



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

Evaluation of the Regional Auto Theft Task (RATT) Force in San Diego County, 1993–1996

Cynthia Burke, Darlanne Hoctor Mulmat, Roni Melton,
and Susan Pennell

ICPSR 3483

User Guide



Inter university Consortium for Political and Social Research

Evaluation of the Regional Auto Theft Task (RATT) Force in
San Diego County, 1993-1996

(ICPSR 3483)

Principal Investigators

Cynthia Burke, Darlanne Hocter Mulmat, Roni Melton,
and Susan Pennell
San Diego Association of Governments

First ICPSR Version
November 2002

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Burke, Cynthia, Darlanne Hoctor Mulmat, Roni Melton, and Susan Pennell. EVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL AUTO THEFT TASK (RATT) FORCE IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, 1993-1996 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. San Diego, CA: San Diego Association of Governments [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2002.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
General Study Overview	3
Study Identification	3
Key Words	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Methods	4
Study Design	4
Sources of Information	5
Sample	5
Response Rates	6
Dates of Data Collection	6
Summary of Contents	6
Description of Variables	6
Presence of Common Scales	6
Unit of Observation	7
Extent of Processing	7
Extent of Collection	7
Data Collection Notes	7
File Specifications	7
Related Publications	8
Final Reports and Other Publications	8
Data Resources Program on the Internet	9
Data Completeness Report	
Part 1	11
Part 2	15
Part 3	17
Part 4	19
Part 5	21

SUMMARY

The Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) received funds from the National Institute of Justice to assist the Regional Auto Theft Task (RATT) force and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The project involved the development of a computer system to enhance the crime analysis and mapping capabilities of RATT. Following the implementation of the new technology, the effectiveness of task force efforts was evaluated. The primary goal of the research project was to examine the effectiveness of RATT in reducing auto thefts relative to the traditional law enforcement response. In addition, the use of enhanced crime analysis information for targeting RATT investigations was assessed. This project addressed the following research questions: (1) What were the characteristics of vehicle theft rings in San Diego and how were the stolen vehicles and/or parts used, transported, and distributed? (2) What types of vehicles were targeted by vehicle theft rings and what was the modus operandi of suspects? (3) What was the extent of violence involved in motor vehicle theft incidents? (4) What was the relationship between the locations of vehicle thefts and recoveries? (5) How did investigators identify motor vehicle thefts that warranted investigation by the task force? (6) Were the characteristics of motor vehicle theft cases investigated through RATT different than other cases reported throughout the county? (7) What investigative techniques were effective in apprehending and prosecuting suspects involved in major vehicle theft operations? (8) What was the impact of enhanced crime analysis information on targeting decisions? and (9) How could public education be used to reduce the risk of motor vehicle theft? For Part 1 (Auto Theft Tracking Data), data were collected from administrative records to track auto theft cases in San Diego County. The data were used to identify targets of enforcement efforts (e.g., auto theft rings, career auto thieves), techniques or strategies used, the length of investigations, involvement of outside agencies, property recovered, condition of recoveries, and consequences to offenders that resulted from the activities of the investigations. Data were compiled for all 194 cases investigated by RATT in fiscal year 1993 to 1994 (the experimental group) and compared to a random sample of 823 cases investigated through the traditional law enforcement response during the same time period (the comparison group). The research staff also conducted interviews with task force management (Parts 2 and 3, Investigative Operations Committee Initial Interview Data and Investigative Operations Committee Follow-Up Interview Data) and other task force members (Parts 4 and 5, Staff Initial Interview Data and Staff Follow-Up Interview Data) at two time periods to address the following issues: (1) task force goals, (2) targets, (3) methods of identifying targets, (4) differences between RATT strategies and the traditional law enforcement response to auto

theft, (5) strategies employed, (6) geographic concentrations of auto theft, (7) factors that enhance or impede investigations, (8) opinions regarding effective approaches, (9) coordination among agencies, (10) suggestions for improving task force operations, (11) characteristics of auto theft rings, (12) training received, (13) resources and information needed, (14) measures of success, and (15) suggestions for public education efforts. Variables in Part 1 include the total number of vehicles and suspects involved in an incident; whether informants were used to solve the case; whether the stolen vehicle was used to buy parts, drugs, or weapons; whether there was a search warrant or an arrest warrant; whether officers used surveillance equipment; addresses of theft and recovery locations; date of theft and recovery; make and model of the stolen car; condition of vehicle when recovered; property recovered; whether an arrest was made; the arresting agency; date of arrest; arrest charges; number and type of charges filed; disposition; conviction charges; number of convictions; and sentence. Demographic variables include the age, sex, and race of the suspect, if known. Variables in Parts 2 and 3 include the goals of RATT, how the program evolved, the role of the IOC, how often the IOC met, the relationship of the IOC and the executive committee, how RATT was unique, why RATT was successful, how RATT could be improved, how RATT was funded, and ways in which auto theft could be reduced. Variables in Parts 4 and 5 include the goals of RATT, sources of information about vehicle thefts, strategies used to solve auto theft cases, location of most vehicle thefts, how motor vehicle thefts were impacted by RATT, impediments to the RATT program, suggestions for improving the program, ways in which auto theft could be reduced, and methods to educate citizens about auto theft. In addition, Part 5 also has variables about the type of officers' training; usefulness of maps and other data; descriptions of auto theft rings in terms of the age, race, and gender of its members; and types of cars stolen by rings.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

STUDY IDENTIFICATION

Evaluation of the Regional Auto Theft Task (RATT) Force in San Diego County, 1993-1996

Cynthia Burke, Darlanne Hoctor Mulmat, Roni Melton, and Susan Pennell

San Diego Association of Governments

Award No. 94-IJ-CX-0027

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Responding to rising motor vehicle thefts during the late 1980s and early 1990s, officials in the San Diego region formed the Regional Auto Theft Task Force (RATT). RATT was designed as a proactive approach to the investigation, apprehension, and prosecution of auto thieves, particularly those involved in major countywide vehicle theft operations. During the first two years of RATT operation, the fact that data were fragmented along jurisdictional boundaries constrained investigations. There was a need for automated and integrated auto theft information. The Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) received funds from the National Institute of Justice to assist RATT and evaluate the effectiveness of the task force. The project involved the development of a computer system to enhance the crime analysis and crime mapping capabilities of RATT. Following the implementation of the new technology, the effectiveness of task force efforts was evaluated. The primary goal of the research project was to examine the effectiveness of RATT in reducing auto thefts relative to the traditional law enforcement response. In addition, the use of enhanced crime analysis information for targeting RATT investigations was assessed. This project addressed the following research questions: (1) What are the characteristics of vehicle theft rings in San Diego and how were the stolen vehicles and/or parts used, transported, and distributed? (2) What types of vehicles were targeted by vehicle theft rings and what was the modus operandi of suspects? (3) What was the extent of violence involved in motor vehicle theft incidents? (4) What was the relationship between the locations of vehicle thefts and recoveries? (5) How did investigators identify motor vehicle thefts that warranted investigation by the task force? (6) Were the characteristics of motor vehicle theft cases investigated through RATT different than other

cases reported throughout the county? (7) What investigative techniques were effective in apprehending and prosecuting suspects involved in major vehicle theft operations? (8) What was the impact of enhanced crime analysis information on targeting decisions? and (9) How could public education be used to reduce the risk of motor vehicle theft?

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

For Part 1 data were collected from administrative records to track auto theft cases in San Diego County. Collection of data prior to the Crime Analysis and Mapping System (CAMS) provided information on the scope of the auto theft problem and related crime patterns in the San Diego region, as well as documentation of the activities and results of RATT investigations in comparison to cases handled with the traditional law enforcement response. RATT investigations focused, according to the program design, on motor vehicle theft suspects involved in major countywide vehicle theft operations, while traditional auto theft detectives responded to all types of auto theft activity throughout their individual jurisdictions. The data were used to identify targets of enforcement efforts (e.g., auto theft rings, career auto thieves), techniques or strategies used, the length of investigations, involvement of outside agencies, property recovered, condition of recoveries, and consequences to offenders which resulted from the activities of the investigations. Data were compiled for all 194 cases investigated by RATT in fiscal year 1993 to 1994 (the experimental group) and compared to a random sample of 823 cases investigated through the traditional law enforcement response during the same time period (the comparison group). The sample for the comparison group was selected from a computer file generated through the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), which contained operational countywide information on all crimes reported to law enforcement. To be included in the comparison group, a case had to involve at least one auto theft-related charge, such as auto theft or carjacking, as well as include suspect information. Because the majority of auto thefts reported were never solved, selection of the comparison sample from all auto theft crimes reported to the police would result in a sample with the majority of cases with minimal investigative action. Therefore, the comparison sample was based upon cases with information about at least one suspect. Since RATT cases generally involved extensive investigations, the comparison group was the most comparable group available for examining the impact of RATT. Data were obtained from arrest and investigation reports that provided detailed data regarding sociodemographic characteristics of the

suspect, the source of information leading to the initial investigation, strategies used, and law enforcement disposition. Prosecutor and court records were accessed through the District and City Attorneys' automated systems and court case files. The research staff also conducted interviews with task force management (Parts 2 and 3) and other task force members (Parts 4 and 5) at two time periods to address the following issues: (1) task force goals, (2) targets, (3) methods of identifying targets, (4) differences between RATT strategies and the traditional law enforcement response to auto theft, (5) strategies employed, (6) geographic concentrations of auto theft, (7) factors that enhance or impede investigations, (8) opinions regarding effective approaches, (9) coordination among agencies, (10) suggestions for improving task force operations, (11) characteristics of auto theft rings, (12) training received, (13) resources and information needed, (14) measures of success, and (15) suggestions for public education efforts. Initial interviews were completed with nine members of the management group, the Investigative Operations Committee (IOC), during the first quarter of 1995 (Part 2), and follow-up interviews were completed with eight members during the fourth quarter of 1996 (Part 3). Of the eight individuals interviewed at follow-up, three represented new members, three were replacements, and two were the same as the initial interview. In addition, 21 staff members were surveyed in 1995 representing 12 local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies (Part 4). Of the 22 officers interviewed on year later (Part 5), eight had been interviewed previously, ten were replacements, and four were new members.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

For Part 1 data were obtained from arrest and investigation reports, which provided detailed data regarding sociodemographic characteristics of the suspect, the source of information leading to the initial investigation, strategies used, and law enforcement disposition. Prosecutor and court records were accessed through the District and City Attorneys' automated systems and court case files. For Parts 2 and 3 interviews were conducted with members of the Investigative Operations Committee. For Parts 4 and 5 interviews were conducted with other members of the RATT task force.

SAMPLE

Not applicable.

RESPONSE RATES

Not applicable.

DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION

1994-1996

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Variables in Part 1 include the total number of vehicles and suspects involved in an incident; whether informants were used to solve the case; whether the stolen vehicle was used to buy parts, drugs, or weapons; whether there was a search warrant or an arrest warrant; whether officers used surveillance equipment; addresses of theft and recovery locations; date of theft and recovery; make and model of the stolen car; condition of vehicle when recovered; property recovered; whether an arrest was made; the arresting agency; date of arrest; arrest charges; number and type of charges filed; disposition; conviction charges; number of convictions; and sentence. Demographic variables include the age, sex, and race of the suspect, if known. Variables in Parts 2 and 3 include the goals of RATT, how the program evolved, the role of the IOC, how often the IOC met, the relationship of the IOC and the executive committee, how RATT was unique, why RATT was successful, how RATT could be improved, how RATT was funded, and ways in which auto theft could be reduced. Variables in Parts 4 and 5 include the goals of RATT, sources of information about vehicle thefts, strategies used to solve auto theft cases, location of most vehicle thefts, how motor vehicle thefts were impacted by RATT, impediments to the RATT program, suggestions for improving the program, ways in which auto theft could be reduced, and methods to educate citizens about auto theft. In addition, Part 5 also has variables about the type of officers' training; usefulness of maps and other data; descriptions of auto theft rings in terms of the age, race, and gender of its members; and types of cars stolen by rings.

PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

Several Likert-type scales were used in Parts 2-5.

UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Part 1: Case, vehicle, or suspect. Parts 2-5: Individuals.

EXTENT OF PROCESSING

Missing data codes were standardized by the principal investigator and ICPSR. ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, converted the hardcopy documentation to a PDF file, and reformatted the data and documentation.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION

This data collection consists of five data files, a PDF user guide, a codebook and data collection instruments in a separate PDF file, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

DATA COLLECTION NOTES

The user guide, codebook, and data collection instruments are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

FILE SPECIFICATIONS

PART NUMBER: 1
PART NAME: Auto Theft Tracking Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 3,414
VARIABLE COUNT: 181
RECORD LENGTH: 437
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 2
PART NAME: Investigative Operations Committee Initial Interview
Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 9
VARIABLE COUNT: 102
RECORD LENGTH: 109
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 3
PART NAME: Investigative Operations Committee Follow-Up Interview
Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 8
VARIABLE COUNT: 75
RECORD LENGTH: 101
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 4
PART NAME: Staff Initial Interview Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 21
VARIABLE COUNT: 268
RECORD LENGTH: 307
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 5
PART NAME: Staff Follow-Up Interview Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 22
VARIABLE COUNT: 227
RECORD LENGTH: 254
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

RELATED PUBLICATION

Hector Mulmat, Darlanne, Cynthia Rienick, Roni Melton, and Susan Pennell. "Targeting Auto Theft with a Regional Task Force and Mapping Technology" (Final Report). NCJ 185356. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, April 1998.

FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal

justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS homepage is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org>

DATA RESOURCES PROGRAM ON THE INTERNET

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-998-9825. The URL for the NACJD homepage is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD>

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3483.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=3414)                                Missing Values
-----
43.6% (79 of 181 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 181 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

56.4% (102 of 181 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

RACE      RACE                                64.4%
AGE       AGE                                64.4%
SEX       SEX                                64.4%
ARREST    ARREST                                64.4%
SMO       MONTH REPORTED STOLEN                    65.3%
SDAY      DAY REPORTED STOLEN                        65.3%
SYR       YEAR REPORTED STOLEN                      65.3%
RECOVER   AUTO RECOVERED                            65.3%
YR        STOLEN AUTO YEAR                          65.4%
MAKE      STOLEN AUTO MAKE                          65.4%
MODEL     STOLEN AUTO MODEL                         65.4%
COLOR     STOLEN AUTO COLOR                         65.4%
RAGENCY   RECOVERING AGENCY                         67.8%
VIN       RECOVERY STATUS OF VIN                    67.8%
LICENSE   LICENSE                                  67.8%
NOREC    # OF RECOVERIES                          67.8%
TOTAL    TOTAL AUTOS RECOVERED                     67.8%
STATUS    STATUS                                    67.8%
=====

```

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
DRIVE	VEHICLE DRIVEABLE	67.8%
IGN	IGNITION ALTERED	67.8%
PROPREC	OTHER PROPERTY RECOVERED	67.8%
RMO	RECOVERY MONTH	68.4%
RDAY	RECOVERY DAY	68.4%
RYR	RECOVERY YEAR	68.4%
LOTCTY	CITY OF THEFT	68.8%
LOTST	STREET OF THEFT	69.2%
LOTNO	ST # OF THEFT	69.3%
PART	PARTS OF AUTOS RECOVERED	69.4%
LOTZIP	ZIP OF THEFT	69.7%
SOMO	SANDAG OPEN DATE MONTH	70.2%
SODAY	SANDAG OPEN DATE DAY	70.2%
SOYR	SANDAG OPEN DATE YEAR	70.2%
SCMO	SANDAG CLOSE DATE MONTH	70.2%
SCDAY	SANDAG CLOSE DATE DAY	70.2%
SCYR	SANDAG CLOSE DATE YEAR	70.2%
VEH	TOTAL NUMBER OF VEHICLES	70.2%
SUS	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUSPECTS	70.2%
CASE	TYPE OF CASE	70.2%
INIT	INTERVIEWER	70.2%
IMPOUND	IMPOUND	70.2%
LORCTY	CITY OF RECOVERY	71.0%
LOTTYE	TYPE OF STREET OF THEFT	71.8%
LORST	STREET OF RECOVERY	73.1%
ADISPO	ARREST DISPOSITION	73.2%
LORNO	ST # OF RECOVERY	73.3%
LORZIP	ZIP OF RECOVERY	73.4%
LORTYPE	TYPE OF STREET OF RECOVERY	75.0%
ARRAG	ARRESTING AGENCY	83.9%
CHGS	NUMBER OF ARREST CHARGES	84.4%
AMO	ARREST MONTH	84.4%
ADAY	ARREST DAY	84.4%
AYR	ARREST YEAR	84.4%
ADRUG	DRUG ARREST	84.5%
AWEAPON	WEAPONS ARREST	84.5%
AAUTO	AUTO THEFT ARREST	84.5%
ACHRG1	ARREST CHARGE 1 (HIGHEST)	84.6%
ACHRG2	ARREST CHARGE 2	88.0%
FILED	NUMBER OF CHARGES FILED	88.6%
FMO	FILE MONTH	88.6%
FDAY	FILE DAY	88.6%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
FYR	FILE YEAR	88.6%
FCHRG1	FILE CHARGE 1 (HIGHEST)	88.6%
FDRUG	DRUG CASE	88.6%
FWEAPON	WEAPONS CASE FILED	88.6%
FAUTO	AUTO THEFT CASE	88.6%
DISPO	DISPOSITION	88.6%
CONV	# OF CONVICTION CHARGES	89.5%
DMO	DISPOSITION MONTH	89.5%
DDAY	DISPOSITION DAY	89.5%
DYR	DISPOSITION YEAR	89.5%
CCHRG1	CONVICTION CHARGE 1 (HIGHEST)	89.5%
CDRUG	DRUG CONVICTION	89.5%
CWEAPON	WEAPONS CONVICTION CHARGE	89.5%
CAUTO	AUTO THEFT CONVICTION	89.5%
PLEA	PLEA BARGAIN	89.5%
VP	VERTICAL PROSECUTION	89.5%
FCHRG2	FILE CHARGE 2	90.0%
SENT	SENTENCE	90.9%
TIME	TIME ORDERED (DAYS)	91.4%
ACHRG3	ARREST CHARGE 3	91.9%
FCHRG3	FILE CHARGE 3	93.4%
ROMO	RATT OPEN DATE MONTH	94.3%
RODAY	RATT OPEN DATE DAY	94.3%
ROYR	RATT OPEN DATE YEAR	94.3%
RCMO	RATT CLOSE DATE MONTH	94.3%
RCDAY	RATT CLOSE DATE DAY	94.3%
RCYR	RATT CLOSE DATE YEAR	94.3%
ACHRG4	ARREST CHARGE 4	94.8%
FCHRG4	FILE CHARGE 4	95.5%
LORUNK	LOCATION OF RECOVERY UNKNOWN	96.5%
LOTUNK	LOCATION OF THEFT UNKNOWN	96.6%
ACHRG5	ARREST CHARGE 5	96.9%
FCHRG5	FILE CHARGE 5	97.0%
CCHRG2	CONVICTION CHARGE 2	97.6%
FCHRG6	FILE CHARGE 6	97.8%
ACHRG6	ARREST CHARGE 6	98.0%
CCHRG3	CONVICTION CHARGE 3	99.0%
RECUNK	RECOVERY DATE UNKNOWN	99.4%
CCHRG4	CONVICTION CHARGE 4	99.5%
CCHRG5	CONVICTION CHARGE 5	99.6%
CCHRG6	CONVICTION CHARGE 6	99.8%
VEHUNK	TYPE OF STOLEN VEHICLE UNKNOWN	99.9%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3483.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
      (Total cases=9)                                Missing Values
-----
77.5% (79 of 102 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 102 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 102 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 102 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 102 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

1.0% (1 of 102 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

IOC2      ROLE OF IOC-2                                11.1%

4.9% (5 of 102 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

GOAL2     PRIMARY GOAL OF RATT-2                        22.2%
UNIQ2     HOW RATT UNIQUE-2                             22.2%
EVOLVE2   HOW DID IT EVOLVE-2                          33.3%
SUCCESS2  WHY RATT MORE SUCCESSFUL-2                   33.3%
SUPPORT2  SUPPORT SOLICITED-2                          33.3%

16.7% (17 of 102 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

EVOLVE3   HOW DID IT EVOLVE-3                          44.4%
NEED2     WHY NEED RATT-2                               55.6%
IOCEC2    IOC RELATIONSHIP TO EC-2                     66.7%
EC2       ROLE OF EXEC COMM-2                           66.7%
UNIQ3     HOW RATT UNIQUE-3                             66.7%
RATTLE2   COORD W/LE-2                                  66.7%
LEADIMP   HOW NEW LEAD IMPROVE                          66.7%
GOAL3     PRIMARY GOAL OF RATT-3                        77.8%
IOC3      ROLE OF IOC-3                                 77.8%
FUNDED2   HOW FUND RATT-2                               77.8%
=====

```

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
SUPPORT3 SUPPORT SOLICITED-3	77.8%
DUPEFF2 DUP OF EFF AVOIDED-2	77.8%
IMP8 IMPACT: OTHER	77.8%
EVOLVE4 HOW DID IT EVOLVE-4	88.9%
EC3 ROLE OF EXEC COMM-3	88.9%
FUNDED3 HOW FUND RATT-3	100.0%
DUPEFF3 DUP OF EFF AVOIDED-3	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3483.P3

Table 3: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
      (Total cases=8)                                Missing Values
-----
41.3% (31 of 75 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 75 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 75 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 75 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 75 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

2.7% (2 of 75 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

CHG2      WHAT CHANGES-2                                12.5%
ROLE      ROLE CHANGE                                  12.5%

5.3% (4 of 75 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

SUC2      HOW SUCCESSFUL-2                                37.5%
HELP1     HOW HELPFUL-1                                  37.5%
IMP13     IMPROVE: OTHER                                37.5%
RCHG1     HOW CHANGE-1                                  37.5%

50.7% (38 of 75 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

UN2       HOW UNIQUE-2                                    50.0%
HELP      CAMS HELPFUL                                    50.0%
PACT2     WHAT IMPACT-2                                    50.0%
HELP2     HOW HELPFUL-2                                    62.5%
SUC3      HOW SUCCESSFUL-3                                75.0%
CHG3      WHAT CHANGES-3                                75.0%
RCHG2     HOW CHANGE-2                                    75.0%
HELP3     HOW HELPFUL-3                                    87.5%
NOH1      NOT HELPFUL-1                                    87.5%
IM10      IMPACT: OTHER                                    87.5%
=====

```

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
PACT3	WHAT IMPACT-3	87.5%
ROLE2	EDUC ROLE-2	87.5%
UN3	HOW UNIQUE-3	100.0%
UN4	HOW UNIQUE-4	100.0%
SUC4	HOW SUCCESSFUL-4	100.0%
HELP4	HOW HELPFUL-4	100.0%
NOH2	NOT HELPFUL-2	100.0%
NOH3	NOT HELPFUL-3	100.0%
NOH4	NOT HELPFUL-4	100.0%
CHG4	WHAT CHANGES-4	100.0%
PACT4	WHAT IMPACT-4	100.0%
NDD	CHANGE NEEDED	100.0%
NDD1	WHAT NEEDED-1	100.0%
NDD2	WHAT NEEDED-2	100.0%
NDD3	WHAT NEEDED-3	100.0%
NDD4	WHAT NEEDED-4	100.0%
NP1	IMPACT-1	100.0%
NP2	IMPACT-2	100.0%
NP3	IMPACT-3	100.0%
NP4	IMPACT-4	100.0%
ROLE3	EDUC ROLE-3	100.0%
ROLE4	EDUC ROLE-4	100.0%
RCHG3	HOW CHANGE-3	100.0%
RCHG4	HOW CHANGE-4	100.0%
COM1	COMMENTS-1	100.0%
COM2	COMMENTS-2	100.0%
COM3	COMMENTS-3	100.0%
COM4	COMMENTS-4	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3483.P4

Table 4: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
      (Total cases=21)                                Missing Values
-----
86.6% (232 of 268 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 268 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 268 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.7% (2 of 268 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

4.1% (11 of 268 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

CIT1      REDUCE: LOCK CAR                                9.5%
CIT2      REDUCE: USE CLUB                                9.5%
CIT3      REDUCE: CAR ALARM                              9.5%
CIT4      REDUCE: CAR COVER                              9.5%
CIT5      REDUCE: NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH                    9.5%
CIT6      REDUCE: PARK WELL LIT                          9.5%
CIT7      REDUCE: NO VALUABLES IN CAR                    9.5%
CIT8      REDUCE: PARK OFF STREET                        9.5%
CIT9      REDUCE: KILL SWITCH                            9.5%
CIT10     REDUCE: OTHER                                  9.5%
CITRED    MOST IMP WAY RED. MVT                          9.5%

0.0% (0 of 268 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.4% (1 of 268 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

DIFFER2   HOW YOU DIFFER FROM 1 DET-2                    33.3%

8.2% (22 of 268 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

YRTEAM2   COORD W/MEMB - WHY                              52.4%
UNIQUE2   WHY MVT SUSP UNIQUE-2                          61.9%
GOAL8     GOAL 8                                          71.4%
ACT28     ACTIVITIES: OTHER                              71.4%
=====

```

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
RECOVER2 AREA MOST MVT RECOVER-2	71.4%
YOTHTEM2 COORD W/MEMB OTH TEAM - WHY	71.4%
DIFFER3 HOW YOU DIFFER FROM 1 DET-3	76.2%
IMP7 IMPACT: OTHER WHY MVT IMPACTED BY RATT	76.2%
YINVAGY2 COORD W/OUT AGEN - WHY	76.2%
YUNINV2 COORD W/AG. NOT INV - WHY	76.2%
STOLEN2 AREA OF CNTY MOST MVT-2	81.0%
CARGOIMP MOST IMPORT WAY REDUCE CARGO THFT	85.7%
CARGO1 REDUCE CARGO THEFT-1	85.7%
CARGO2 REDUCE CARGO THEFT-2	85.7%
DIFFER4 HOW YOU DIFFER FROM 1 DET-4	90.5%
STOLEN3 AREA OF CNTY MOST MVT-3	90.5%
CARGO3 REDUCE CARGO THEFT-3	90.5%
CARGO4 REDUCE CARGO THEFT-4	90.5%
STOLEN4 AREA OF CNTY MOST MVT-4	95.2%
STOLEN5 AREA OF CNTY MOST MVT-5	95.2%
RECOVER3 AREA MOST MVT RECOVER-3	95.2%
CARGO5 REDUCE CARGO THEFT-5	95.2%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3483.P5

Table 5: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=22)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values

66.1% (150 of 227 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 227 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 227 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
4.8% (11 of 227 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
1.3% (3 of 227 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
MOST2 STARTED MOST INVESTIGATIONS-2	9.1%
MOST3 STARTED MOST INVESTIGATIONS-3	9.1%
PROB ACTIVITIES: PROBATION	9.1%
1.8% (4 of 227 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
CNG1 WHAT CHANGES-1	13.6%
IMPACT1 IMPACT OF CHANGES-1	13.6%
CNG2 WHAT CHANGES-2	18.2%
R10 RINGS: AREAS OF THEFT-2	18.2%
0.4% (1 of 227 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
ROLE1 HOW ROLE CHANGE-1	36.4%
25.6% (58 of 227 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
AD9 ACTIVITIES: CAMS	40.9%
R6 CARS IN RINGS-2	40.9%
CP2 RATT'S ROLE-2	45.5%
REQ1 WHY REQUESTED MAPS-1	50.0%
USE WERE MAPS USEFUL	50.0%
T12 OTHER TRAINING	54.5%
I16 ID MVT: OTHER	54.5%
=====	

Table 5 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
IMPACT2	IMPACT OF CHANGES-2	54.5%
R11	RINGS: AREAS OF THEFT-3	54.5%
USE1	HOW USED-1	59.1%
R15	OTHER RINGS-1	59.1%
IMP17	IMPEDE: OTHER	63.6%
MOD12	MODIFY: OTHER	63.6%
CNG3	WHAT CHANGES-3	63.6%
REQ2	WHY REQUESTED MAPS-2	77.3%
USE2	HOW USED-2	81.8%
A14	ACTIVITIES: OTHER	81.8%
IMPACT3	IMPACT OF CHANGES-3	81.8%
NDD	ARE CHANGES NEEDED	81.8%
R7	CARS IN RINGS-3	81.8%
NOT1	NOT USEFUL-1	86.4%
ND1	WHAT CHANGES NEEDED-1	86.4%
NDC1	IMPACT OF CHANGES-1	86.4%
ROLE2	HOW ROLE CHANGE-2	86.4%
REQ3	WHY REQUESTED MAPS-3	90.9%
CAMUSE	OTHER DATA USEFUL	90.9%
DATA1	OTHER DATA USEFUL-1	90.9%
CHAR10	IMPACT: OTHER	90.9%
NDC2	IMPACT OF CHANGES-2	90.9%
USE3	HOW USED-3	95.5%
ND2	WHAT CHANGES NEEDED-2	95.5%
NDC3	IMPACT OF CHANGES-3	95.5%
CP3	RATT'S ROLE-3	95.5%
REQ4	WHY REQUESTED MAPS-4	100.0%
USE4	HOW USED-4	100.0%
NOT2	NOT USEFUL-2	100.0%
NOT3	NOT USEFUL-3	100.0%
NOT4	NOT USEFUL-4	100.0%
DATA2	OTHER DATA USEFUL-2	100.0%
DATA3	OTHER DATA USEFUL-3	100.0%
DATA4	OTHER DATA USEFUL-4	100.0%
CNG4	WHAT CHANGES-4	100.0%
IMPACT4	IMPACT OF CHANGES-4	100.0%
ND3	WHAT CHANGES NEEDED-3	100.0%
ND4	WHAT CHANGES NEEDED-4	100.0%
NDC4	IMPACT OF CHANGES-4	100.0%
R8	CARS IN RINGS-4	100.0%
R12	RINGS: AREAS OF THEFT-4	100.0%
R16	OTHER RINGS-2	100.0%

Table 5 (continued)

Variable Name and Label		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
R17	OTHER RINGS-3	100.0%
R18	OTHER RINGS-4	100.0%
CP4	RATT'S ROLE-4	100.0%
ROLE3	HOW ROLE CHANGE-3	100.0%
ROLE4	HOW ROLE CHANGE-4	100.0%
COM1	COMMENTS-1	100.0%
COM2	COMMENTS-2	100.0%
COM3	COMMENTS-3	100.0%
COM4	COMMENTS-4	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.