

90053

Key Program Issues Surrounding the Security Survey:
A Frame of Reference for the Phase I Research

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/International
Training, Research & Evaluation
Council
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Key Program Issues Surrounding the Security Survey:
A Frame of Reference for the Phase I Research

prepared for the

Community Crime Prevention Division
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U.S. Department of Justice

by

The International
Training, Research and Evaluation Council
Two-Ten East Broad Street
Falls Church, Virginia

September, 1975

NCJRS

JUN 9 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS ACQUISITIONS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION	1
The Concept of Crime Prevention: Its Definition and Principal Focus	1
The Security Survey: A Significant Crime Prevention Tool and the Focus of the Research	4
The Security Survey: A Definition	4
Focus of the Research	5
Research Parameters and Key Issues	7
Research Parameters	7
The Identification of Key Issues	8
II PLANNING PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	9
How Should A Security Survey Project Be Staffed?	9
What Is The Population To Be Served By A Security Survey Program?	12
Are Inspections Undertaken As A Result Of Requests From Citizens And Or Initiated By Agencies Irrespective Of Whether Requests Are Received?	13
What Local Conditions Are Present That Influence The Decision To Establish A Security Survey Program And Do Such Factors Have An Effect On Program Implementation?	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
II (Con't)	
Upon What Goals And Objectives Are Security Survey Programs Based?	16
III	
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	18
What Is The Technical Scope And Content Of The Security Survey?	18
What Constitutes Survey Compliance And What Strategies Should Be Employed To Promote Compliance?	19
IV	
EVALUATION PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	22
What Indicators Can Be Used To Assess The Success Or Failure Of Security Survey Programs?	22
BIBLIOGRAPHY	26

Section I

THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION

THE CONCEPT OF CRIME PREVENTION: ITS' DEFINITION AND PRINCIPAL FOCUS

Myriad approaches and philosophies to the prevention of crime have been posited over the centuries. Yet, today the existence of crime is a daily reality with "--sales figures for home and personal protection devices mounting along with the purchase of guns and dogs... Increasing public outcry against crime fills the headlines."1/

Primarily because of the increased pressures on and difficulty of sworn law enforcement officers to stem the tide of ever-increasing rates of crime, theoreticians and practitioners alike agree on the need for increased citizen action if the problem is to be mitigated. As pointed out by one prestigious task force "--if this country is to reduce crime, there must be a willingness on the part of every citizen to give himself, his time, his energy, and his imagination."2/ However, albeit most citizens agree that crime prevention is their business as well as that of law enforcement officials, few accept it as their duty.

This attitude, which is often correlated with the rising crime problems in our society, may well have its roots deeply embedded in the history of our law enforcement system. More specifically, in the early days of law enforcement -- well over a thousand years ago -- mutual responsibility was the keystone of the system. Each person was responsible not only for the protection of his property, but for that of

- 1/ National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report on Police (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p.1.
- 2/ National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Community Crime Prevention (Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973) p. 2. See Also, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police (Washington, D. C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 221, 228 and the Commission's The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington, D. C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 288.

his neighbor. In fact, a citizen observing a crime was duty-bound to pursue the offender. Peace was kept, for the most part, not by public officials, but by the entire community. 1/

With the rise of specialization and taxation, citizens began to delgate their personal law enforcement responsibilities by paying others to assume peacekeeping duties. As such, law enforcement has evolved into a multi-faceted specialty as citizens have relinquished an ever-increasing proportion of their crime prevention role. With this trend, however, criminal justice professionals note that with this increasing absence of citizen assistance and individual concern for one's property and well being, neither more manpower nor improved technology will enable law enforcement agencies to shoulder the monumental burden of combatting crime in America. 2/

Moreover, the need today is for a more balanced allocation of crime prevention duties and responsibilities between law enforcement officers and the citizenry. This will clearly call for citizens to reassume many of their previously delegated responsibilities. Yet, even given our highly complex and sophisticated society, most citizens have little idea as to how they can help protect themselves and their property from criminal victimization. 3/

1/ See for example Selden D. Bacon, The Early Development of American Municipal Police. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University 1939; Edwin Powers, Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts, 1620-1692 (Boston, Beacon Press, 1966), pp. 424-9; David H. Flaherty, "Law and the Enforcement of Morals in Early America," Perspectives in American History, Vol. V (1971), pp. 203-53; National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report No. 14, The Police (Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office, 1930), pp 50-8 and passim. A. C. Germann, F. Day and Robert Gallati, Introduction to Law Enforcement (Springfield, Ill: Charles R. Thomas, 1966), pp. 11-75.

2/ National Commission, Community Crime Prevention p. 7-8

3/ This point was emphasized on a number of occasions during the telephone discussions with the elected officials of the following state-wide crime prevention officers associations: Texas, Minnesota, North Carolina and Oregon.

Thus, if citizen involvement in crime prevention is to become more balanced, law enforcement agencies must begin informing and educating the citizen on ways he can protect himself, his home and his family. 1/

One of the primary means by which law enforcement agencies have begun "informing and educating the citizen" has been through the use of community/crime prevention programs as a supplement to the more traditional functions of patrol, investigation and apprehension. Community crime prevention programs are generally based on a philosophy of self-defense for individuals and organizations and emphasize action to be taken before a crime is committed. More specifically this action has been defined as: 2/

The anticipation, the recognition and the appraisal of a crime risk and the initiation of action to remove or reduce it.

One of the underlying foundations of this definition is the belief that crime results from the coexistence of the desire to commit a misdeed and the feeling or belief that the opportunity is available. 3/ While sociologists, criminologists, psychologists and the various other forces in society, may someday reduce the desire to commit a crime, a more formidable area to attack is clearly criminal opportunity. 4/

"Crime risks," as stated in the definition of crime prevention are synonymous with "criminal opportunity," i. e. dark streets, unprotected

1/ National Commission, Community Crime Prevention p. 201-202.

2/ Working Group on Crime Prevention Methods, Report of Working Group on Crime Prevention Methods (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1956), p. 37. See also Home Office Crime Training Center, Stafford, England, p. 70.

3/ O. W. Wilson, Police Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963) pp. 2-7.

4/ National Commission, Community Crime Prevention, pp 194-202. See also National Crime Prevention Institute, Establishing A Crime Prevention Bureau, a report prepared under LEAA Grant No. 72-DF-99-0009 (Louisville: National Crime Prevention Institute, undated), p. 6.

buildings, inadequate locks and safes; poorly planned municipal facilities; and, so on. The role of the law enforcement agency, thus, is to anticipate that crime will occur when risks are high, to recognize when a high-crime risk exists, to appraise the seriousness of the particular risk, and, finally, to initiate action in concert with the citizen to remove or reduce the risk. ^{1/}

THE SECURITY SURVEY: A SIGNIFICANT CRIME PREVENTION TOOL AND THE FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH

The Security Survey: A Definition

In the field of security as well as in the practice of crime prevention, the security survey is considered one of the most important single methods of recognizing, appraising and reducing losses due to criminal victimization. ^{2/} This view has been proven out by the ever increasing number of security and law enforcement agencies with established survey capabilities. ^{3/}

By definition, the security survey is described as: ^{4/}

- ^{1/} National Crime Prevention Institute, Establishing A Crime Prevention Bureau, a report prepared under LEAA Grant No. 72-DF-99-0009 (Louisville: National Crime Prevention Institute, undated), p. 2.
- ^{2/} Arthur A. Kingsbury, Introduction to Security and Crime Prevention Surveys (Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1973), p. 9. See also Raymond M. Momboisse, Industrial Security for Strikes, Riots and Disasters (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher), p. 13. Ed San Luis, Office and Office Building Security (Los Angeles: Security World Publishing Co., Inc., 1973) p. 207.
- ^{3/} In conjunction with this research International Training, Research and Evaluation Council is developing a listing of agencies which allegedly use the technique as defined. Currently in excess of 300 organizations are included.
- ^{4/} Momboisse, pg. 13. The residence as a subject for surveying was added by International Training, Research and Evaluation Council. It is also important to note that this technique is referred to by a variety of synonyms in the research including premise survey; security survey; crime prevention survey; burglary prevention investigation; premise inspection; on-site survey; industrial, institutional and commercial premise survey; and, building inspection. In that these names all deal with the concept as defined above, the general term "security survey" will be utilized throughout the project to facilitate understanding and minimize confusion.

a critical on-site examination and analysis of an industrial plant or business (or residence) to ascertain its present security status, identify deficiencies or excesses, determine the protection needed, and to make recommendations to improve the security where necessary.

Because of several common characteristics the security survey may be likened to the traditional criminal investigation. This comparison hinges primarily on the facts that both techniques are systematic in nature; are aimed at identifying the method of a criminal act; and, are in effect, more an art than a science. Two other points concerning the survey are also noteworthy. First, it can be undertaken prior to the commission of a crime; and, second, it can offer protection against rather than just remedial action after the commission of a crime.^{1/}

Focus of the Research

The security survey, as defined, thus includes the actual, on-site physical inspection of a facility. Through the application of this technique, it is hypothesized that unauthorized entries into a facility can be reduced as a result of the identification of potential security weaknesses and the provision of advice as to how such actual and/or potential weaknesses can be strengthened. Unfortunately, although numerous organizations and agencies are using the technique,

^{1/} Koepsell-Girard and Associates, Crime Prevention Handbook (Chicago, Ill.: Motorola Teleprograms, Inc., 1975), p. 32-34. The security texts cited above should also be consulted i.e. Momboise, Kingsbury, etc.

no systematic research has been undertaken to determine whether the security survey actually lives up to these expectations.^{1/}

In responding to this question, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, as part of its National Evaluation Program, has requested the International Training, Research and Evaluation Council (TREC) to examine the security survey through a "Phase I Evaluation." In general, it will be the purpose of the evaluation to:

- identify the assumptions that underlie the use of the security survey;
- document the variety of activities and interventions involved in the implementation of security survey programs;
- outline and assess the implementation problems and operational issues concerning the security survey technique;
- establish criteria for assessing and understanding security survey activities;

^{1/} A number of researchers have documented the existence of the technique and/or discussed the fact that it is being employed as a crime prevention tool but have not attempted to evaluate its effectiveness. See for example: Thomas W. White, et.al. Police Department Programs for Burglary Prevention (Washington, D. C. The Urban Institute, February, 1975), pp. 17, 18 and 46-51. Arnold Sagalyn, Residential Security (Washington, D. C. U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1973), p. 67-72. George J. Washnis, Community Involvement in Police Activities (Washington, D. C.: Center for Governmental Studies, draft 1975), p. 20. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report on Police (Washington, D. C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 66 and 68. In addition, the numerous "evaluations" that have been conducted of local project activities have in the main tended to focus on the use of the technique rather than the cost-effectiveness, degree of implementation of recommendations, victimization rates following survey, etc. A listing of such evaluations is presented elsewhere in this paper.

report on available evidence with regard to the actual assessment and evaluation of security survey projects; and, to

- design evaluation plans for single project assessments as well as to fill present gaps in the knowledge vis-a-vis the use of the security survey.

RESEARCH PARAMETERS AND KEY ISSUES

Research Parameters

Two principal constants have been established to serve as the parameters within which the research will be conducted. First, the research will focus on agencies and organizations that offer and/or conduct security surveys as an on-going operational function. Those that perform such inspections infrequently, or only in response to infrequent requests will not be considered. The sample to be examined will, therefore, concentrate on such groups as law enforcement agencies; line departments or units which, although involved in crime prevention, report directly to a county executive, mayor or city manager (i.e. non-law enforcement agencies); etc. Based on research findings, the survey activities of other groups may also be examined, including public housing authorities, business and civic groups (i.e. chambers of commerce, organizations of senior citizens and/or retired persons, etc.), and others, so long as they meet the basic operational criteria.^{1/}

The second constant to be used in defining the research structure is as follows. Only public agencies and private, non-profit organizations will be considered. The sample will not include survey activities undertaken by private, for-profit groups and corporations.

^{1/} It is important to note that only limited efforts at identifying and/or investigating such organizations vis-a-vis the conduct of surveys were uncovered during the review of the literature. The identification of such projects will, thus, be based on data to be aggregated by the research team and augmented by findings developed through telephone interviews and field work.

The Identification of Key Issues

The various tasks, conditions and assumptions that underlie security survey programs will constitute the substantive framework of the Phase I research. As a means of ordering and more clearly defining these program components, however, it is necessary to identify the key issues that surround survey operations. It will be on the basis of these issues, which will provide a structured frame of reference for the research, that each of the succeeding activities will be designed and undertaken. In the remainder of this paper, therefore, these issues will be articulated and discussed within the context of security survey program planning, implementation and evaluation. 1/

1/ It should be noted that Kingsbury in his Introduction to Security and Crime Prevention Survey (pp. 24-28) uses a similar approach to depict the "Developmental Stages of the Security Survey Process."

Section II

PLANNING PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

Topics that might be considered in relation to this phase of the survey process include factors that stimulate the initiation of the approach; the establishment of program goals and objectives; the development of an overall strategy for program implementation; and, so on. The specific issues to be addressed are outlined below.

HOW SHOULD A SECURITY SURVEY PROJECT BE STAFFED?

Questions of manpower utilization, cost-effectiveness, community relations and so on all undergird this issue which concerns the types of staff that are being utilized to conduct surveys. Alternatives that have been documented include: 1/

- 1/ Sagalyn, et. al. Residential Security, pp. 72-75. White, et. al. Police Department Programs for Residential Security, p. 47. Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Operational Guide to Crime Prevention Program Administration (Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975), pp. 3, 13 and 29 thru 31. The National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services (Washington, D. C., 1973), p. 42 and passim. Telephone interviews with five current officials of State Crime Prevention Officers Associations led to variations in responses with respect to who is actually responsible for conducting premise surveys. Interviewed by telephone were: Sergeant Ray Evans, Plainfield Police Department, Plainfield, New Jersey, September 5, 1975; Lieutenant Richard Piland, Multnomah County Sheriff's Department, Portland, Oregon, September 5, 1975; Sergeant Keith Wall, Eden Prairie Police Department, Eden Prairie, Minnesota, September 5, 1975; and, Daryl Joy, Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, September 5, 1975; and, Chief Deputy Earl Lloyd, Iredale County Sheriff's Department, Statesville, N. C., September 5, 1975.

- commissioned crime prevention officers that have received in depth training;
- commissioned law enforcement officers that have been afforded minimal levels of training;
- non-commissioned law enforcement personnel that have received in depth training;
- law enforcement reserve officers that have received in depth training;
- community volunteers that have received in depth training; and,
- employees of non-law enforcement governmental agencies that have received in depth training; i. e. fire inspectors and public housing security officers.

Throughout the research, three schools of thought emerged as to these alternatives. One advocating the conduct of surveys by law enforcement personnel; the second called for the use of civilian, non-government personnel; and, the third suggested that governmental personnel outside the law enforcement agency should be used to perform this function.

The following argument illustrates the attitude of those that advocate the use of commissioned law enforcement officers. 1/

"Conducting a home inspection afforded many police officers their first opportunity while on duty to deal with the public in a calm, reasoned atmosphere--or, more simply, to deal with ordinary people in an ordinary, business-like way . . . (Further) there can be no question that experienced police officers have a better intuitive grasp of security deficiencies than could be transferred to another agency whose function would be to inspect homes without the concurrent benefit of ongoing experience with residential crime."

1/ Sagalyn, pp. 71-73.

Another argument for this alternative suggests that the use of commissioned officers provides a valuable indirect community relations benefit to the law enforcement agency. A benefit that may be difficult to quantify but which is of concern to local administrators. 1/

Advocates of the use of civilians or other, community-based resources to perform security surveys point out that this approach ". . . is often less expensive than the addition of sworn and non-sworn personnel to the payroll . . ." 2/ This argument appears valid when one compares the general salary ranges of police personnel with "community-service" personnel who may be assigned to a law enforcement agency, and is particularly true when one considers the use of community volunteers such as groups of elderly persons, members of service clubs and organizations, etc.

Finally, the utilization of expertise from governmental organizations other than law enforcement agencies has been suggested as an alternative source of manpower to conduct premises surveys. More specifically, some believe that fire inspectors, security personnel from housing authorities and building inspectors should be used to perform this task. 3/

Moreover, the research will consider how security survey projects are being staffed and document and assess the effectiveness of the various alternatives.

1/ Telephone interview with Daryl Joy, Texas Crime Prevention Institute, September 5, 1975, and Sergeant K. Wall, Eden Prairie Police Department, Eden Prairie, Minnesota, September 5, 1975.

2/ The National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services (Washington, D. C., 1973), p. 42.

3/ National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services, p. 43. This alternative may be particularly suited in those cases where building security laws are in force. See, for example: Texas Municipal League, A Building Code for Texas Cities: An Explanatory Handbook and Recommended Ordinance (Austin, Texas: Texas Municipal League, 1975), p. 25.

WHAT IS THE POPULATION TO BE SERVED BY A SECURITY SURVEY PROGRAM?

This issue is based on three interrelated questions. These are:

- Should surveys be conducted city-wide or only in specific target areas?
- Should commercial establishments as well as residences be surveyed?
- Should all facilities and/or structures be surveyed or only those that have been victimized?

Research regarding these questions is sparse and the evidence qualitative. None the less, a number of factors that have been consistently associated with these questions have been considered. These include the resources available to organizations that undertake surveys; the concentration of criminal activity within a jurisdiction; and, the need for organizations to carefully select potential survey sites vis-a-vis the first two factors.

With regard to the first of these factors, it has been noted that "...the decision about whether to provide premise surveys throughout a city or in target areas only will depend largely on resources available... 1/ Albeit not specifically addressed, the types of resources that may be involved in such a consideration include finances, manpower and time. 2/

The concentration of crime has also been cited as a determinant of how a security survey program will be planned. More specifically, the concentration factor in relation to the geographic dispersal of crime and/or in terms of the types of sites being victimized (i.e. commercial vs. residential) may have to be taken into account when determining what

- 1/ White, et. al. Police Department Programs for Burglary Prevention p. 48-49. See also National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services, p. 41.
- 2/ Past efforts of various members of the research team have substantiated this assumption. See for example Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Assessment of the Texas Six-City Crime Prevention Program (Falls Church, Va.: Koepsell-Girard and Associates) p. 74-79. See also Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Crime Specific Burglary Prevention Handbook (Sacramento: State of California, 1974) pp 39-64.

population should be served. 1/ This factor and that dealing with resources may be closely interrelated.

The third factor which has been suggested as pertinent in relation to determining which facilities should be surveyed deals with past victimization rates and compliance. That is, as reported by one observer, care should be taken in terms of selecting sites for inspection due to low rates of compliance--at least in relation to residential units. This researcher further warned that ". . . there appears to be only two instances in which it makes good sense to conduct a security inspection: (1) when the home has just been victimized by a burglar, or (2) when the homeowner requests the inspection from the police . . ." 2/

Clearly, these factors open the issue area and suggest the need for a closer look at their significance and effect on the security survey implementation process.

ARE INSPECTIONS UNDERTAKEN AS A RESULT OF REQUESTS FROM CITIZENS AND OR INITIATED BY AGENCIES IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER REQUESTS ARE RECEIVED?

Cost-effectiveness and manpower considerations undergird this issue. Preliminary research identified three possible responses: one concerns the organization initiating activities; a second calls for citizens to request action; and, the third combines these two.

Those that feel surveys should be conducted irrespective of whether citizens have requested such services point out that this strategy offers the following advantages: 3/

- more people will receive security surveys; and,
- priorities in conducting surveys can be set by the agency.

1/ White, et. al., Police Department Programs, p. 47.

2/ Sagalyn, Residential Security, p. 71.

3/ White, et. al., Police Department Programs, pp. 49-51.

The alternative approach suggests that, at least among homeowners, inspections should be conducted in response to a specific request. The logic behind this alternative is that ". . . in the case of a homeowner who specifically requests an inspection, he is likely to comply with the recommendations if he is interested enough to make the request in the first place." 1/

A third strategy concerns a combination of the two approaches. Reasoning supporting this alternative includes: 2/

- the inherent public relations aspects of the technique, i.e. it is difficult for a law enforcement agency to balk at performing a service if requested; and,
- if portions of a community are being subject to a rash of burglaries, it is difficult to stand by and initiate the use of a preventive technique that could reduce the potential for further victimization, especially when sufficient manpower is available.

WHAT LOCAL CONDITIONS ARE PRESENT THAT INFLUENCE THE DECISION TO ESTABLISH A SECURITY SURVEY PROGRAM AND DO SUCH FACTORS HAVE AN EFFECT ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION?

The purpose of a security survey, whether for a commercial establishment or a residence, is to reduce the risk for criminal opportunity--and, especially the crime of burglary. As such, it might be reasoned that a primary condition which undergirds the establishment of a security survey program is a high burglary rate. While this assumption permeates other issues dealing with the survey, certain conditions which may have a significant impact on the implementation of

1/ Sagalyn, et.al., Residential Security, p. 71.

2/ Telephone interviews with Lieutenant Piland, Multnomah County Sheriff's Department, Portland, Oregon, September 5, 1975; and, Sergeant K. Wall, Eden Prairie Police Department, Eden Prairie, Minnesota, September 5, 1975.

such programs have not yet been addressed. These might include: 1/

- Availability of Funds. The availability of outside funding (i. e. from federal or state) might be a significant factor in the decision to establish a survey program. That is, if an organization never employed the approach prior to the availability of "free" federal or state money, its efforts may simply be a reaction to this factor rather than the belief that the survey approach is a meaningful method of hardening a target.

- Level of Security/Crime Prevention Expertise. The decision to use this technique may be a function of the training and/or experience accrued by members of an agency or organization; i. e. attendance at the National Crime Prevention Institute, a state-level crime prevention school; or experience gained in an armed services security police function; or prior experience with a private security consultant.

- Public Opinion. Because it is generally known that the survey technique frequently improves the image of a provider agency in the eyes of its clientele, some may establish a program primarily to improve their public relations posture. This may be particularly true among providers (i. e. police agencies, housing authorities, etc.) with a tenuous relationship with the clientele it serves.

- Miscellaneous Conditions. A top-level representative of an organization (i. e. chief of police, mayor, etc.) may, for example, visit another jurisdiction that has employed the survey technique and may be "sold" on the apparent value of the approach. As a result, the decision maker may mandate its implementation by his organization.

1/ Undocumented field experience of members of the research team support these alternatives as potential stimuli of survey programs.

Although preliminary research indicates that these conditions have not been documented in the literature, it may be hypothesized that they have a direct impact on the planned use of this technique alone or in combination with other crime prevention efforts.

UPON WHAT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ARE SECURITY SURVEY PROGRAMS BASED?

Goals and objectives, in addition to offering overall program guidance and direction, perform such important functions as: 1/

- provide direction and purpose to an organization as a whole so that staff will have a firm basis for understanding what they, as a team, are expected to accomplish;
- dictate the focus of work activities; and,
- offer a base line by which progress can be monitored and evaluated.

Past research has shown that crime prevention programs, in general, are not based on well developed goals and objectives. In fact, it was pointed out that "--- one police department spent \$102,000 on 18 crime prevention programs. As far as can be determined, none of them had specific objectives. As a result, it was difficult to evaluate the worth of each program or to identify where improvement could be made." 2/

- 1/ Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Operational Guide to Crime Prevention Program Planning, Management and Evaluation. (Falls Church, Va. Koepsell-Girard and Associates 1975), p. 7. See also George L. Morrissey, Management By Objectives and Results (Reading: Mass. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970) p. 2-10 and passim and Koepsell-Girard and Associates, Administrative Crime Prevention Course: Student Handbook (Falls Church, Va., Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975)p. II-1 thru II-33.
- 2/ The National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities For Improving Productivity In Police Services (Washington, D. C., 1973) p. 39. See also the numerous evaluation reports cited elsewhere in this paper.

Certain progress has, nevertheless, been made by some to articulate goals and objectives that relate to security survey programming. In particular, such general programatic guidelines as follows have been used: 1/

- To increase the organization's knowledge of the security weaknesses in the community;
- To inform the public of the security weaknesses which contribute to their burglary losses;
- To advise the public on the specific security improvements that should be made and how to make them;
- To achieve a reduction in the number of successful burglaries committed where little or no force is required to enter a premise;
- To increase the percentage of burglaries that are detected while in progress; and,
- To aid in the overall reduction of burglary rates in the community.

The research team will seek to document the appropriateness of such goals as well as to identify other goals statements that are being used or might be employed to assist organizations to plan, implement and evaluate security survey programs.

1/ Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Crime-Specific Burglary Prevention Handbook (Sacramento, State of California, 1974) p. 39-41. Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Operational Guide to Crime Prevention Program Planning, Management and Evaluation, p. 7-26.

Section III

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

For purposes of the research the second discrete phase of the survey process has been defined as implementation. Topics that deal with operationalizing the survey process include determinations as to the technical scope of the surveys to be conducted and the criteria selected as compliance indices. Specific issues in relation to the implementation process are discussed below.

WHAT IS THE TECHNICAL SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE SECURITY SURVEY?

This issue may have an impact on the acceptance or compliance with survey findings and recommendations. More specifically, in many professions, certain methods and approaches are considered the "optimal" way of doing things". Unfortunately, in security or crime prevention surveying ". . . there is no one best way to accomplish a given goal, but rather a combination of many techniques and ideas to achieve the desired objectives . . ." ^{1/} Thus, such questions as the following may arise when implementing the survey process: ^{2/}

- How much time should be expended per inspection?

- What should be used as the guide to determine the level of detail encompassed by the survey?

- What format should be utilized to develop survey findings and present recommendations; i. e. in depth outline and staff report; simple checklist of vulnerable items; or, a mental checklist of security weaknesses followed by verbal presentation of recommendations?

^{1/} Kingsbury, p. 23.

^{2/} See, for example, Kingsbury, p. 23. Momboisse, p. 13, and Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Evaluation of the Mesquite Police Community Service/Crime Prevention Program (Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975), pp. 45-49.

- Should commercial inspections be more detailed than residential surveys?

Current knowledge to the most appropriate responses or answers to these questions is sparse. In fact, as noted by one of the few sources that have investigated the issue: 1/

The amount and detail of information collected during a premise survey varies greatly. Typically, a residential survey checks points of access and offers tips on when going away and other crime prevention information. For a business, the task may be much more complex, including information about safes, alarms, transfer of cash, premise characteristics, specific deficiencies and recommendations for improvements.

Moreover, the research will document the current situation vis-a-vis the scope of the security survey techniques.

WHAT CONSTITUTES SURVEY COMPLIANCE AND WHAT STRATEGIES SHOULD BE EMPLOYED TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE?

The issue of compliance and the use of strategies to stimulate citizen action received little treatment in the literature. When addressed, however, two schools of thought emerged. One dealt with the definition of compliance, while the other was concerned with strategies applicable to promote compliance. 2/

With regard to a universally accepted definition of compliance, none was found to exist. Rather, local program administrators seemingly relate their definition to such factors as:

1/ White, et. al., Police Department Programs, p. 49.

2/ See, for example; Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Crime-Specific Handbook (Sacramento: Office of the Governor, 1974), pp. 47-49. White, et. al., Police Department Programs, p. 48; Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Assessment of the Texas Six-City Crime Prevention Program (Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1971), pp. 74-85; and, Sagalyn, et.al., Residential Security, pp. 70-72.

- the degree of implementation of survey recommendations; and,
- agreement with and fulfillment of building security code requirements where such laws exist.

Even within this context, however, a consensus could not be found. For example, several sources indicated that it may not be cost-effective to be concerned with compliance, given the belief that the public relations value and the "security-consciousness" generated among persons contacted is a sufficient return on investment. 1/

The soundness of this logic may be questioned, however, as stated by one source ". . . a definition of compliance must be reached and uniformly used . . ." 2/ Notably, this observation was made in relation to manpower allocation--a question clearly related to the cost-effectiveness issue.

The second aspect of this issue concerns approaches utilized to stimulate compliance. 3/ Those identified included: 4/

- the use of follow up visitations which may or may not be in response to a subsequent victimization;
- mailing a post card reminder;
- the conduct of a telephone follow up program; and,
- the use of insurance incentive programs.

1/ Telephone interviews with crime prevention experts. See also Koepsell-Girard and Associates, p. 77.

2/ White, et.al., p. 48.

3/ No correlation between the definition of compliance or the rate of compliance and strategies used to promote citizen action was evident in the literature.

4/ Office of Criminal Justice Planning, p. 47. Koepsell-Girard and Associates, p. 75 and telephone interviews with crime prevention experts.

Patently, the first three call for the expenditure of resources, which suggests that research should be undertaken to identify if knowledge exists as to the effectiveness of these approaches. The last strategy--insurance incentives--was also noted as an approach that might be employed to stimulate compliance. ^{1/} Due to the fact that this alternative may have considerable merit, given past experience with fire codes and insurance ratings, efforts will be made to determine actual experience with this approach.

^{1/} Telephone interviews with crime prevention experts.

Section IV

EVALUATION PHASE: ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

This element of the process might include consideration of such items as the types of indices utilized to evaluate the survey process; the nature of the data gathered and maintained to document and/or assess the effectiveness of the security survey; etc. Specific issues to be assessed during the research are outlined in the following paragraphs.

WHAT INDICATORS CAN BE USED TO ASSESS THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF SECURITY SURVEY PROGRAMS?

The issue of what factors can be used to assess or evaluate the success of security survey programs, while seemingly straightforward, has not been clearly addressed in the literature. In addition, the project evaluations identified approached the issue from a variety of perspectives. ^{1/} Notably, many of these approaches were quite

- ^{1/} Initial research efforts included the review of the following crime prevention program evaluations: County of Los Angeles, Evaluation of the Bellflower Project, 1973; Kenneth E. Mathews, Jr., Evaluation of First-Year Results of Community Crime Prevention--Burglary Reduction (Seattle: Law and Justice Planning Office, 1974); Taylor, et. al., Field Review Report: Burglary Prevention (St. Louis, Missouri: Law Enforcement Assistance Council, 1973); A. L. Schneider, Evaluation of the Portland Neighborhood-Based Anti-Burglary Program (Eugene, Oregon: Oregon Research Institute, 1975); Crime Prevention Unit, Crime Prevention Evaluation: Building Surveys (Wichita, Kansas: Police Department, 1973); R. Nielson, Evaluation of the United Crime Prevention Effort (Salt Lake City, Utah Law Enforcement Planning Agency, 1975); Crime Prevention Unit, An Evaluation of Crime Prevention Operations (Palo Alto, California Police Department, 1974); Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Evaluation of the Texas Six-City Program, 1975; An Evaluation of the Mesquite, Texas, Crime Prevention Program, 1975; An Evaluation of the Garland Crime Prevention Program, 1975, An

unsystematic in nature. Highlighting this point, our source noted that "---there is no doubt that crime prevention activities have, in many instances, been effective. Unfortunately, however, most have been subjected to little evaluation beyond subjective judgements or limited observations..." 1/

Nonetheless, the types of indicators that have been offered generally relate to three types of measurements. These measurements can be summarized as follows:

- Efficiency Measures. Such indicators are normally used to document the amount of activity that takes place i.e. the number of surveys conducted. As such, this measure represents an assessment of energy expended, regardless of impact.
- Effectiveness Measures. These indices are used to evaluate the impact of program activities upon an identified problem. They are "end" oriented and relate to what is defined as program goals and objectives; not to the way in which the program is achieved i.e. reduction in the burglary rate. As such, these measures assess the result of an effort rather than the effort itself.
- Attitudinal Measures. These are opinion measures which serve as indicators as to whether a program is satisfying public expectations. In other words, if the "right thing" is being done according to those receiving services. As such, this type of measure is based on the "attitude" of those that have received services from or participated in a program.

(continued footnote) Evaluation of the Pandhandle Texas Regional Crime Prevention Program; An Evaluation of the East Texas Regional Crime Prevention Program, 1975; and Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Crime Specific Burglary Prevention Handbook (Sacramento, State of California, 1974).

2/ National Commission on Productivity, Opportunities For Improving Productivity in Police Services (Washington, D.C. National Commission on Productivity, 1973) p. 38.

Within the context of these basic measurements the following have been suggested as efficiency indicators:^{1/}

- Number of inspections conducted;
- the cost to conduct surveys; and,
- the time spent in the survey process.

Effectiveness measures that were recommended included:^{2/}

- Number of those surveyed that complied totally, partially or not at all with survey recommendations;
- Number of burglaries committed against targets with all recommendations implemented, partial implemented, and not implemented at all;
- Number of burglaries committed against non-inspected premises;
- Total burglary rate;
- The number of recommended improvements (target hardening measures) subsequently defeated; and,
- data on displacement (both geographical and type of crime).

^{1/} See especially Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Crime Specific Burglary Prevention Handbook, p. 47. White, et.al. Police Department Programs For Burglary Prevention (Washington, D.C. The Urban Institute, 1975), p. 51. Koepsell-Girard and Associates, An Operational Guide to Data Development and Analysis for Crime Prevention Program Administration (Falls Church, Va. Koepsell-Girard and Associates, p. 20-30.

^{2/} Ibid

Attitudinal measures, many of which are "----based on anecdotal and subjective impressions", may also be considered valid components of evaluation in the eyes of past researchers. 1/ Such measures include:

- reports from those involved in the survey process concerning unsuccessful burglary attempts after recommendations were implemented;
- requests to be re-surveyed following facility remodeling and/or other changes in security conditions;
- comments as to a reduction in the "fear" of crime or victimization after being surveyed; and,
- indications that the survey was just what the citizens desired and/or it improved their image of the organization that performed the work.

Moreover, a variety of indices have been suggested for use in evaluating the security survey technique. To date, little knowledge exists as to their real-life applicability and value. Documentation as to this issue will thus be aggregated during the research.

1/ Ibid., see especially White et.al., and Koepsell-Girard and Associates, p. 28-30.

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL: BOOKS, REPORTS AND ARTICLES

- Anderson, Charles E., Burglary Prevention by Target Area, Crime Prevention Review, Vol. 1, No. 3, Los Angeles, California: Attorney General's Office - State of California, April 1974.
- Bacon, Sheldon D. The Early Development of American Municipal Police. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1939.
- County of Los Angeles, Evaluation of the Bellflower Project, 1973.
- Crime Prevention Unit. Crime Prevention Evaluation: Building Surveys. Wichita, Kansas: Wichita Police Department, 1973.
- Flaherty, David H. "Law and the Enforcement of Morals in Early America", Perspectives in American History. Vol. V., 1971.
- Germann, A. C., Day, F. and Gallati, R. Introduction to Law Enforcement. Springfield, Ill. Charles C. Thomas Publishing Co., 1966.
- Hughes, Mary Margaret, Editor, Successful Retail Security. Los Angeles, California: Security World Publishing Co., Inc. Undated.
- Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland. Deterrence of Crime In and Around Residences, Criminal Justice Monograph, LEAA/NILE-CJ, June 1973.
- Kingsbury, Arthur A. Introduction to Security and Crime Prevention Surveys. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.
- Koepsell-Girard and Associates. An Introduction to the Principles and Practices of Crime Prevention: Student Handbook. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1974.

Koepsell-Girard and Associates. An Evaluation of the Governor's Six-City Crime Prevention Program. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, Inc., 1975.

_____. Crime Prevention Handbook. Chicago, Ill. Motorola Teleprograms, Inc., 1975.

_____. An Evaluation of the Mesquite, Texas, Crime Prevention Program. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975.

_____. An Evaluation of the Garland, Texas, Crime Prevention Program. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975.

_____. An Evaluation of the Pandhandle Texas Regional Crime Prevention Program. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1974

_____. An Evaluation of the East Texas Regional Crime Prevention Program. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975.

_____. Administrative Crime Prevention Course: Student Handbook. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975.

_____. An Operational Guide to Crime Prevention Program Planning, Management and Evaluation. Falls Church, Virginia: Koepsell-Girard and Associates, 1975.

Mathews, Kenneth E. Jr., Evaluation of The First-Year Results of Community Crime Prevention--Burglary Reduction. Seattle, Washington: Law and Justice Planning Office, 1974.

Mombiosse, Raymond M. Industrial Security for Strikes, Riots, and Disasters. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Morrisey, George L. Management By Objectives and Results. Reiding, Mass., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report No. 14. The Police. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1930.

National Crime Prevention Institute. Establishing a Crime Prevention Bureau. A report prepared under LEAA Grant No. 72-DF-99-0009. Louisville, National Crime Prevention Institute, Undated.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report on Police. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Community Crime Prevention. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973.

National Commission on Productivity. Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services, Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Productivity, 1973.

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Patterns of Burglary, second edition, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Nielson, R., Evaluation of the United Crime Prevention Effort. Salt Lake City, Utah: Law Enforcement Planning Agency, 1975.

Office of Criminal Justice. Crime-Specific Burglary Prevention Handbook. Sacramento, California: 1974.

Palo Alto Crime Prevention Unit. An Evaluation of Crime Prevention Operations. Palo Alto, California: Palo Alto Police Department, 1974.

Powers, Edwin. Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts; 1670-1692. Boston, Beacon Press, 1966.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: The Police. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Sagalyn, Arnold, et.al., Residential Security, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, December 1973.

San Luis, Ed, Office and Office Building Security. Los Angeles, California: Security World Publishing Co., Inc, 1973.

Schnieder, A. L. Evaluation of the Portland Neighborhood-Based Anti-Burglary Program. Eugen, Oregon: Oregon Research Institute, 1975.

Taylor, James, et.al., Field Review Report: Burglary Prevention. St. Louis, Missouri: Law Enforcement Assistant Council, 1973.

Texas Municipal League. A Building Code for Texas Cities: An Explanatory Handbook and Recommended Ordinances. Austin, Texas: Texas Municipal League, 1975.

Washnis, George J., "Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention," unpublished draft manuscript, Center for Governmental Studies, Washington, D. C., 1975.

White, Thomas W., et.al., Police Department Programs For Burglary Prevention. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Wilson, D.W. Police Administration. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Working Group on Crime Prevention Methods. Report of Working Group on Crime Prevention Methods. London. Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1956.

Telephone Interviews

- _____. Telephone Interview with Sgt. P. Evans, Plainfield Police Department. Plainfield, N. J., September 5, 1975.
- _____. Telephone interview with Lt. R. Piland, Multnomah County Sheriff's Department, Portland, Oregon, September 5, 1975.
- _____. Telephone interview with Sgt. K. Wall, Eden Prairie Police Department, Eden Prairie, Minnesota, September 5, 1975.
- _____. Telephone interview with Daryl Joy, Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, September 5, 1975.
- _____. Telephone interview with Chief Deputy Earl Lloyd, Iredale County Sheriff's Department, Statesville, N. C. September 5, 1975.

END