Understanding Law Enforcement Intelligence Processes

David Carter, Michigan State University

Jeremy Carter, Indiana University-Purdue University

Steven Chermak, Michigan State University

Jack Drew, Michigan State University

Nature of the Problem

1. Law enforcement intelligence dramatic changes since 9/11.

2. New expectations for State, Local, and Tribal (SLT) law enforcement agencies

3. Little empirical work on the intelligence function of SLT law enforcement agencies

Data/Research Methodology

1. Web-Based Survey of Law Enforcement Personnel
   - Officers with Contemporary LE Intelligence Experience
   - Two samples (MIPT/DHS Intelligence Toolbox)

2. Response rate was approximately 35%

3. Sample was mostly sworn officers, analysts or investigative positions, and over 10 years experience

Perceived Threat of Extremist Groups by Type of Group

Type of Group	Potential Threat (2013-14)	Potential Threat (2006-07)
Sovereign Citizens	3.20 (1)	2.49 (7)
Islamic Extremists/Jihadists	2.89 (2)	3.13 (1)
Militia/Patriot	2.67 (3)	2.61 (6)
Racist Skinheads	2.58 (4)	2.82 (3)
Neo-Nazis	2.56 (5)	2.94 (2)
Extreme Animal Rightists	2.54 (6)	2.79 (4)
Extreme Environmentalists	2.51 (7)	2.74 (5)
Klux Klux Klan	2.38 (8)	2.47 (8)
Left-Wing Revolutionaries	2.36 (9)	2.04 (13)
Extreme Anti-Abortion	2.36 (9)	2.30 (11)
Black Nationalists	2.34 (11)	2.35 (10)
Extreme Anti-Tax	2.33 (12)	2.47 (8)
Extreme Anti-Immigration	2.33 (12)	2.41 (9)
Christian Identity	2.19 (13)	2.59 (8)
Idiosyncratic Sectarians	2.19 (13)	2.13 (12)
Millennial/Doomsday Cults	2.17 (15)	1.93 (14)
Reconstructed Traditions	2.13 (16)	2.04 (13)

Perceptions of Likelihood of Terrorism-Related Crimes by Type of Incident

Type of Incident	Likelihood of Incident (2013-14)	Likelihood of Incident (2006-07)
Cyberterrorism	3.09 (1)	3.09 (2)
Conventional Explosive Devices	2.85 (2)	3.18 (1)
Military Weapons Incident	2.60 (3)	2.50 (5)
Biological	2.37 (4)	2.47 (7)
Agroterrorism (food)	2.35 (5)	2.56 (3)
Agroterrorism (disease)	2.26 (6)	2.56 (3)
Chemical	2.25 (7)	2.50 (5)
Radiological	2.13 (8)	2.13 (8)

Usefulness of Information from Agencies and Sources

Agency	Score	Source	Score
State/Local Fusion Centers	3.53	Internet	3.40
FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force	3.42	Media	3.14
Federal Bureau of Investigation	3.34	Sources on the Street	3.12
Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis	3.27	Pro. LE Publications	3.06
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms	3.18	LEO	2.95
Drug Enforcement Administration	3.15	Non-Law Enforcement Books	2.78
Immigration and Customs Enforcement	3.13	RISS.net	2.76
Law Enforcement Prosecutors	3.06	Alternative Literature	2.70
State Office of Homeland Security	3.01	Risk Assessments	2.67
Customs and Border Protection	2.69	HSIN.Intell	2.66
State Attorney General Anti-terrorism Task Force	2.62		

Satisfied with the Working Relationship

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Local Law Enforcement	4.47	National Guard	4.12
State/Local Fusion Center	4.45	State Office of Homeland Security	4.10
State Law Enforcement	4.37	Homeland Security Investigation	4.10
Department of Homeland Security	4.22	Hospitals	4.08
Federal Bureau of Investigation	4.15	Public Transportation	4.03
Emergency Management	4.18	Public Works	3.99
Fire Marshals	4.18	Private Sector Agencies	3.97
Department of Corrections	4.14	Public Health	3.93
Critical Infrastructure Security	4.01	Internal Revenue Service	3.74
Tribal Law Enforcement	3.99		

Factors Influencing Agency (Non)Preparedness

	Prepared[a]		Not Prepared[b]	
Threats	Coef	Odds Ratio	Coef	Odds Ratio
Right-Wing	.092	1.39	-.097	-1.84
Left-Wing	.104	1.19	-.124	-1.87
Single-Issue	.131	1.31	-.125	-1.26
Jihad	.233	.76	-.272	-1.36
CBRNE	.246	1.91	-.156	-1.84
Relationships				
Federal	.223	1.84	-.262	-6.48***
State	.236	2.67**	-.234	-5.84***
Public	.203	1.67	-.227	-4.90***
Private	.835	1.80	-.807	-5.10***
Organizational				
Training	.043	.47	-.304	-3.85***
Threat Assessments	.847	3.59***	-.829	*2.65**
Threat Warnings	.347	1.65	-.525	-4.01***
Vulnerability Assessments	.964	4.60**	-1.287	-2.75**
Risk Assessments	.678	3.61***	-1.501	-2.87**
Personnel Problem	-1.169	-3.42***	.414	2.25*
Training Problem	-1.122	-2.71**	.733	4.03***
Resources Problem	-.886	-2.45*	.446	2.83**
Agency Culture Problem	-.394	-1.28	.706	3.81***
Received Federal Funding	.834	1.33	.105	.21
Received State Funding	1.231	1.36	-.088	-.15
Received Local Funding	-.094	-.09	-.014	-.02
Agency Size	.242	1.50	-.131	-.82

Conclusions

- Importance of organizational leadership
  - Train personnel
  - Develop external partnerships
  - Participate in state, regional and national information sharing initiatives

- Changing nature of threats
  - New threats, methodologies, targets
  - Emphasis on analytic products to maintain awareness

- Assessing agency information sharing
  - Staffing, clearances, and resources
  - Culture of information sharing

Contact

Steven Chermak

chermak@msu.edu

www.start.umd.edu

Sworn Status, Role and Tenure within their Agency

	MIPT		Toolbox Training	
	n	Percent[a]	*n*	Percent[a]
Sworn status				
Sworn	151	66.2	108	80.0
Non-sworn	77	33.8	27	20.0
Role				
Administrator	15	6.9	33	25.8
Supervisor	47	21.5	40	31.3
Investigator	86	39.7	35	27.3
Analyst	71	32.4	20	15.6
Tenure				
Less than a year	3	1.3	0	0
1-3 years	16	7.0	2	1.5
4-9 years	57	25.0	20	14.8
10-15 years	52	22.8	34	25.2
More than 15 years	100	43.9	79	58.5

[a] Percentages may not equal 100.0 due to rounding.