9-2015

Evolving Homeland and Civil Security Mission Space and Research a Cross-Disciplinary and Global Challenge

Alexander Siedschlag
The Pennsylvania State University, SIEDSCHA@erau.edu

9-2015

Evolving Homeland and Civil Security Mission Space and Research a Cross-Disciplinary and Global Challenge

Alexander Siedschlag

PROCEEDINGS

9th Annual Homeland Security and Defense Education Summit

Evolving Homeland Security to meet Future Threats/Hazards

September 25-26, 2015

Naval Postgraduate School
Center for Homeland Defense and Security

In Partnership With
Department of Homeland Security
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Valencia College
International Society for Preparedness, Resilience and Security

Table of Contents

Evolving Homeland and Civil Security Mission Space and Research
A Cross-disciplinary and Global Challenge

Alexander Siedschlag, Ph.D
Distinguished Professor
The Pennsylvania State University

Executive Summary

Homeland security has evolved from a governmental function to a networked community with shared responsibility for addressing all-hazards challenges to globalized societies, moving from an 'Americanized' term to a generic concept. It aims at ensuring civil security – a broader effort not geographically, culturally, or functionally bound. The paradigm of civil security research provides an insightful framework for research and teaching in homeland security as part of a global and holistic effort, calling for a cross-disciplinary perspective.

Homeland Security as a Functional Policy

Homeland security today represents a functional policy area found in different countries, although its institutional setup in the U.S. is still singular.[1] However, U.S. homeland security has increasingly focused on broader functional aspects of the mission space. Definitions have evolved:

- from homeland security as "a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur;"[2]
- over additionally addressing the "full range of potential catastrophic events, including man-made and natural disasters;"[3]
- to homeland security as the "intersection of evolving threats and hazards with traditional governmental and civic responsibilities for civil defense, emergency response, law enforcement, customs, border patrol, and immigration."[4]

An "enterprise" beyond a governmental function exerted through DHS,[5] homeland security, its enduring core missions, and risk-informed priorities involve international, transnational, and

[1] Cf. Morag, N. (2011). *Comparative Homeland Security: Global Lessons*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
[2] The President of the United States, Homeland Security Council (2002). *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C.: The White House, viii. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/nat-strat-hls-2002.pdf
[3] The President of the United States, Homeland Security Council (2007). *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C.: The White House, 3. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf
[4] U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2010). Quadrennial Homeland Security Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland. Washington, D.C., 12. Retrieved from https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2010-qhsr-report.pdf
[5] U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2010), 8.

potentially global reach and interdependency in addition to their national (meaning nation-wide as opposed to nation-only) and whole community scope. Examples include the counterterrorism continuum, the cyber dimension, the emphasis on working with international partners, and the emphasis on homeland security governance, coordinating the risk managing efforts of a "networked community."[6]

U.S. Homeland Security as Part of a Pluralistic Security Community

A security community is a socially constructed, "cognitive" region, characterized by "shared identities, values, and meanings,"[7] whose borders do not typically coincide with traditional geographical borders.[8] DHS terminology suggests that the "homeland security community" can be regarded as a security community, as it is "flexible, adaptable, and efficient in addressing diverse challenges if it acts as an integrated, mutually supporting network."[9] Security communities also promote "security and risk reduction approaches that are responsive to the needs of our partners."[10]

From a security community perspective, nations need to work together to realize homeland security as a common good, geared to repelling threat to each nation's and security community's commonly acquired values.[11] U.S. homeland security being an enterprise, society is an active partner in the creation and delivery of security as a common good, not just a recipient of that good. Societal security efforts to safeguard commonly acquired values should itself be guided by those values, and not acquire a potential to infringe upon them. Those aspects are part of a challenge that relates to ethical, legal, and social implications, known as ELSI. It warrants critical thinking rooted in cross-disciplinary and global perspectives.

The Civil Security Perspective

Nowadays, homeland security has evolved into a generic concept.[12] It is best understood as a pluralistic endeavor rooted in civil security research, that is, a multidisciplinary and international enterprise of study contributing to a scientific basis for homeland security efforts, drawing from across disciplines.[13] This includes using the wealth of resilience supporting knowledge acquired by national security, civil defense, internal security and disaster research during decades prior to 9/11.[14] Civil security reflects that in our globalized societies, security risks and crises are *global*,

---

[6] Cf. U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2014). *The 2014 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*. Washington, D.C., 14. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2014-qhsr-final-508.pdf

[7] Adler, E., & Barnet, M. (1998). *Security Communities.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[8] Bellamy, A. J. (2004). *Security Communities and Their Neighbours: Regional Fortresses or Global Integrators?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[9] U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2014), 31.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Drawing from Arnold Wolfers' classic definition of national security, see Wolfers, A. (1952). "National security" as an ambiguous symbol. *Political Science Quarterly 67,* 481-502.

[12] Cf. Amass, S. F. et al., eds. (2006). *The Science of Homeland Security*. West Lafayette, ID: Purdue University Press; Bourne, M. (2014). *Understanding Security*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; Voeller, J. G. ed. (2010). *Wiley Handbook of Science and Technology for Homeland Security*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

[13] Cf. Gill, M. ed. (2014). *The Handbook of Security* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; Siedschlag, A., ed. (2015). *Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Homeland and Civil Security: a Research-Based Introduction*. New York: Peter Lang; Smith, C. L., & Brooks, D. J. (2013). *Security Science: The Theory and Practice of Security.* New York: Elsevier.

[14] Dory, A. J. (2003). *Civil Security: Americans and the Challenge of Homeland Security.* Washington, D.C.: Center

spilling over their place of origin and acquiring the potential for global impact, such as in the cyber dimension but also in supply chain, transportation, and other sectors.

In homeland security higher education, it is essential to represent different concepts, intellectual styles, and methodological choices, including a broadening of perspective "from home to abroad."[15] Programs must reflect that "the homeland security mission is…a global one, and a homeland security approach that ends at a nation's borders is not a homeland security approach at all."[16]

Teaching to the Challenge

The test for homeland security higher education programs is to co-evolve with the real-world mission space without reinforcing or legitimizing securitization at the expense of analytical rigor and critical thinking. [17] We must educate continuing and emerging leaders to be thoughtful masters, not willing servants, of the mission space of tomorrow. We do not know which specific disciplinary perspectives tomorrow's homeland security requires. What we do know is that it will require the ability and willingness to think and act, as well as to teach and learn, across professions, disciplines, and nations, and around the world.

Using the example of Penn State's Intercollege Master of Professional Studies in Homeland Security (*i*MPS-HLS) program,[18] the following table illustrates major dimensions of the educational/pedagogical value added to homeland security higher education programs by a cross-disciplinary global perspective, informed by civil security research.

TABLE 1. Online Pedagogical Effectiveness Added Value of Teaching Homeland Security in Cross-disciplinary and Global Perspective[19]

Dimension	**Concept**	**Effectiveness Indicator**	**Course Implementation**
Philosophy	Instructivist vs. Constructivist	Constructivist and learner centered approaches	Assignments that support transformative understanding of the subject matter across jurisdictions, countries, and cultures
Learning Theory	Behavioral vs.	Thoughtful matches	Scenario foresight

for Strategic and International Studies.

[15] Newsome, B. O., & Jarmon, J. A. (2015). *A Practical Introduction to Homeland Security and Emergency Management: From Home to Abroad.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage (CQ Press).

[16] Morag, N. (2011), 362.

[17] Balzacq, T., ed. (2011). *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve.* London and New York: Routledge.

[18] Penn State World Campus: Online homeland security graduate programs. http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/hls

[19] The table is based on selected parts of the "Online pedagogical effectiveness framework," see Kidd, T. (2009). *Online Education and Adult Learning: New Frontiers for Teaching Practices.* Hershey, PA and New York, NY: Information Science Reference, 25.

	Cognitive	between materials, learning styles, and learning contexts	studies and table top exercises requiring reconciliation of different information, leadership styles, professional mindsets, as well as operational codes and contexts
Cultural Sensitivity	Insensitive vs. Respectful	Learning experiences that encourage synthesis and analysis; opportunities for deep learning	Assignments are focused on working with international partners, across cultures; case and scenario repositories for use across courses
Task Orientation	Academic vs. Authentic		
Source Motivation	Extrinsic vs. Intrinsic	Engagement in online materials	Online policy sources and real-world tools for analysis from other countries then the U.S. are used, for example as developed in security research grants projects
Structural Flexibility	Fixed vs. Open	High quality materials design; range of navigational choices; open jaws to allow for limited course change/adaptation without instructional design effort or course revision procedures required	International case study repositories; slots for dynamic learning 'nuggets,' such as videos, and/or live online sessions with international experts; International Track available as an emphasis

The *i*MPS-HLS program, sponsored by six colleges, by its very nature fosters a cross-disciplinary perspective, and the available options per definition have a global perspective: biosecurity, geospatial intelligence, information security and forensics, and public health preparedness. A common core curriculum where all students in the program work together across the boundaries of academic specializations supports students in developing interoperability of minds and reflective interaction capacity as members of an evolving international community of scholar-practitioners.

The Socio-Behavioral Response of Survivors to Campus Active Shooting Events

Mark Landahl
Sgt., Ph.D., CEM®
Frederick Community College
Frederick County Sheriff's Office

Executive Summary

This presentation reviews a study of survivor behavior during campus active shooting events that employs a qualitative inductive design using grounded theory methodology within a multiple case study strategy. The findings across the cases of the Louisiana Technical College and Case Western Reserve University shootings develop an Active Shooter Behavioral Response Model that traces the actions of survivors. The findings show an absence of panic behavior, but evidence of information seeking behavior, and division of labor and helping behavior among survivors.

Introduction

American college campuses have repeatedly shown their vulnerability to active shooter events. In the U.S., 21 million students attend more than 4,500 degree-granting institutions that employ nearly 3.7 million faculty and staff.[1] Research suggests that active shooter events are increasing in both frequency and lethality.[2] The focus of this study is on the actions of victims and survivors in the seconds and minutes following the commencement of a campus attack. It examines the immediate aftermath and resultant actions, interactions, and behaviors in sociological terms. The goal of this research is to catalog behaviors in order to inform policy development upon empirical findings of human behavior in actual active shooting events. The following research questions guide the study:

1. What are the processes involved in collectively defining the socio-behavioral response to ASEs?
2. How do social interactions and social organization emerge among survivors in a campus ASE?
3. What type of protective behaviors do survivors of campus ASE exhibit?
4. How do decisions for protective behavior arise among survivors in ASE?

Methods

The study has a qualitative inductive design that uses grounded theory methodology[3] within a multiple case study strategy.[4] The research uses secondary data available under freedom of information laws in the respective states. The cases include the shooting incidents at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, OH and Louisiana Technical College in Baton Rouge,

[1] Snyder, T. D., and Dillow, S. A. (2012). *Digest of education statistics 2011* (NCES 2012-001). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
[2] See several sources including: Blair, J. & Schweit, K. (2014). *A study of active shooter incidents in the United States between 2000 and 2013*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
[3] Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine: Publishing.
[4] Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Fifth Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

LA. Data sources include police reports, 9-1-1 call recordings, written witness statements, recordings of interviews by detectives, police radio recordings, court documents, media reports, and site visits by the researcher. The researcher used NVivo 10 software to assist in data analysis.

Research Questions and Propositions from the Literature

A unified body of knowledge on active shooter events does not exist.[5] As a result, the study uses findings from a wide body of disaster research on other event types as a proxy. These events include fires, terrorist bombings, explosions, maritime disasters, and crowd disasters. Many of these studies of disaster use the Emergent Norms Theory (ENT) as a theoretical basis to examine human behavior.[6] The core set of five studies of the same event, the Beverly Hills Supper Club Fire, use similar methods and data to this study to examine human behavior during the fire.[7] Analysis of the findings of these and the nine other event based studies develop several propositions from the literature related to the research questions. Generally, these studies show consistent behaviors among victims and survivors that are contrary to popular myths of human behavior in disaster.[8]

Findings

The results of the analysis confirm the propositions from the literature and show that human behavior in response to active shooter events is generally consistent with that of other disaster event types. The study advances four core findings:

- **Finding 1.** The survivor response to campus active shooter events is social rather than asocial and includes helping behavior between survivors consistent with research findings in other disaster event types.

- **Finding 2**. Survivors of active shooter events will process environmental cues, social cues, and engage in social interaction to define the situation, gather information and implement and reassess protective behavior choices within a framework that maintains and extends social and organizational roles.

- **Finding 3.** Survivors gather additional information and process environmental cues, social observations, and social interactions to determine protective action behaviors that include taking cover on the floor, running to evacuate, running to shelter, hiding, using available resources to barricade themselves, locking doors, turning off lights, and barricading doors.

- **Finding 4**. Survivors show group level interaction for confirmation of environmental cues and processing of additional incident cues that lead to implementation and reassessment of protective actions many times with a division of tasks amongst the group (Emergent Social Structure).

---

[5] Muschert, G. (2007). Research in school shootings. *Sociology Compass*, 1: 60-80.
[6] Turner, R. & Killian, L. (1987). *Collective Behavior*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
[7] Five studies examine the event including the classic work: Johnson, N. (1988). Fire in a crowded theater: A descriptive investigation of the emergence of panic. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disaster*, 6, 7-26.
[8] See Tierney, K. (2003). Disaster beliefs and institutional interests: Recycling the disaster myths in the aftermath of 9-11. *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy*, 11, 33-51.

The modeled data from the two cases also fits into the ENT theoretical orientation. This provides further support to ENT as the theoretical basis for understanding behavior in disaster events with consideration for ecological factors.