage Publications, London

Sarasalo, E, Bergman, B and Toth, J (1996) 'Growing up conditions and current psychosocial situation among kleptomaniacs and shoplifters', American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry, 17 5-20

Sarasalo, E, Bergman, B and Toth, J(1997) 'Theft behaviour and its consequences among kleptomaniacs and shoplifters - a comparative study', *Forensic Science International*, **86** (3) 193-205

Sarver, V T (1983) 'Ajzen and Fishbein's theory of reasoned action: a critical assessment', Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 13 155-163

Scherdin, M J (1986) 'The halo effect: psychological deterrence of electronic security systems', *Information Technology and Libraries*, (September) 232-235

Schlueter, G R, O'Neal, F C, Hickey, J and Seiler, G L (1989) 'Rational vs non-rational shoplifting types: the implications for loss strategies', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, **33** 227-239

Schutz, (1954) 'Concept and theory formation in the social sciences' in Bynner, J and Stribley, K M (eds) (1978) Social Research: Principles and Practice Longman Inc., New York 25-39

Schwandt, T A (1994) 'Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry' in Denzin, N K and Lincoln, Y S (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* Sage Publications Inc, Thousand Oaks, 118-137

Schwartz, S and Wood, H V (1991) 'Clinical assessment and intervention with shoplifters', Social Work, 36 (May) 234-238

Schwartz, S H and Tressler, R C (1972) 'A test of a model for reducing measured attitude-behaviour inconsistencies', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24 (2) 225-236

Sennewald, CA and Christman, JH (1992) Shoplifting Butterworth-Heinemann, London

Shapland, J (1978) 'Self-reported delinquency in boys aged 11-14', British Journal of Criminology, 18 (3) 255-265

Shapland, J (1995) 'Preventing retail sector crimes' in Tonry, M and Farrington, D (eds) Crime and Justice Series Vol 19 University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 263-342

Shaw, C R (1930) The Jack Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Shaw, C R and McKay, H C (1942) Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Sheppard, B H, Hartwick, J and Warshaw, P R (1988) 'The theory of reasoned action: a meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 325-343

Sherman, L W (1990) 'Police crackdowns: initial and residual deterrence ' in Tonry, M and Morris, N (eds) Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1-47

Sherman, L W (1993) 'Defiance, deterrence and irrelevance: a theory of the criminal sanction', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, **30** (4) 445-471

Sheth, J N (1979) 'The surpluses and shortages in consumer behaviour', Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, (Fall) 414-427

Sieber, (1973) 'The integration of field work and survey methods', American Journal of Sociology, 78 1335-1359

Silberman, M (1976) 'Toward a theory of criminal deterrence', American Sociological Review, 41 (June) 442-461

Simon, H A (1978) 'Rational decision making in business organisations', American Economic Review, 68 1-13

Sjoquist, D (1973) 'Property crime and economic behaviour: some empirical results', American Economic Review, 63 (June) 439-46

Skogan, W G (1977) 'Dimension of the dark figure of unreported crime', Crime and Delinquency, 23 (Jan) 41-50

Smart, C (1976) Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique Routledge and Kegan Paul, London

Smetana, J G and Adler, N E (1980) 'Fishbein's value x expectancy model: an examination of some assumptions', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6 (1) 89-96

Smigel, E O (1956) 'Public attitudes towards stealing as related to the size of the organisation', American Sociological Review, 21 320-327

Smigel, E O and Ross, H L (1970) Crimes Against Bureaucracy Nostrand Reinhold, New York

Smith, A T H (1981) 'Shoplifting and the Theft Acts', Criminal Law Review, (Sept) 586-595

Smith, J L (1982) 'A structuralist interpretation of the Fishbein model of intentions', Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour, 12 29-46

Snow, D A, Baker, S G and Anderson, L (1989) 'Criminality and homeless men: an empirical assessment', *Social Problems*, **36** (Dec) 532-547

Sohier, J (1969) 'Shoplifting: a rather ordinary crime', International Criminal Police Review, 24 161-166

Solomon, G and Ray, J (1984) 'Irrational beliefs of shoplifters', Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40 (4) 1075-1077

Songer-Nocks, E (1976) 'Situational factors affecting the weighting of predictor components in the Fishbein model', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **12** 56-69

Speed, M, Burrows, J and Bamfield, J (1995) Retail Crime Costs 1993/94 Survey: The Impact of Crime and the Retail Response British Retail Consortium, London

Stafford, M C and Warr, M (1993) 'A reconceptualisation of general and specific deterrence', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, **30** (2) 123-135

Steffensmeier, D J and Steffensmeier, R H (1977) 'Who reports shoplifters? Research continuities and further developments', International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 5 79-95

Steiner, J M, Hadden, S L and Herkomer, L (1976) 'Price tag switching', International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 4 (2) 129-143

Stern, H (1962) 'The significance of impulse buying today', Journal of Marketing, (April) 50-62

Sternthal, B, Tybout, A M and Calder, B J (1994) 'Experimental design: generalisation and theoretical explanation' in Bagozzi, R P (ed) *Principles of Marketing Research* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 195-223

Stone, G P (1954) 'City shoppers and urban identification: observations on the psychology of city life', American Journal of Sociology, 60 36-45

Strutton, D, Vittell, S J and Pelton, L E (1994) 'How consumers may justify inappropriate behaviour in market settings: an application of the techniques of neutralisation', *Journal of Business Research*, **30** (3) 253-260

Strutton, D, Vitell, S J and Pelton, L E (1995) 'Making an impact on the shoplifter', International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, (Spring) xii-xiii

Sudman, S (1994) 'Sampling' in Bagozzi, R P (ed) Principles of Marketing Research Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 73-115

Sudman, S and Bradburn, N M (1974) Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis Aldine, Chicago

Sudman, S and Bradburn, N (1982) Asking Questions Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Sutherland, E H (1937) The Professional Thief University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Sutherland, E H and Cressey, D R (1966) Criminology 7th edn. J.B. Lippincott Company, USA

Sutherland, E.H. and Cressey, D.R. (1970) Criminology 8th edn. J.B. Lippincott Company, USA

Sykes, G M and Matza, D (1957) 'Techniques of neutralisation: a theory of delinquency', American Sociological Review, 22 (6) 664-670 Tacq, J (1997) Multivariate Analysis Techniques in Social Science Research Sage Publications, London

Tarling, R (1993) Analysing Offending: Data, Models and Interpretations HMSO, London

Tauber, E M (1972) 'Why do people shop?' Journal of Marketing, 36 (Oct) 46-59

Taylor, I, Walton, P and Young, J (1973) *The New Criminology* Routledge and Keegan Paul, London

Taylor, I, Walton, P and Young, J (1975) Critical Criminology Routledge and Keegan Paul, London

Taylor, L (1982) 'Hoisting and tweeding', New Society, 2nd Dec 381-382

Teevan, J (1976) 'Subjective perception of deterrence', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 13 (July) 155-164

Thomas, D J (1980) 'The demographics of shoplifting', Dissertation Abstracts International, 40 May 1980 (11-A)

Thompson, C, Locander, W and Pollio, H(1990) 'Putting consumer experience back into consumer research: the philosophy and method of existential phenomenology', *Journal of Consumer Research*, **16** (Sept) 133-146

Thompson, K E, Alekos, P J and Haziris, N (1994) Reasoned Action Theory Applied to the Prediction of Olive Oil Usage Cranfield University School of Management, Cranfield

Thorsell, B A and Klemke, L W (1972) 'The labelling process: reinforcement and deterrent', Law and Society Review, 6 (3) 393-404

Thurber, S and Snow, M (1980) 'Signs may prompt antisocial behaviour', Journal of Social Psychology, 112 309-310

Tibbetts, S G (1997) 'Shame and rational choice in offending decisions', Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 24 (2) 234-255

Tibbetts, S G and Herz, D C (1996) 'Gender differences in factors of social control and rational choice', *Deviant Behaviour*, 17 (2) 183-208

Tilley, N (1993a) The Prevention of Crime Against Small Businesses: The Safer Cities Experience Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper 45, Home Office, London

Tilley, N (1993b) Understanding Car Parks, Crime and CCTV: Evaluation Lessons from Safer Cities Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper 42, Home Office, London

Tittle, C R (1980) Sanctions and Social Deviance. The Question of Deterrence Praeger, New York

Tonglet, M and Bamfield, J (1997) 'Controlling shop crime in Britain: costs and trends', International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, 25 (9) 293-300

Touche Ross (1989) Survey of Retail Shrinkage and Other Stock Losses Touche Ross Management Consultants, London

Trasler, G (1986) "Situational crime control and rational choice: a critique' in Heal, K and Laycock, G (eds) Situational Crime Prevention: From Theory into Practice HMSO, London, 17-24

Tremblay, P (1986) 'Designing crime', British Journal of Criminology, 26 (3) 234-253

Tuck, M (1976) How Do We Chose? A Study in Consumer Behaviour Methuen, London.

Tuck, M (1979) 'Consumer behaviour theory and the criminal justice system', Journal of the Market Research Society, 21 44-58

Tuck, M and Riley, D (1986) 'The theory of reasoned action: a decision theory of crime', in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 156-169

Tunnell, K D (1992) Choosing Crime: The Criminal Calculus of Property Offenders Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago

Turner, C B and Cashdan, S (1988) 'Perceptions of college students' motives for shoplifting', *Psychological Reports*, **62** 855-862

Tversky, A and Kahneman, D (1974) 'Judgement and uncertainty: heuristics and biases', Science, 185 1124-1131

Valiquette, C A M, Valois, P, Desharnais, R and Godin, G (1988) 'An item-analytic investigation of the Fishbein and Ajzen multiplicative scale: the problem of a simultaneous negative evaluation of belief and outcome', *Psychological Reports*, **63** 723-728

Van Maanen, J (1983) Qualitative Methodology Sage, Beverly Hills

Versele, S C (1969) 'Study of female shoplifters in department stores', International Criminal Police Review, 24 266-270

Vold, G B and Bernard, T J (1986) Theoretical Criminology Oxford University Press, New York

Waldo, G P and Chiricos, T G (1972) 'Perceived penal sanctions and self-reported criminality: a neglected approach to deterrence research', *Social Problems*, **19** 522-540

Wagner, D and Berger, J (1985) 'Do sociological theories grow?' American Journal of Sociology, 90 697-728

Walsh, D P (1978) Shoplifting: Controlling a Major Crime MacMillan, London

Walsh, D (1986) 'Victim selection procedures among economic criminals: the rational choice perspective', in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G (eds) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer-Verlag, New York, 39-52

Warr, M (1989) 'What is the perceived seriousness of crime?' Criminology, 27 (4) 795-821

Warshaw, P (1980) 'Predicting purchase and other behaviours from general and contextually specific intentions', Journal of Marketing Research, 17 (Feb) 26-33

Warshaw, P R and Davis, F D (1985) 'Disentangling behavioural intention and behavioural expectations', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **21** 213-228

Weaver, F M and Carroll, J S (1985) 'Crime perceptions in a natural setting by expert and novice shoplifters', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, **48** 349-359

Weiner, N L (1970) 'The teen-age shoplifter: a microcosmic view of middle -class delinquency' in Douglas, J D (ed) Observations of Deviance Random House, New York, 213-217

Wellford, C (1975) 'Labelling theory and criminology: an assessment', *Social Problems*, **22** 332-345

Wells, C and Dryer, A (1997) Retail Crime Costs Survey 1995/96 British Retail Consortium, London

Wells, C. and Dryer, A. (1998) Retail Crime Costs Survey 1997 British Retail Consortium, London

West, D J and Farrington, D P (1973) Who Becomes Delinquent? Heinemann Eduactional Books Ltd, London

Wiles, P (1971) 'Criminal statistics and sociological explanations of crime' in Carson, W G and Wiles, P (eds) *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency in Britain. Volume One: The British Tradition* Robertson and Company Ltd, London

Wilkes, R E (1978) 'Fraudulent behaviour by customers', Journal of Marketing, 42 (Oct) 67-75

Wilkinson, K (1980) 'The broken home and delinquent behaviour' in Hirschi, T and Gottfredson, M (eds) Understanding Crime: Current Theory and Research Sage, Beverley Hills, 21-41

Williams, K S (1991) Textbook on Criminology 2nd edn. Blackstone Press Ltd, London

Williams, M and May, T (1996) Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science UCL Press, London

Williams, R and Dalby, J (1986) 'Benzodiazepines and shoplifting', International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, **30** 35-39

Williams, K R and Hawkins, R (1986) 'Perceptual research on general deterrence: a critical review', *Law and Society Review*, 20 (4) 545-572

Willis, S (1991) 'Confessions of a shoplifter', Security Management, 35 (Jan) 83-84

Wilson, J Q (1975) Thinking About Crime Vintage, New York

Wilson, J Q and Herrnstein, R J (1985) Crime and Human Nature Simon and Schuster, New York

Wilson, R M S, Gilligan, C and Pearson, D J (1992) Strategic Marketing Management: Planning, Implementation and Control Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford

Won, G and Yamamoto, G (1968) 'Social structure and deviant behaviour: a study of shoplifting', Sociology and Social Research, 53 44-55

Woodruffe, H (1996) 'Methodological issues in consumer research; towards a feminist perspective', Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 14 (2) 13-18

Yates, E (1986) 'The influence of psycho-social factors on non-sensical shoplifting', International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, **30** (3) 203-211

Young, J (1986) 'The failure of criminology: the need for a radical realism' in Matthews, R and Young, J (eds) *Confronting Crime* Sage, London, 4-30

Young, J (1994) 'Incessant chatter: recent paradigms in criminology' in Maguire, M, Morgan, R and Reiner, R (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 69-124.

Zabriskie, N (1972-3) 'Fraud by consumers', Journal of Retailing, 48 (Winter) 22-27

Zuckerman, M and Reis, H (1978) 'Comparison of models for predicting altruistic behaviour', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36 (5) 498-510

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ajzen, I (1989) 'Attitude structure and behaviour' in Pratkanis, A R, Becker S J and Greenwald A G (eds) Attitude Structure and Function Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, 241-274

Ajzen, I and Driver, B L (1992) 'Contingent value measurement: in the nature and meaning of willingness to pay', *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1 (4) 297-316

Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M (1973) 'Attitudes and normative variables as predictors of specific variables', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27 (1) 41-57

Ajzen, I, Nichols, A J and Driver, B L (1995) 'Identifying salient beliefs about leisure activities: frequency of elicitation versus response latency', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **25** (16) 1391-1410

Ajzen, I and Timko, C (1986) 'Correspondence between health attitudes and behaviour', Journal of Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7 (4) 259-276

Ajzen, I, Timko, C and White J B (1982) "Self-monitoring and the attitude-behaviour relation", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42 (3) 426-435

Anderton, B and Kiely, J (1988) 'Employee theft', Personnel Review, 17 (5) 37-43

Bagozzi, R P and Kimmel, S K (1995) 'A comparison of leading theories for the prediction of goal-directed behaviours', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **34** 437-461

Beale, D A and Manstead, A S R (1991) 'Predicting mothers' intentions to limit frequency of infants' sugar intake: testing of the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **21** (5) 409-431

Beck, A, Gill, M and Willis, A (1994) 'Violence in retailing: physical and verbal victimisation of staff' in Gill, M (ed) Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention Perpetuity Press, Leicester, 83-101

Bettman, J R, Johnson, E J and Payne, J W (1991) 'Consumer decision making' in Robertson, T S and Kassarjian, H H (eds) *Handbook of Consumer Behaviour* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 50-84

Bettman, J R and Park, C W (1980) 'Effects of prior knowledge and experience and phase of choice process on consumer decision processes: a protocol analysis', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (Dec) 234-48

Branthwaite, A (1983) 'Situations and social actions: applications for marketing of recent theories in social psychology', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, **25** (1) 19-38

Brantingham, P J and Brantingham, P L (1978) 'A theoretical model of crime site selection' in Krohn, M D and Akers, R L (eds) Crime, Law and Sanctions Sage, Beverly Hills, 105-118

Brantingham, P L and Brantingham, P J (1981) 'Mobility, notoriety, and crime: a study in the crime patterns of urban nodal points', *Journal of Environmental Systems*, **11** (1) 89-99

Brantingham, P L and Brantingham, P J (1993) 'Environment, routine and situation: toward a pattern theory of crime' in Clarke, R V and Felson, M (eds) *Routine Activity and Rational Choice, Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 5* Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 259-294

Brantingham, P L, Brantingham, P J and Wong, P (1989) 'Malls and crime: a first look', Security Journal, 1 (1) 175-181

Budd, R J (1986) 'Predicting cigarette use: the need to incorporate measures of salience in the theory of reasoned action', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **16** (8) 663-686

Budd, R J (1987) 'Response bias and the theory of reasoned action', Social Cognition, 5 (2) 95-107

Cameron, MO (1967) 'An interpretation of shoplifting' in Clinard, MB and Quinney, R Criminal Behaviour Systems: A Typology Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Toronto, 109-120

Cameron, M O (1970) 'The five finger discount' in Ross, H L and Smigel, E O (eds). Crimes Against Bureaucracy Van Nostrand Reinhold Co, New York, 97-118

Chamblis, W J (1966) 'The deterrent influence of punishment', Crime and Delinquency, **12** 70-75

Clarke, R V G. and Mayhew, P (1980) Designing Out Crime HMSO, London.

Clinard, M and Meier, R (1979) Sociology of Deviant Behaviour Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York

Cobb, C J and Hoyer, W D (1986) 'Planned versus impulse purchase behaviour', Journal of Retailing, 62 (Winter) 67-81

Cohen, J B, Fishbein, M and Ahtola, O T (1972) 'The nature and uses of expectancyvalue models in consumer attitude research', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (Nov) 456-460

Conroy, C A (1980) 'Store security methods: how effective are they?' Retail Control, 48 (9) 15-28

Cornish, D (1993) 'Theories of action in criminology: learning theory and rational choice' in Clarke, R V and Felson, M (eds) Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 5 Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 351-382

Cox, A E (1968) 'Shoplifting', Criminal and Law Review, 425-434

Curran, D A (1984) 'Characteristics of the elderly shoplifter and the effects of sanctions on recidivism' in Wilbanks, W and Kim, P K H (eds) *Elderly Criminals* University Press of America, New York, 123-141

D'Alessio, S and Stolzenburg, L (1990) 'A crime of convenience: the environment and convenience store robbery', *Environment and Behaviour*, **22** 255-271

Doll, J and Orth, B (1993) 'The Fishbein and Ajzen theory of reasoned action applied to contraceptive behaviour: model variables and meaningfulness', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **23** (5) 95-415

Dotter, D L and Roebuck, J B (1988) 'The labelling approach re-examined', *Deviant Behaviour*, 9(1) 19-32

Downes, D and Rock, P (1995) Understanding Deviance 2nd edn. Clarendon Press, Oxford

Edwards, D and Roundtree, G (1982) 'Assessment of short-term treatment groups with adjudicated first offender shoplifters', Journal of Offender Counselling Services and Rehabilitation, 6 89-102

Ellen, P S and Madden, T J (1990) 'The impact of response format among intentions, attitudes and social norms', *Marketing Letters*, 1 (2) 161-170

Farrington, D P and Kidd, R F (1977) 'Is financial dishonesty a rational decision?' British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 16 139-146

Faupel, C E and Klockars, C B (1987) 'Drugs-crime connections: elaborations from life histories of hard-core heroin addicts', *Social Problems*, **34** (1) 34-68

Felson, M (1986) 'Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control and criminal outcomes' in Cornish, D B and Clarke, R V G *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending* Springer Verlag, New York, 119-128

Felson, M and Cohen, L E (1980) 'Human ecology and crime: a routine activity approach', Human Ecology, 8 (4) 389-406

Fishbein, M (1967) Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement John Wiley and Sons Inc, New York

Fisher, R J (1993) 'Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning', Journal of Consumer Research, 20 (Sept) 303-315

Fiske, S and Taylor, S (1984) Social Cognition Adison-Wesley, Reading, Mass

Fitzgerald, M, Mclennan, G and Pawson, J (1981) Crime and Society: Readings in History and Theory The Open University Press, England

Foxall, G (1984) 'Consumers' intentions and behaviour: a note on research and a challenge to researchers', *Journal of the Market Research Society*, **26** 231-241

Foxall, GR (1994) 'Consumer decision making' in Baker, MJ (ed) *The Marketing Book* Butterworth-Heineman, London, 193-215

Foxall, G R (1994) 'Environment-impacting consumer behaviour; a framework for social marketing and demarketing' in Baker, M J (ed) *Perspectives on Marketing Management* Wiley, Chichester, 27-53

Foxall, G R and Goldsmith, R E (1994) Consumer Psychology for Marketing Routledge, London

Gold, M (1966) 'Undetected delinquent behaviour', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, **3** 27-46

Grasmick, H G and Green, D E (1980) 'Legal punishment, social disapproval and internationalisation as inhibitors of illegal behaviour', *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, **71** (3) 325-335

Greenberg, J and Scott, K S (1996) 'Why do workers bite the hand that feeds them?' Employee theft as a social exchange process', *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, **18** 111-156

Hall, R (1984) 'Understanding shoplifting can help prevent it', Canadian Grocer, 98 (4) 9-12

Hardt, R H and Peterson-Hardt, S (1977) 'On determining the quality of the delinquency self-report method', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, **14** 247-261

Hassard, J and Parker, M (1994) Towards a New Theory of Organisations Routledge, London

Henry, S and Mars, G (1978) 'Crime at work: the social construction of amateur property theft', Journal of the British Sociological Association, 12 245-263

Hindelang, MJ (1970) 'The commitment of delinquents to their misdeeds: do delinquents drift?' Social Problems, 17 502-509

Hirschi, T and Gottfredson, M (1980) Understanding Crime: Current Theory and Research Sage Publications, Beverley Hills

Hollinger, R C and Clarke, J P (1983) 'Deviance in the workplace: perceived certainty, perceived severity and employee theft', Social Forces, 62 398-418

Hope, T (1985) Implementing Crime Prevention Measures Home Office Research Study 86 HMSO, London

Jones, J W (1980) 'Attitudinal correlates of employees' deviance: theft, alcohol use and non-prescribed drug use', *Psychological Reports*, **47** 71-77

Jones, J W and Terris, W (1983) 'Predicting employees' theft in home improvement centres', *Psychological Reports*, **52** 187-201

Kahneman, D and Tversky, A (1984) 'Choices values and frames', American Psychologist, 39 341-50

Kallis, J M, Krentler, K A and Vanier, D J (1986) 'The value of user image in quelling aberrant consumer behaviour', Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 14 29-35

Kassarjian, HH (1982) 'Consumer Behaviour' Annual Review of Psychology 33 619-49.

Kollatt, D T and Willett, R P (1969) 'Is impulse purchasing really a useful concept for marketing decisions?' Journal of Marketing Research, 4 (Jan) 21-31

Kornhauser, R (1978) Social Sources of Delinquency University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Kowalski, G S and Faupel, C E (1990) 'Heroin use, crime and the main hustle', *Deviant Behaviour*, 11 (1) 1-16

Kraft, T (1970) 'Treatment of compulsive shoplifting by altering social contingencies', Behaviour Research and Therapy, 8 393-394

Kurtines, W M (1986) 'Moral behaviour as rule governed behaviour: person and situation effects on moral decision making', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **50** (4) 784-791

Lemert, E (1967) Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Mahoney, A R (1974) 'The effects of labelling upon youth in the juvenile justice system: a review of the evidence', *Law and Society Review*, **8** 583-598

Markin, RJ (1974) Consumer Behaviour: A Cognitive Orientation McMillan, New York

Mars, G (1982) Cheats at Work Unwin, London

Marsh, A and Matheson, J (1983) Smoking Attitudes and Behaviour HMSO, London Masuda, B (1992) 'Displacement vs, diffusion of benefits and the reduction of inventory losses in a retail environment', Security Journal, **3** 131-136

May, T (1993) Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process Open University Press, Buckingham

McNees, MP, Gilliam, SW, Scinelle, JF and Risley, TR (1979) 'Controlling employee theft through time and product identification', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour Management*, **2** 113-119

Mitroff, I and Kilman, R H (1978) Methodological Approaches to Social Science Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA

Murphy, D J I (1979) 'Theft from stores by employees and the public: an everyday perspective', *Abstracts on Criminology and Penology*, **19** (3) 243-248

Nelken, D (1994) The Futures of Criminology Sage Publications, London

Netemeyer, R G, Andrews, J C and Durvasula, S (1993) 'A comparison of three behavioural intentions models: the case of Valentine's Day gift giving', Advances in Consumer Research, 20 135-141

Newman, O (1973) Defensible Space: People and Design in the Violent City Architectural Press, London

Norman, P and Smith, L (1995) 'The theory of planned behaviour and exercise - an investigation into the role of prior behavioural intentions and attitude variability', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **25** (4) 403-415

Olshavsky, R W and Granbois, D H (1979) 'Consumer decision-making - fact or fiction', Journal of Consumer Research, 6 (Sept) 93-100

Raats, M M, Shepherd, R and Sparks, P (1995) 'Including moral dimensions of choice within the theory of planned behaviour', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **25** (6) 484-494

Raghubir, P and Menon, G (1996) 'Asking sensitive questions: the effects and type of referent and frequency wording in counter-biasing methods', *Psychology and Marketing*, **13** (7) 633-652

Remenyi, D, Williams, B, Mooney, A and Schwartz, E (1998) Doing Research in Business and Management Sage Publications, London

Robertson, T S and Kassarjian, H H (eds) (1991) Handbook of Consumer Behaviour Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Robin, G D (1969) 'Employees as offenders', Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 6 (April) 163-173

Ryan, M J and Bonfield, S (1980) 'Fishbein's intentional model: a test of external and pragmatic validity', *Journal of Marketing*, 44 (Spring) 82-95

Sampson, P and Harris, P (1970) 'A users guide to Fishbein', Journal of the Market Research Society, 12 (3) 145-166

Schuman, H and Presser, S (1981) Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question, Form, Wording and Context Academic Press Inc, San Diego

Sellin, T (1938) Culture Conflict and Crime Social Science Research Council, New York

Sellin, T and Wolfgang, M E (1964) *The Measurement of Delinquency* John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York

Sheley, J F and Bailey, K D (1985) 'New directions for anti-theft policy: reductions in stolen goods buyers', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, **13** (5) 399-415

Sherif, M and Sherif, C W (1968) Attitude, Ego-involvement and Change John Wiley and Sons, New York

Shields, R (1992) Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption Routledge, London

Shipman, M (1988) The Limitations of Social Research Longman Group, London

Shover, N and Honaker, D (1992) 'The socially bounded decision making of persistent property offenders', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, **31** (4) 276-293

Simmons, JL (1965) 'Public stereotypes of deviants', Social Problems, 3 223-232

SPSS (1984) SPSSX Basics McGraw-Hill Book Company, USA

Steffensmeier, D J and Terry, R M (1973) 'Deviance and respectability: an observational study of reactions to shoplifting', *Social Forces*, **51** 417-426

Terris, W and Jones, J W (1980) 'Attitudinal and personality correlates of theft among supermarket employees', *Journal of Security Administration*, **3** 65-78

Terris, W and Jones, J W (1982) 'Psychological factors related to employee theft in the convenience store industry', *Psychological Reports*, **51** 1219-1238

Terry, D J and O'Leary, J E (1995) 'The theory of planned behaviour: the effects of perceived behavioural control and self-efficacy', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **34** 199-220

Terry, R M and Steffensmeier, D J (1973) 'The influence of organisational factors of victim store willingness to report a shoplifting incident: a field experiment', *Sociological Focus*, 6 (4) 27-45

Tittle, C (1969) 'Crime rates and legal sanctions', Social Problems, 16 (Spring) 409-423

Tittle, C (1977) 'Sanction fear and the maintenance of social order', Social Forces, 55 (March) 579-596

Tittle, C R and Hill, R J (1967) 'A note on the accuracy of self-reported data and prediction of political activity', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, **31** (Spring) 103-106

Tucker, J (1989) 'Employee theft and social control', Deviant Behaviour, 10 (4) 319-334

Tversky, A and Kahneman, D (1986) 'Rational choice and the framing of decisions', Journal of Business, 59 (4) 5251-5278

Warshaw, P R (1980) 'A new model for predicting behavioural intentions: an alternative to Fishbein', Journal of Marketing Research, 17 (May) 153-172

Weinberg, P and Bottwald, W (1982) 'Impulsive consumer buying as a result of emotions', Journal of Business Research, 10 43-57

Weinstein, G H (1974) 'The truth about teenage shoplifting', Parents Magazine, 49 42-43, 60-61

Wicker, AW (1969) 'Attitudes vs actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioural responses to attitude objects', *Journal of Social Issues*, **25** (4) 41-78

Winifree Jr., L T, Sellers, C S, Duncan, P M, Kelly, G, Williams, L E and Clinton, L (1989) 'Returning to delinquency: factors effecting the survivorship of juvenile shoplifters', *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 49-62

Wisher, C (1968) 'Teenage shoplifting: who, where, when, how?' Security World, 5 (10) 16-20

Young, J and Matthews, R (1992) Rethinking Criminology: The Realist Debate Sage, London

Zaichkowsky, J L (1991) 'Consumer behaviour: yesterday, today, tomorrow', Business Horizons, (May-June) 51-58

Zeitlin, L R (1971) 'A little larceny can do a lot for employee morale', *Psychology Today*, (June) 22-26

Zuckerman, M (1978) 'The search for high sensation' Psychology Today (Feb) 39-46