

Survey of Auto Theft Experts: The Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds

Conducted for the State of Michigan Automobile
Theft Prevention Authority

By

Professor Richard A. Spreng
Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management
Michigan State University

Executive Summary

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this project was to assess the current allocation of Michigan Auto Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) funds across a variety of methods to reduce auto theft. This study was designed to capture “expert opinion” regarding auto theft prevention methods. Three sections of the questionnaire focused on the respondent’s opinion of the optimal allocation of auto theft funds across nine methods of reducing auto theft, the potential reduction in auto theft as a result of these allocations, and a set of 18 opinion questions regarding auto theft issues.

Method

A questionnaire was developed and then administered to 956 members of the International Association of Automobile Theft Investigators (IAATI). A final sample of 211 was obtained. The respondents generally believed they had high knowledge about auto theft issues and spent a large percentage of their time on auto theft issues. Respondents were from insurance companies, various law enforcement agencies (e.g., state police, city/township police, sheriffs departments), and auto theft task forces, as well as a variety of others interested in auto theft issues.

Results

The largest allocations of funds were to law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues, multi-jurisdictional task forces with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel, and training of law enforcement personnel. Low allocations were given to community programs such as etching vehicle glass, public awareness campaigns, and training of prosecutors and judges.

The potential reductions in auto theft based on the allocations mirrored the allocation results. The top three were again law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues, multi-jurisdictional task forces with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel, and training of law enforcement personnel. Low reductions were again associated with community programs such as etching vehicle glass, public awareness campaigns, and training of prosecutors and judges.

The opinion questions validated many of the above results, indicating strong agreement that law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft, multi-jurisdictional task forces, and law enforcement training are effective in reducing auto theft. There was low agreement that community programs and public awareness campaigns are effective.

When the results were examined by the respondent’s level of knowledge, the percentage of time the respondent spends on auto theft issues, or the respondent’s place of employment, there was remarkable agreement across all three types of questions.

Conclusions

A consistent pattern of results across all three sets of questions is that law enforcement dedicated to auto theft represents the best approach to auto theft. In addition, training for law enforcement was deemed to be very important. Together these results indicate that experts believe allocations to law enforcement to be critical to auto theft reduction programs. Also very high was the use of multi-jurisdictional task forces and prosecutors dedicated to auto theft. Conversely, the respondents generally did not think that community programs or public relations campaigns are very effective.

Survey of Auto Theft Experts: The Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds

Purpose and Scope of the Project

The purpose of this project was to assess the current allocation of Michigan Auto Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) funds across a variety of methods to reduce auto theft. One method of doing this is to examine the effectiveness of each method in reducing auto theft. This, however, is very difficult. For example, the State of Illinois commissioned a study completed by the Northwestern University Traffic Institute, which stated “For the present, routinely available auto theft data are simply not adequate to support any judgements regarding the effectiveness of the task forces in reducing auto theft.” This difficulty is due to the many factors, other than the target method, that can influence auto theft rates. In general, it will be very difficult to unambiguously quantify the effect of any one auto prevention method.

Therefore, the current study was designed to capture “expert opinion” regarding auto theft prevention methods. After identifying methods generally used to combat auto theft, a questionnaire was developed and administered to a variety of auto theft prevention experts. The results of the survey will provide an indication of what experts believe to be the optimal allocation of funds.

Method

A questionnaire was developed through discussions with personnel at the Michigan ATPA, an examination of the annual reports of other states with auto theft prevention agencies, and by examination of other studies conducted by independent organizations (see Appendix 1 for bibliography). The questionnaire is shown in Appendix 2.

The survey was administered by sending an email to potential respondents with an invitation to connect to a web site that contained the questionnaire. The invitation also promised respondents a copy of the final report as an incentive to filling out the questionnaire. Requests for the report were submitted by email separately from the questionnaire to maintain the anonymity of the respondent. After connecting to the web site, the respondent filled out the questionnaire and submitted it via the internet. The initial emails were sent on March 20 and 21, 2001. On April 2, 2001 a follow-up request was sent to all potential respondents reminding those who had not responded to do so. Data collection ended on April 15.

The population surveyed was the membership of the International Association of Automobile Theft Investigators (IAATI) who had email addresses listed in the IAATI Membership Directory. This resulted in 1088 potential respondents, but 132 (12 percent) of the emails were not active. Thus, there was a total valid sample of 956. The number of respondents was 232, which is a 24 percent response rate. This is an acceptable response rate. Some respondents did not fill out the survey completely and were eliminated, resulting in a final sample of 211. Some tables below do not add to 211 since not all questions were answered by all respondents.

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Knowledge. The respondents generally considered themselves to be knowledgeable about auto

theft issues (see Table 1). On the question “In comparison to the average person employed in your position, how knowledgeable are you about auto theft issues?” the mean response was 5.59 on a seven-point scale. Only 11 respondents (5 percent) indicated that they were below average in knowledge, and an additional 32 (15 percent) considered themselves average in knowledge. The remaining 164 respondents (78 percent) considered themselves above average, and of these 128 (61 percent) indicated a 6 or 7 on the seven point scale. Thus, it appears that our respondents generally considered themselves to be experts in auto theft issues.

**Table 1
Knowledge**

Knowledge Level	Number	Percent
1 = Very low knowledge	3	1.4%
2	4	1.9%
3	4	1.9%
4 = About average knowledge	32	15.2%
5	36	17.1%
6	69	32.7%
7 = Very high knowledge	59	28.0%

Time Devoted to Auto Theft Issues. The respondents spend a considerable amount of their time on auto theft issues. When asked “What percentage of your time do you spend on auto theft case related activities?” using a scale with zero at one end and 100 percent at the other, only 8 respondents indicated zero while 76 (36 percent of the respondents) indicated that they spend 80 percent or more of their time on auto theft issues. Table 2 shows the percentage at each level, and indicates that 129 of the respondents (62 percent) spend 50 percent or more of their time on auto theft issues. Again, this provides evidence that we succeeded in surveying respondents who have a high level of experience and involvement in auto theft related issues.

**Table 2
Time Spent on Auto Theft Issues**

Percent of Time	Number	Percent
0%	8	3.8%
10%	28	13.3%
20%	10	4.7%
30%	16	7.6%
40%	15	7.1%
50%	13	6.2%
60%	12	5.7%
70%	28	13.3%
80%	21	10.0%
90%	26	12.3%
100%	29	13.7%

Place of Employment. Table 3 shows the employment breakdown for the respondents. The largest percentage of respondents was employed by insurance companies, followed by city/township police.

**Table 3
Place of Employment**

Employment	Number	Percent
Insurance Company	65	32.3%
City/Township Police	57	28.4%
State Police	29	14.4%
Auto Theft Task Force	25	12.4%
Sheriffs Dept.	12	6.0%
Federal Agency	4	2.0%
Auto Manufacturing	3	1.5%
Prosecutor's Office	2	1.0%
Secretary of State's Office	2	1.0%
Court System	1	0.5%
Auto Retailing	1	0.5%

Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds

Question 1 asked respondents to allocate \$6 million to a variety of auto theft prevention activities (see questionnaire in Appendix 2 for exact wording). The respondent was to allocate a percentage of the funds to the various activities, and Table 4 shows the results. Paired samples t-tests were used to assess whether the percentage for each activity was significantly different than the percentage allocated to other methods (Appendix 3).

**Table 4
Allocation of Funds**

Auto Theft Prevention Activity	Percent of Funds
Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.	24.8%
Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.	18.4%
Training of law enforcement personnel.	10.4%
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.	9.0%
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.	8.7%
Insurance company investigators.	8.1%
Public awareness campaigns.	6.4%
Training of prosecutors and judges.	5.7%
Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.	5.0%
Other allocation	2.4%

The greatest percentage of funds was allocated to “Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues,” with an average of 24.8 percent of the funds. This was significantly higher, based on paired samples t-tests, than all the other methods. The next highest allocation was to “Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel” with an average of 18.4 percent of the funds. This was significantly higher than all the other methods

with the exception of “Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.” The third highest method was “training law enforcement personnel” at 10.4 percent of the funds, and was significantly higher than three of the other methods. Thus, the top three methods dealt with law enforcement personnel either alone (dedicated to auto theft and training) or on a task force, and was allocated over 53 percent of the funds.

Prosecutors also seem to be important in that the fourth highest allocation was for “prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues” (9 percent of the funds, significantly higher than three other methods), as well as the role of prosecutors on task forces (discussed above; 18.4 percent of funds). In addition, 5.7 percent of funds were allocated to training of prosecutors and judges.

Of somewhat lower importance were “inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles and parts” (8.7 percent of funds) and “insurance company investigators” (8.1 percent of funds). The least important use of funds were identified to be “public awareness campaigns” (6.4 percent of funds) and “community programs” (5 percent of funds).

Respondents were also allowed to write in other methods that they think would be effective, and 35 respondents did so. The top four were bait car programs (four responses), database system for tracking cars and offenders (four responses), and stiffer penalties (three responses). No other suggestion was made by more than two respondents.

Potential Reductions in Auto Theft

Following the allocations, the respondents were asked to indicate the percent reduction in auto theft that would result from spending their recommended amount on each method (see Appendix 2 for exact wording). The results, shown in Table 5, show that respondents believed that the greatest reductions would result from allocating funds to “Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues,” and “Multi-jurisdictional task forces,” with each producing over a 10 percent reduction in auto theft. These two were not significantly different from each other (Appendix 4). The mean level of reduction the respondents believed would result from “Law enforcement personnel” was significantly higher than all the other methods (except for “Multi-jurisdictional task forces”).

Four other methods (training of law enforcement personnel, inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts, prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues, and insurance company investigators) were believed to be able to produce 6 to 8 percent reductions. The three methods at the bottom (training of judges and prosecutors, public awareness campaigns, and community programs) were believed to be able to produce less than 5 percent reductions in auto theft.

Table 5
Reduction in Auto Theft Based on Allocations

Auto Theft Prevention Activity	Percent Reduction
Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.	15.50%
Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.	13.20%
Training of law enforcement personnel.	8.80%
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.	8.50%
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.	6.50%
Insurance company investigators.	6.50%
Training of prosecutors and judges.	4.90%
Public awareness campaigns.	4.80%
Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.	3.60%

Opinions on Auto Theft Solutions

Respondents were also asked to react to 18 statements dealing with solutions to auto theft. Table 6 shows the statements and results. Each statement used a seven-point scale anchored “strongly disagree” (1) and “strongly agree” (7). Appendix 2 (the questionnaire) includes the percent of responses for each statement.

Table 6
Auto Theft Solutions
(percent agree or strongly agree)

Auto theft Solution	Percent
Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft cases are effective in reducing auto theft.	82.0
The best way to reduce insurance fraud is to aggressively pursue and publicize convictions.	70.1
Multi-jurisdictional task forces are an effective method for reducing auto theft.	68.2
Training of law enforcement is effective in reducing auto theft.	67.3
Law enforcement agencies need more training in how to identify insurance fraud.	66.4
Lack of uniformity of data between states is a serious problem.	52.6
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts is effective in reducing auto theft.	46.4
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft cases are effective in reducing auto theft.	44.5
Lack of uniformity of data between agencies within your state is a serious problem.	42.6
Insurance investigators are an effective method for reducing auto theft.	38.9
Training of prosecutors and judges is effective in reducing auto theft.	38.4
Public awareness campaigns are effective in reducing auto theft.	23.7
Community programs are effective in reducing auto theft.	20.4
Insurers make an adequate effort to identify auto theft insurance fraud.	15.6
There is adequate sharing of data between agencies within your state.	12.3
Insurance companies aggressively prosecute insurance fraud.	10.9
There is adequate sharing of data between states.	6.2
Law enforcement is doing enough to identify insurance fraud.	3.8

Law Enforcement. The results indicate that respondents had high agreement with the use of dedicated law enforcement personnel (82 percent agreement), multi-jurisdictional task forces that include law enforcement (68 percent agreement), and training of law enforcement personnel (67 percent) to reduce auto theft. As was found in the allocation of funds section, law enforcement is seen as key to reducing auto theft.

Insurance Fraud. There was also high agreement that insurance fraud can be reduced by aggressively pursuing and publicizing convictions (70 percent) and that law enforcement personnel need more training to identify insurance fraud (66 percent). There was only moderate agreement that insurance investigators are effective in reducing auto theft (39 percent). There was very little agreement with the statement that insurance companies do enough to identify insurance fraud (16 percent). Similarly, there was strong disagreement that law enforcement is doing enough to identify insurance fraud (only 4 percent agree). In addition, there was disagreement that insurance companies aggressively prosecute insurance fraud (11 percent). Together these responses indicate a belief that more needs to be done to train law enforcement to identify insurance fraud, and insurance companies must do more to identify, prosecute and publicize insurance fraud convictions.

Auto Theft Data. There was agreement that the lack of uniformity of data between states is a serious problem (52 percent), and strong disagreement that there is adequate sharing of this data between states (6 percent agree). There was also moderate agreement that the lack of uniformity of data between agencies within states is a problem (43 percent), and strong disagreement that there is a adequate sharing of data between agencies within states (12 percent agree). Thus, it appears that the uniformity of data between states and within states is not as large of a problem as that of sharing data.

Prosecutors and Judges. The results indicate moderate agreement that prosecutors dedicated to auto theft are effective in reducing auto theft (45 percent). There is slightly less support for the effectiveness of training for prosecutors and judges (38 percent).

Public Awareness and Community Programs. There was low agreement that public awareness programs (24 percent) and community programs (20 percent) are effective methods of reducing auto theft.

Inspection of Businesses. A single statement dealt with the effectiveness of inspecting businesses for stolen vehicles or parts. The results indicated moderate agreement that this was effective (46 percent).

Impact of Knowledge on Responses

One factor that could influence the answers given is the respondent's level of knowledge. This section examines the effect of knowledge on responses by testing whether the responses differ by knowledge level. For this analysis, respondents were divided into three knowledge groups based on their response to the seven-point knowledge question: high knowledge (score of 7, n = 59), moderate knowledge (score of 5 or 6, n = 105) and low knowledge (score of 4 or less, n = 43). The analytic technique used was analysis of variance (ANOVA), with knowledge category as the independent variable and the allocations, potential reductions, and the opinion responses as the dependent variables.

Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds. The analysis indicated there were no differences in allocation of funds based on knowledge level. For each method an ANOVA showed that the mean allocation for that method was not significantly different for high, moderate, or low knowledge respondents.

Potential Reductions of Auto Theft. The analysis indicated that there were no differences in the expected reduction in auto theft for the various methods by knowledge level. For each method

an ANOVA showed that the mean reduction was not significantly different for different knowledge levels.

Opinions on Auto Theft Solutions. The analysis indicated that the responses to the auto theft solutions statements generally did not depend upon the respondent's knowledge level. For the 18 statements only one differed significantly by knowledge level. Low knowledge subjects had significantly higher agreement with the statement that "law enforcement is doing enough to identify cases of insurance fraud" than both moderate and high knowledge subjects. Thus, in general, knowledge does not influence opinions about auto theft reduction.

Conclusions on Knowledge. Allocations, expected reductions, and opinions regarding auto theft prevention methods do not vary depending upon knowledge level. A caveat to these results is that very few subjects (11) thought they were below average in knowledge of auto theft issues. Thus, we are testing differences among groups made up of fairly high knowledge respondents. These results might differ if more respondents were truly low knowledge.

Influence of Where the Respondent Works

A second factor that could influence the results is where the respondent works. This section examines whether the responses differ by place of employment. The categories of employment used are City/Township Police, Sheriff's Office, State Police, Insurance Company, Prosecutor's Office, Secretary of State's Office, and Auto Retailing/Manufacturing. The analytic technique used was analysis of variance, with place of employment as the independent variable and the allocations, potential reductions, and the opinion responses as the dependent variables.

Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds. The analysis indicated that there was only one category of funds allocation in which there were any significant differences. For "insurance company investigators" those who work for an insurance company gave a significantly greater percentage of funds to this category (11.7 percent) than did city/township police (6.6 percent), sheriff's office (4.4 percent) or state police (4.5 percent). Those working for insurance companies did not differ significantly from the other employment categories.

Potential Reductions of Auto Theft. When potential reductions in auto theft were examined by where the respondent worked, there was one significant difference. Those who work for an insurance company believed that insurance investigators would result in a greater reduction (12.9 percent reduction) than those who work for city/township police (6.0 percent reduction). None of the other comparisons were significantly different.

Opinions on Auto Theft Solutions. This analysis indicated three solutions that differed significantly by employment group. The statement "insurers make an adequate effort to identify auto theft insurance fraud" had a significantly higher level of agreement among insurance company employees than among city/township police. There were no significant differences between any of the other employment groups. The question "law enforcement is doing enough to identify cases of insurance fraud" had higher agreement among state police than city/township police, and higher agreement among state police than insurance company employees. Finally, the statement "the best way to reduce insurance fraud is to aggressively pursue and publicize convictions" had higher agreement among insurance company employees than those working in a sheriff's office. Again, there is remarkable agreement among the respondents. This analysis examined 504 potential differences (18 questions times 28 comparisons per question) and found only three differences.

Conclusions on Place of Employment. Overall, the results are rather striking in that there is very little significant variation in allocation of funds, potential reductions, or opinions across employment categories. There appears to be a high level of consensus among auto theft experts on the best methods to combat auto theft.

Influence of the Amount of Time the Respondent Spends on Auto Theft Issues

The final factor that could influence the results is the percentage of time the respondent spends on auto theft related issues. For this analysis the respondents who spend less than half their time on auto theft issues (between zero and 40 percent) were considered low in time spent (n=78, 37 percent) and those who spend fifty percent or more (between 50 percent and 100 percent) of their time were considered high in time spent (n = 132, 63 percent). The analytic technique used was analysis of variance, with amount of time spent as the independent variable and the allocations, potential reductions, and the opinion responses as dependent variables.

Allocation of Auto Theft Prevention Funds. There was only one difference in the amount of funds allocated by the time spent on auto theft issues. Those who spend a higher percentage of their time on auto theft issues allocated a significantly lower percentage of funds to community programs (6.1 percent of funds) than those who were lower in time spent (8.0 percent of funds).

Potential Reductions of Auto Theft. There were no differences in the expected reduction in auto theft based on how much time the respondent spends on auto theft issues. For each method the mean level of those low versus those high in time spent were not significantly different.

Opinions on Auto Theft Solutions. There were no significant differences between the two groups for any of the opinion question. For all 18 opinion statements the mean response for the high time spent group was not significantly different than the low time spent group.

Conclusions on Time Spent. Overall, there was a great deal of consistency among the respondents for all three sets of questions, regardless of whether they spend a small or a great amount of their time on auto theft issues.

Limitations

The primary limitation of the study was that only members of IAATI with email addresses in the IAATI Membership Directory were contacted. Therefore, if there are systematic differences between those who use email as a communications tool and those who do not, the results may be biased. There are, however, several advantages of using email to contact respondents. Data collection was much less expensive and faster than a mail survey. In addition, it was easier to send a follow-up message to respondents to get greater participation. Over 50 percent of the respondents replied after the follow-up email was sent. Finally, data input was quick, inexpensive, and accurate, since the respondents inputted the data themselves.

Implications

A consistent pattern of results is that law enforcement represents the best approach to auto theft. Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft: (a) received an allocation of funds that was significantly higher than any other method; (b) was believed to result in the greatest reduction in auto theft if given the funds; and (c) had the highest agreement in the opinion section that it is an effective way to reduce auto theft. In addition, training for law enforcement was third highest in allocation, potential reduction, and agreement that it is an effective method. Together these results indicate that experts believe allocations to law enforcement to be critical to auto theft reduction programs.

Also very high was the use of multi-jurisdictional task forces with: (a) the second highest funds allocation; (b) the second highest reduction in auto theft; and (c) very strong agreement that it is an effective method. Closely related to this was support for prosecutors dedicated to auto theft which was fourth highest in allocation of funds, fifth highest in potential reduction of auto theft, and fairly high agreement that it is effective.

Conversely, the respondents generally did not think that community programs or public relations campaigns are very effective. These two methods: (a) were in the bottom three for allocation of funds; (b) were believed to result in the lowest reduction of auto theft; and (c) were very low in agreement that they were effective methods of reducing auto theft. The training of prosecutors and judges was also of fairly low importance on all three measures.

The remaining methods (inspection of businesses and insurance company investigators) were moderate in importance in reducing auto theft.

The results of the opinion questions indicated several other issues in fighting auto theft. One was very strong agreement that insurance fraud can be reduced by aggressively pursuing and publicizing cases of insurance fraud. Yet there was very strong disagreement that insurance companies are doing enough to identify insurance fraud, insurance companies aggressively prosecute insurance fraud, and that law enforcement is doing enough to identify insurance fraud. There was strong agreement law enforcement agencies need more training in identifying insurance fraud.

The opinion questions also indicated a perception that there is isn't enough sharing of data within states or sharing of data between states. There was moderate agreement that the lack of uniformity of data between states is a serious problem, and weaker agreement that this is a problem between agencies within states.

One of the most striking aspects of the results was the lack of variation between subgroups of respondents. While there was limited variation in knowledge (mostly high) and amount of time spent (also mostly high) there were a variety of places of employment represented. There was a great deal of consistency in responses for all three subgroup types.

Appendix 1 Bibliography

“Evaluations of Illinois Auto Theft Task Forces,” The Northwestern University Traffic Institute, 1994.

“Evaluation of Illinois Secretary of State Auto Parts Audit Teams,” The Northwestern University Traffic Institute, 1994.

“Minnesota Auto Theft Prevention Program, 1999 Annual Report”

“1999 Annual Report of the Florida Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Authority”

“Illinois Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Council, 1997 Annual Report”

“Texas Automobile Theft Prevention Authority, 1999 Annual Report”

“Arizona Automobile Theft Authority, 1999 Annual Report”

“Maryland Vehicle Theft Prevention Council, 1997 Annual Report”

Appendix 2

Auto Theft Survey

Thank you for filling out this questionnaire. Your responses will be confidential.

The first two questions show nine methods used to reduce auto theft. Assume that you have a \$6 million budget for auto theft programs for your state. In Question 1, please indicate what you think is the optimal allocation of money across the nine methods. In the boxes provided, allocate 100 percent of these funds for auto theft programs across the nine methods. If there is an additional method that you think is effective, you may write it in the space provided. Please make sure the column adds up to 100%. For Question 2, what percentage decrease in auto theft would result from this amount of money being allocated to each method?

Q1 Type in each box the percentage of funds you would allocate to this method. Do not use decimals or the % sign. For example, if you think a method should get 20 percent of the funds you would write in its box 20.

Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.	24.8%
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.	9.0%
Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.	5.0%
Public awareness campaigns.	6.4%
Insurance company investigators.	8.1%
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.	8.7%
Training of law enforcement personnel.	10.4%
Training of prosecutors and judges.	5.7%
Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.	18.4%
Other (please specify)	
Other allocation	2.4%

Q2 For each method, please indicate what you think would be the result of allocating this amount of money to the method. Type in each box the percentage decrease in auto theft that you think would occur if your state allocated this amount of money to it. Again, do not use decimals or the % sign. For example, if you think the amount of money you allocated to a method would produce a 2 percent decrease in auto theft, you would write 2 in its box.

Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.	15.5%
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.	6.5%
Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.	3.6%
Public awareness campaigns.	4.8%
Insurance company investigators.	6.5%
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.	8.5%
Training of law enforcement personnel.	8.8%
Training of prosecutors and judges.	4.9%
Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.	13.2%
Other (from above)	2.8%

Q3 In comparison to the average person employed in your position, how knowledgeable are you about auto theft issues (check one number)?

	<small>Very low knowledge</small>		<small>About Average knowledge</small>		<small>Very high knowledge</small>
I am...	1%	2%	2%	16%	18%
	33%	28%			

Q4 What percentage of your time do you spend on auto theft case related activities?

	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
I spend...	4%	13%	5%	8%	7%	7%	6%	14%	10%	13%	14%

Q5 Please answer the following questions by clicking the appropriate box.

	Strongly Disagree			Neither			Strongly Agree
Multi-jurisdictional task forces are an effective method for reducing auto theft.	0%	0%	0%	6%	23%	20%	50%
Insurance investigators are an effective method for reducing auto theft.	2%	5%	9%	18%	27%	21%	19%
Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft cases are effective in reducing auto theft.	0%	0%	0%	3%	12%	33%	50%
Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft cases are effective in reducing auto theft.	0%	2%	5%	15%	31%	20%	26%
Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass, are effective in reducing auto theft.	5%	9%	9%	25%	31%	14%	8%
Public awareness campaigns are effective in reducing auto theft.	2%	7%	9%	18%	40%	13%	11%
Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts is effective in reducing auto theft.	0%	1%	4%	11%	35%	26%	22%
Training of law enforcement is effective in reducing auto theft.	0%	0%	1%	4%	23%	37%	33%
Training of prosecutors and judges is effective in reducing auto theft.	1%	3%	4%	22%	30%	18%	22%
Lack of uniformity of data between agencies within your state is a serious problem.	5%	4%	3%	24%	19%	17%	28%
Lack of uniformity of data between states is a serious problem.	3%	1%	3%	18%	17%	23%	34%
There is adequate sharing of data between agencies within your state.	11%	17%	15%	25%	19%	8%	5%
There is adequate sharing of data between states.	14%	24%	18%	24%	14%	2%	4%
Insurers make an adequate effort to identify auto theft insurance fraud.	5%	18%	19%	22%	20%	11%	5%
Insurance companies aggressively prosecute suspected insurance fraud.	15%	19%	16%	20%	18%	9%	2%
Law enforcement is doing enough to identify cases of insurance fraud.	21%	29%	24%	11%	12%	1%	2%
Law enforcement agencies need more training in how to identify insurance fraud.	2%	0%	1%	6%	22%	33%	36%
The best way to reduce insurance fraud is to aggressively pursue and publicize convictions.	3%	0%	0%	7%	17%	29%	43%

Q6 How much does your state currently spend per year on auto theft issues?

Zero	1%
Less than \$500,000	8%
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	2%
\$1,000,001 to \$2,500,000	3%
\$2,500,001 to \$5,000,000	4%
\$5,000,001 to \$7,500,000	3%
\$7,500,001 to \$10,000,000	1%
Over \$10,000,000	11%
Do not know	66%

Q7 Where do you work (check all that apply):

City/Township Police	31%
Sheriffs Department	7%
State Police	16%
Insurance Company	35%
Prosecutor's Office	2%
Court System	1%
Auto Theft Task Force	13%
Secretary of State's Office	1%
Auto Retailing	1%
Auto Manufacturing	2%
FBI	0%
Other Federal Agency	3%
Other (please specify)	

If you would like a copy of the final report, please send an e-mail message to Dr. Richard Spreng with "Report" in the subject line. The address is: spreng@msu.edu. When the report is finished a copy will be e-mailed to you. Thank you again for participating in this survey.

Appendix 3 Allocations that are Significantly Different^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	-								
2	A	-							
3	A	A	-						
4	A	A		-					
5	A		B	B	-				
6	A		B	B		-			
7	A		B	B		B	-		
8	A	A			A	A	A	-	
9	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	-

^a An “A” in a cell means that the average percentage of funds allocated to the method in the column is significantly higher than the method in the row. A “B” indicates that the row method is significantly higher than the method in the column. A blank cell means the two methods are not significantly different. The statistical test used was a paired samples t-test ($p < .05$). This tests whether the averages for any two methods are statistically different.

1. Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.
2. Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.
3. Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.
4. Public awareness campaigns.
5. Insurance company investigators.
6. Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.
7. Training of law enforcement personnel.
8. Training of prosecutors and judges.
9. Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.

Appendix 4
Expected Reductions that are Significantly Different^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	-								
2	A	-							
3	A	A	-						
4	A	A	B	-					
5	A		B	B	-				
6	A		B	B		-			
7	A	B	B	B		B	-		
8	A	A	B	B	A	A	A	-	
9		B	B	B	B	B	B	B	-

^a An “A” in a cell means that the average percentage of funds allocated to the method in the column is significantly higher than the method in the row. A “B” indicates that the row method is significantly higher than the method in the column. A blank cell means the two methods are not significantly different. The statistical test used was a paired samples t-test ($p < .05$).

1. Law enforcement personnel dedicated to auto theft issues.
2. Prosecutors dedicated to auto theft issues.
3. Community programs, such as etching vehicle glass.
4. Public awareness campaigns.
5. Insurance company investigators.
6. Inspection of businesses for stolen vehicles/parts.
7. Training of law enforcement personnel.
8. Training of prosecutors and judges.
9. Multi-jurisdictional task force with law enforcement and prosecutorial personnel.