

SAFETY IN APARTMENT COMPLEXES: THE INFLUENCE OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Eric S. McCord
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA, USA

This study evaluates management and environmental features in 38 privately-owned apartment complexes in a city in Southern California, USA. An environmental survey completed during on-site inspections collected data on accessibility, surveillability, lighting, disorder and maintenance, and awareness space variables common to CPTED strategies and supported by theories of environmental criminology. A management survey collected data on applicant screening processes, and eviction, visitor, and trespass policies, commonly recommended in Crime Free Multi-Housing programs across the United States. To allow for a meaningful study across the apartment complexes, minimum rent paid, number of tenants both 12-24 yrs old (crime prone years) and 60yrs or over, and number of units in complex were controlled for during the study. The results support the effectiveness of access control (fencing) and on-going maintenance, while uncovering the detrimental effect on crime and police call for service (CFS) rates of apartment complexes located near retail alcohol outlets. Little impact on crime and CFS rates could be directly attributed to management policies, though the presence of on-site management and their stated level of responsibility for prevention of criminal acts proved interesting and a subject for future research.

Introduction

The U.S. Census Bureau (2003) estimates that one third of all Americans, over 80 million people, live in rental accommodations. According to the 2003 National Crime Victim Survey estimates, property crime rates for renters are 52% higher than those purchasing their home, and households in multi-unit structures average 30% more overall crime than single-family residences. Additionally, 40 percent of renter households report crime levels in their neighborhoods as bothersome or so serious that they want to move. Thus, it appears that crime disproportionately impacts renter households, especially those living in multi-unit structures.

Research on apartment crime is particularly significant at this time. The national ratio of renters to homeowners has been dropping steadily since 1994. This resulted in the third quarter of 2003 having the highest apartment vacancy rate in 33 years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). With only 59% of apartment complex owners reporting their business profitable (Savage, 1998), there is now more pressure than ever on landlords to reduce maintenance and security costs, while keeping occupancy rates as high as possible. The focus of this research is apartment complexes and seeks to identify management policies and environmental attributes common to CPTED strategies associated with lower crime and police calls for service rates.

Criminological research suggests that there is a strong connection between place management, the physical environment, and crime levels. Managers and landlords who control these factors need information on which environmental attributes and management practices can help them maintain a reasonably safe place, while staying within financial constraints and profitability.

Crime Free Multi-Housing programs (Campbell Delong Resources, 2002) have for the past decade promoted a series of crime reduction recommendations that have yet to be scientifically evaluated. They include suggestions for applicant screening, eviction processes, and visitor and trespass policies. Better management or “place management”, as it is known in criminological theory (Eck, 1994), is the stated goals of these programs. This study attempted to examine whether these recommendations do indeed contribute to lower crime levels.

Literature review

Three general theories in environmental criminology predominate in the explanation of crime and place relationships. Each of these theories directly supports CPTED strategies, offering a theoretical explanation as to why these strategies often work in "real world" circumstances. The three theories are routine activity (Cohen & Felson, 1979), rational choice perspectives (Clarke & Cornish, 1985), and crime pattern theory (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993).

Routine Activity theory

Routine activity theory explains crime through the convergence in space and time of a motivated offender with a suitable target, in the absence of a capable guardian. A capable guardian is anyone who by his or her mere presence prevents a crime from occurring. The theory posits that the interactions of these three conditions explain crime opportunity, and that this opportunity is brought about by the daily, normal activities of victims and offenders in society (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Places that are more amenable to the convergence of these three factors will suffer higher rates of crime.

Upon completing a comparative study between apartment complexes with drug sales and others without, Eck (1994) added to routine activity theory with the addition of a “place manager” concept. This research identified the important role in crime discouragement played by people who monitor or control places, including homeowners, doormen, private security officers, motel clerks, and apartment managers.

Rational Choice Perspective

The rational choice perspective is based on the classical position that people use some level of rationality in their decision to commit crime. This criminal decision making is described as a two-stage process. The first stage is a long-term, multi-level process where offenders decide whether or not to commit crime by assessing their personal needs and wants, moral attitudes towards criminality, available non-criminal alternatives, and personal background factors such as economic situation, family life, and individual personality characteristics. The second stage is short term and situational and involves the potential offender evaluating the physical and social environment surrounding a specific crime target for such factors as the perceived value of the target, the difficulty of getting at it due to security enhancements, and the likelihood of being seen, caught, and punished (Clarke & Cornish, 1985).

Crime Pattern theory

Crime pattern theory, developed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1993), is particularly useful in explaining the amount of crime found at specific locations. It combines routine activity theory with rational choice and offers an explanation as to

when and where crime will occur based upon the location of offenders, victims, and crime targets across spatial and temporal patterns.

An important concept in crime pattern theory is awareness space; an idea related to the cognitive map people form concerning geographical relationships in the world around them. As people move about during the day attending to their routine activities (e.g., work, school, or shopping trips), they develop an awareness of places they experience. For the criminally inclined, this awareness includes information on locations they perceive as easy crime targets. Research shows that criminals later return to these areas to commit crime, rather than search for targets in less familiar territory.

Certain locations or types of businesses tend to attract more criminals than would normally be found in the population, and/or provide increased opportunities for criminals. In particular, bars and other retail liquor outlets have been shown in a number of studies to increase levels of crime occurring in the surrounding block and neighborhoods, as well as suffering from high crime rates themselves (e.g., Block & Block 1995).

Routine activity, rational choice perspectives, and crime pattern theory are general theoretical models that explain relationships between crime and place. They are inherent to CPTED and management strategies that are aimed at preventing crime at specific places, such as evaluated here in apartment complexes.

CPTED

For a number of years CPTED's primary focus was on preventing crime before it occurred by applying concepts of access control, improved surveillance, and territoriality in the planning and design stages of new development. In recent years, it has advanced to include the concepts of place management and routine maintenance, while also evolving into a place-based response to current crime problems practiced by police departments and other interested parties.

The primary purpose of access control strategies in CPTED is to deny access to crime targets and to create a perception of risk in the offender. "Territoriality" is closely related concept in practice because reducing access through such strategies as fencing also invoke increased levels of ownership and responsibility for the enclosed area (Newman, 1972).

Surveillance strategies in CPTED are aimed at increasing the chances that an offender will be observed attacking a crime target. It includes adding more windows to overlook public areas and access points, keeping landscape trimmed, and using CCTV and increased lighting to remove the privacy criminals seek while going about their deeds.

Maintenance in CPTED refers to the ongoing concern directed at the preservation and upkeep of property. It's developed as a concept under CPTED primarily due to the timely release of Wilson and Kelling's (1982) "broken windows" thesis that theorized that potential offenders perceive deteriorated environments as possessing a breakdown in community control and order, thus leading to a reduced risk of apprehension.

Research studies on physical signs of deterioration, including poor building maintenance and the presence of graffiti and litter, have been correlated with crime

levels in neighborhood studies (e.g., Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001) and in apartment complexes in particular (Clarke & Bichler-Robertson, 1998).

Place management under CPTED refers to the way property is designated, controlled, and used. Crowe (2000) lists CPTED strategies including directing attention to (and controlling) gathering areas, placing safe activities in unsafe areas and unsafe ones in safe areas, and reducing conflicts among users of space, as ways to reduce crime. These strategies are in agreement with the definition of place management in routine activity theory. Many CPTED practitioners are now also involved in suggesting regulations and procedures related to the management of places to reduce incidences of crime and disorder.

Apartment Management

Managers and landlords of apartment complexes are “place managers” as defined by Eck (1994) in his supplement to routine activity theory and as now practiced in CPTED. They perform important roles in the prevention of crime by regulating the behavior of tenants and visitors on the property, as well as, reducing crime opportunities found there. Studies have shown that poor apartment management is related to higher crime levels and police calls for service.

Crime Free Multi-Housing (CFMH) programs, a crime prevention program offered by many police departments in the United States and Canada, recognize the importance of place management and seek to improve its effectiveness in apartment complexes and other rental housing (Campbell Delong Resources, 2002).

One element of Crime Free Multi-Housing programs is the required attendance of managers and landlords at an eight-hour managers training, or landlord class. The class emphasizes their responsibilities to crime prevention, provides information on working with the police, teaches the warning signs of drug use and sales, and encourages the promotion of a “sense of community” among tenants. The class also covers local laws and provides suggestions on tenant screening, eviction processes, and encourages the development of trespass and visitor policies.

Present Study

This research evaluated environmental and management policies related to CPTED strategies and criminology theories in 38 apartment complexes. It tested for the presence, direction, strength of these variables with that of crime and police calls for service (CFS) rates. Thirty-nine environmental factors and 20 management policies, most suggested in CFMH classes, were examined (See survey instruments in appendices). The study was cross-sectional in design and sought to identify the physical attributes and management policies that best explain the varying crime and call for service rates found across the investigated privately-owned apartment complexes.

Data

Two years (2002-2003) of crime and police calls for service (CFS) data were provided by the municipal police department responsible for the sample city. The data were standardized by the number of housing units resulting in crime and CFS rates for each complex. All reported crime was used regardless of its severity. Calls for service unrelated to crime or disorder (e.g., medical aids, fires, information requests) were removed.

Study sites

All privately-owned apartment complexes in the city with eight or more units were used. The complexes studied contained at minimum eight units with some having over 200 individual housing units ($M=63$, $SD=66$). Smaller complexes consisted of a single building while larger ones included several buildings on the same property.

The sample city, a convenience sample due to the author's past contacts with it, is a suburban community of approximately 70,000 residents located on the fringe of a major metropolitan area in Southern California, USA. It is an active community that draws shoppers from surrounding cities to its several large shopping centers, as well as, workers to its industrial and warehouse areas, and has what can be best described as, a moderate crime rate.

Compared with the entire United States, the sample city has a higher percentage of male residents (54 vs. 49%), younger population (median age 31 vs. 35 yrs), higher minority population (43 vs. 25%)-including those with a Hispanic background (46 vs. 13%), lower education levels (29 vs. 20% < high school education), and lower percentage of renters in its population (31 vs. 33%). It also has a lower rate of families (6 vs. 9%) and individuals (8 vs. 12%) living below the poverty level, identifying it as a blue-collar working town.

Attributes of tenants in rental housing in the city were compared to that of the United States. The city has a higher percentage of rental units containing family households (71 vs. 53%), householders 15-64 years old (67 vs. 49%), tenants in rental complexes with 10 or more units (40 vs. 33%), and number of tenants per unit (3.2 vs. 2.4).

Analyses & Findings

The study included all 38 privately-owned apartment complexes in the sample. Of these, 22 complexes (58%) had full-time, on-site managers. Management policy information was collected from all complexes with on-site managers and 9 of the 16 apartment complexes without on-site managers, for a total of 31 surveys (82%). Environmental information was collected at all 38 sites.

Table 1 provides descriptive information on the study sites. Included are the dependent variables of police call for service and crime rates as standardized by number of

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Complexes in Study

Variable	N	Mean	SD
CFS Rate	38	2.58	1.87
Crime Rate	38	.44	.28
Percentage 12-24 yrs	31	30.91	18.54
Percentage \geq 60 yrs	31	10.44	14.59
One-bedroom Rent	31	796.61	164.21
Number Units	38	63.68	66.28

housing units, and the control variables of estimated percentages of 12-24 year olds (crime-prone years) and tenants 60yrs old and above, lowest rent paid for a one-

bedroom apartment, and total number of units in the complex. Analysis of this data indicates a wide variance in most categories.

Environmental features analyses

Correlations between crime and police CFS rates with all 39 of the individual environmental variables revealed only 5 significant features ($p < .05$). Correlations (Table 2) showed that higher levels of pedestrian and vehicle access control through the use of fencing and gates were correlated with lower crime and CFS rates. Better upkeep of on-site parking lots, lower levels of litter on the property, and not having a liquor outlet within 1/4 mile of an apartment complex, were also correlated with lower crime and police CFS rates.

Table 2. Pearson Rho Correlations between CFS and Crime Rates and Significant Environmental Factors

Factor	N	CFS Rt	Crime Rt
Ped Access Control	38	-.258	-.341*
Veh Access Control	38	-.243	-.345*
Upkeep Parking Lot	38	-.169	-.312*
Litter Levels	38	-.272*	-.259
Liquor Outlet 1/4 mile	38	-.397*	-.344*

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

Management policy analyses

None of the 20 individual management policies collected attained a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) in their relationship with crime and CFS rates. However, some findings are nevertheless important and worth presenting here.

The level of on-site management, full-time, part-time, or no managers, was correlated with crime ($r_s = -.173, p = .30$) and CFS rates ($r_s = -.074, p = .65$). Additionally, the percentage of responsibility that management assumed for crime prevention, as a proportion of the total responsibility by management, tenants and the police resulting in a combined total of 100%, was also related to CFS and crime rates. Managers or owners that assumed higher stated levels of responsibility experienced lower CFS ($r_s = -.013, p = .94$) and crime rates ($r_s = -.215, p = .24$).

The value of attending a Crime Free Multi-Housing training class was revealed in a Mann-Whitney U testing for differences in the percentage management assumed for crime prevention. Manager and owners that attended the CFMH training revealed significantly higher mean rank scores (M rank = 21.44, $n = 9$) then those that did not attend the training (M rank = 13.77, $n = 22$) $z(31) = -2.158, p \leq .05$.

Multivariate analyses

Logistic regression analyses was used to determine if the impact of the environmental features on CFS and crime still held true when controlling for differences in important social features across the apartment complexes. These control variables included the size of the apartment complex (# units), lowest rent paid for a one bedroom unit, and estimated percentages of persons 12-24 yrs old (crime prone years) and over 60 yrs old.

In these regression analyses, CFS and crime rates were split at the median point resulting in 15 of 31 complexes in the above median or high range for CFS, and 13 of

the 31 complexes in the above median, or high range for crime rates. (Recall that seven landlords did not participate in the study resulting in a total of 31 cases with complete data.) A new variable ("unfenced") was developed that combined pedestrian access with the vehicle access variable. This variable was coded as "1" for apartment complexes that neither had fencing that controlled pedestrian or vehicle access onto the property, and "0" for all others.

As shown in Table 4, when the control variables are regressed with the other significant environmental features, apartments without fencing that controls both pedestrian and vehicle access are almost 44 times more likely to be complexes in the high CFS rate category ($X^2=17.046$, $p < .01$, pseudo $R^2=.663$). Additionally, complexes located in the proximity of liquor outlets were almost 54 times more likely to be in the high crime rate group ($X^2=21.070$, $p < .01$, pseudo $R^2=.663$).

Logistic regression analyses were run with the control variables and the level of on-site management (full-time, part-time, or no managers on-site) and percentage of responsibility that management assumed for crime prevention against both CFS and crime rates. Neither of these models nor were any of their factors significant, and they are not presented here.

Table 4. Logistic Regression Models For Control and Selected Environmental Features Predicting CFS and Crime Rates

Predictor	<i>B</i>	Wald X^2	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio
<u>CFS Rates</u> N= 31				
rent	.008	2.892	.089	1.008
%12-24 yr olds	-.041	1.226	.268	.960
% ≥ 60 yr olds	-.084	1.032	.310	.920
# units	-.001	.003	.957	.999
litter	.687	.086	.769	1.987
upkeep lot	1.259	.337	.561	3.522
liquor outlet	-1.071	.736	.391	2.918
unfenced	3.778	4.345	.037	43.711
<u>Crime Rates</u> N=31				
rent	.012	2.638	.104	1.012
%12-24 yr olds	.014	.111	.739	1.014
% > 60 yr olds	-.146	.747	.387	.864
# units	.010	.389	.533	1.010
litter	1.359	.343	.558	3.890
upkeep lot	-4.598	2.031	.154	.010
liquor outlet	3.986	3.838	.050	53.832
unfenced	3.038	3.095	.079	20.863

Conclusion

This research evaluated management policies and environmental features commonly associated with CPTED and supported by the crime-place theories of routine activity, rational choice perspectives, and crime pattern theory.

Higher levels of litter and poor lot maintenance were associated with higher crime and police CFS rates. It is not yet clear to criminologist if disorder leads to increased crime as postulated by "broken windows" theory or if disorder is a symptom that social control and concern for an area has already broken down. Either way, increased disorder is related to increases in the fear of crime, a primary concern of both CPTED practitioners and communities.

The research also showed that complexes that were not surrounded by fencing restricting public pedestrian and vehicle access onto the property experienced higher rates of crime and police CFS. This effect continued to be important when social factors including the size of the complex and demographics of the tenants were controlled for in the regression analyses. Promoting fencing at apartment complexes should not raise the concern of social commenters who decry the use of walled communities because many private homeowners already enjoy these benefits, and the grounds of apartment complexes, fenced in or not, were never intended to be public use areas.

Apartment complexes located within one block (1/4th mile) of retail liquor outlets (bars, liquor, or convenience stores) were also found to experience higher rates of crime and police CFS, and these effects persisted with inclusion of the control variables. Unfortunately, only rarely do apartment managers and owners have input into the location of their complexes. Still, they should remain aware of any new liquor outlets moving into their neighborhood and provide comments at the mandatory public hearings to be sure their security concerns, and those of their tenants are considered. Additionally, managers and landlords aware of neighborhood disruptions occurring because of a nearby liquor outlet should complain to city authorities and state liquor license boards until conditions are improved.

Apartments with on-site management and landlords and managers that accepted higher responsibility for crime prevention in this study, tended to have lower crime and police CFS rates, though not at a statistically significant level. Additional and larger studies across a number of communities are called for in order to confirm these propositions. Managers and landlords that attended Crime Free Multi-Housing (CFMH) training classes however, did accept higher levels of responsibility for crime prevention at significant levels, which should alone justify the importance of these classes.

Knowledge of what works in preventing crime in apartment complexes is being expanded by recent research, such as with the present study. However, little use of this knowledge will occur without apartment landlords and managers accepting a high level of responsibility for preventing crime and ensuring that their tenants live in safe and high quality housing.

References

- Block, R. L., & Block, C. R., (1995). Space, place and crime: Hot spot places of liquor-related crime. In J. E. Eck & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Crime prevention studies: Vol. 4. Crime and place* (pp.145-184). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993). Nodes, paths, and edges: Considerations on the complexity of crime and the physical environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 13, 3-28.
- Campbell Delong Resources, Inc. (2002). *Landlord training program: City of San Bernardino's crime free rental housing program* (2nd ed.). San Bernardino, CA: Author.
- Clarke, R. V., & Bichler-Robertson, G. (1998). Place managers, slumlords and crime in low rent apartment buildings. *Security Journal*, 11, 11-19.
- Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. B. (1985). Modeling offender's decisions: A framework for policy and research. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research: Vol. 6*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588-608.
- Eck, J. E. (1994). Drug markets and drug places: A case-control study of the spatial structure of illicit drug dealing. *University Microfilms International*.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space*. New York: MacMillian.
- Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Disorder in urban neighborhoods-does it lead to crime? (NIJ Publication No. NCJ157310). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Savage, H. (1998). Property owners and management survey: What have we learned? (U.S. Census Bureau publication). Retrieved December 5, 2003 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/3/98pubs/h121-9801.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2003). American housing survey. Retrieved March 5, 2004 from www.census.gov/hhes/www/ahs.html.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. (1982, March). The police and neighborhood safety: Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-36.

Appendix A

Apartment Environmental Survey

Location code: _____ Date: _____ Surveyor: _____

Pedestrian Accessibility

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Pedestrians have uncontrolled physical access onto complex Y=1 Gates broken=.5 N=0		*Reverse coded for correlation
Complex has access to public alleyway Y=1 N=0		
“No Trespassing” signs posted at all pedestrian entrances Y=1 most entrances=.5 few/none=0		

Vehicle Accessibility

Vehicles have uncontrolled physical access onto complex Y=1 Gates broken=.5 N=0		*Reverse coded for correlation
Residents have visibly assigned parking stalls Y=1 N=0		
Visitor parking is in same lot as tenants Y=1 N=0		
“No Trespassing” signs posted at all vehicle entrances Y=1 Most entrances=.5 Few/none=0		

Unit Accessibility

Front doors have deadbolt locks Y=1 N=0		
Peepholes on front door Y=1 N=0		

Surveillability (as designed and presently landscaped) Estimate 0-100%

* include primary windows from adjacent residential properties

<i>Variable</i>	Code	Comments
% of pedestrian entrances into complex within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of total walkway area within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of housing unit doors, front & rear, within view of 2 or more (other) primary windows		
% of ground floor unit windows, front & rear, within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of total common use activity area (pool, laundry room, open areas) within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of vehicle entrances into complexes within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of drive lanes within view of 2 or more primary windows		
% of parking stalls (or garage doors) within view of 2 or more primary windows		

Lighting

Well lighted=1

Lighted but many dark areas=.50

Well lighted, but some dark areas=.75

Poorly/not lighted=0

Pedestrian entrances into complex		
Walkways in/at complex		
Individual housing unit entrances		
Common areas (pools, laundry room, etc)		
Vehicle entrances		
Parking lot: drive lanes		
Parking lot: vehicle parking stalls		

Disorder & Maintenance (measure on and within 20' of property)

<i>Variable</i>	Code	Comments
Evidence of litter/garbage overall Little/None=1 Some=.5 Heavy=0		
Evidence of graffiti overall Little/None=1 Some=.5 Heavy=0		
Evidence of alcohol/drug use on grounds Little/None=1 Some=.5 Heavy=0		
General upkeep: structures (paint, repairs) Good=1 Moderate=.5 Poor=0		
General upkeep: landscaping/grounds Good=1 Moderate=.5 Poor=0		
General upkeep: parking lot (surface, stall markings, etc.) Good=1 Moderate=.5 Poor=0		

Awareness Space

Complex map at entrances Y=1 N=0		*reverse coded for correlation
Overall area: (1/4 mile face block both sides of street): Residential=1 Mixed (other resid. & comm./industrial)=.5 Commercial=0		
Type of property on each side Residential: single-family=1 Residential: multi-housing=.5 Commercial/industrial=0 Other=specify- i.e. freeway, RR track, etc.)	F B L R	
Busiest type street with complex access:		
Freeway on-ramp within 1/2 mile Y=0 N=1		
High school or middle school within 1/4 mile Y=0 N=1		
Bar, liquor, or convenience stores within 1/4 mile Y=0 N=1		
Fast food rest. within 1/4 mile Y=0 N=1		
Shopping center within 1/4 mile Y=0 N=1		

Appendix B

Apartment Management Survey

Location code: _____ Date: _____ Surveyor: _____

Interviewed is: Manager Owner

Other: _____

Variable	Code	Comments
Total number of rental units		
Estimated % of units occupied over the past 2 years		
Current lowest rent per month: one bedroom		
Current estimated % of 12-24 year olds		
Current estimated % of tenants ≥ 60 yrs		
# units rented under Section 8 or other programs to assist low-income renters?		
On-site manager 24 hr=1 Less then 24 hr manager=.50 Tenant w/some mgr duties=.25 None=0		
Number of full-time employees at this complex (note: 2 half-timers= 1 full time)		

Applicant Screening

Variable	Code	Comments
Are credit checks performed on prospective tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Are prior eviction checks performed on prospective tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Are criminal history checks performed on prospective tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Do you require at least two pieces of identification, one a government photo ID, from prospective tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Do identification requirements pertain to all prospective tenants living in the apartment over the age of 18? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Do you contact prior landlords? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Would you disqualify prospective tenants who falsify their applications? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		

Eviction Process

Do you have wording in your rental contract explaining that tenants may be evicted for drug sales, criminal acts, or disturbance violations on the property? Y=1 N=0		
Would you evict a tenant who sales drugs, commits crime on the property, or continually disturbs other tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		

Visitor Policy

Variable	Code	Comments
Do you have a visitor policy written into the rental contract that limits the time visitors may stay with tenants? Y=1 N=0		
Do you have a visitor policy written into the rental contract that states that tenants are responsible for visitor's behavior? Y=1 N=0		
Would you evict a tenant who repeatedly allows <u>visitors</u> to stopover that commit crime on the property or disturb other tenants? Always=1 Usually=.5 Never/rarely=0		
Do you have a policy for dealing with trespassers? Y=1 N=0		

Variable	Code	Comments
Have you attended a Crime Free Multi-Housing, or similar, landlord training class in the past 3 years? Y=1 N=0		
<i>Problem Management Philosophy (3 questions):</i> If a tenant complained to you about a loud stereo in an apartment that you know to be a continual problem, <u>which would you more likely do?</u> Advise them to call the police (0), call the police yourself (.5), or contact the problem tenants and advise them to lower the stereo (1). (total #)		
If a teenager, unknown to you, is sitting alone on the common grass area in your complex during a school day, <u>which would you more likely do?</u> Ignore him since he is not causing any problems (0), watch to see what he does (.5), or contact him and ask his business for being there (1). (total #)		
If a string of vehicle break-ins has been occurring in your complex, <u>which would you more likely do?</u> Ensure that tenants are reporting them to the police (0), check your lighting and other security related equipment (.5), call a meeting or send a flier to tenants warning them of the problem and advising them to report all suspicious characters (1). (total #)		
Estimate the amount of responsibility (100% total) each of the following has for preventing crime in the complex. P =? M =? T =?	P = M = T =	

Variable	Code	Comments
Do unit sliding glass doors have extra security locks or hardware installed? Y=1 Tenants provided with them=.5 N=0		
Do ground-level windows have extra security locks or hardware installed? Y=1 Tenants provided with them=.5 N=0		