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Abstract

Within police departments there is particular concern about the relationship between leadership and the positive organizational outcomes of the police department, a relationship complicated by outside factors such as the cooperation of the community and political leaders (Campbell & Kodz, 2011). These same concerns exist within the police departments of colleges and universities where the crime rate has steadily increased over the last twenty-five years (Griffith, Hueston, Wilson, Moyers, & Hart, 2004). The purpose and aim of this quantitative survey study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey: one college that had employed an unarmed security force and one college that had employed an armed police force. The findings from this study indicated that there were significant relationships between whether the campus police force was unarmed or armed and feelings of safety from theft and violence, safety on campus, effectiveness of campus police, effectiveness of the college escort service, the effectiveness of the residence assistant. With the findings from this study, campus administrators and policy makers will be better able to determine the merits of implementing an armed police force.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Leadership is challenging and, depending on the method and execution, can be either effective or unproductive (Campbell & Kodz, 2011). This is particularly true for police officers charged with preserving order and guaranteeing the safety of the population. Within police departments there is particular concern about the relationship between leadership and the positive organizational outcomes of the police department, a relationship complicated by outside factors as the cooperation of the community and political leaders (Campbell & Kodz, 2011). These same concerns exist within the police departments of colleges and universities where the crime rate has steadily increased over the last twenty-five years (Griffith et al., 2004). Crime incidents that once where only found in large cities have now entered into college campuses (Bromley, 2003). Higher educational institutions, once were marked as suburbs should not be thought of as an asylum from criminal activity (Bromley, 2003). Actually, Wolf, Pressler, and Winton (2009) stated that most campus police organization at public institutions did not have Tasers for their officers, because of public opinions about the weapons (Wolf, Mesloh, & Henych, 2008).

The interaction between officers and the student body is important but often non-existent because of lack of contact between parties. Johnson and Bromley (1999) surveyed the student body at the University of Florida, where enrollment exceeded 30,000 students. Nine percent of respondents conveyed that they were victims of crime, but only 55% of those victims reported the incidents to the campus police department (Johnson & Bromley, 1999). In addition, nearly 25% of students participated in a
campus police deterrence program; 64% of those students were not familiar with a police officer on their campus (Johnson & Bromley, 1999). Although over 40 states have granted campus police officers some type of police authority at public universities, narcotics, gang activity, and person-to-person crimes have continued to increase over the past decade (Wolf, 1998). With crime on college and university campuses increasing, it is significant that campus police officers obtain a more proactive approach to policing, beginning with their leadership on campus (Wolf, 2001).

This study examined the relationship between student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. The aim of this research was to have a better understanding of the effects of student perceptions of campus safety. The study surveyed two different schools, one with an unarmed security department and the second school with an armed police department. This research revealed areas in which professional development and changes in policy could improve the current state of campus safety in U.S. colleges and universities. Further, the study will provide insight into campus police leadership at both higher education institutions to help explain why some students are satisfied with the campus police and others are not. Once the surveys were completed at both higher education institutions, a detailed report was presented to the police leaders at each of the private colleges that participated in the study. This study is important because it will guide higher education institutions to improve campus safety to ensure that standards of perceptions of safety are upheld on northern New Jersey campuses. It is imperative for the campus community to provide input when dealing with the satisfaction of campus safety because students are the central stakeholders in colleges and universities (Griffith et al., 2004). However, many colleges cannot conduct in-depth
research because they do not have the budget or research capabilities needed to adequately measure campus police leadership satisfaction (Griffith et al., 2004).

Kingsbury (2007) found that crime, once isolated to large cities and off college and university campuses, is now common on college and university campuses. Nichols (1995) found that college campuses with student enrollment in excess of 30,000 experience criminal activity similar to that of small cities throughout the United States. A 2004-2005 study by the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that 74% of colleges and universities with approximately 2,500 students use police officers that are sworn to enforce all the laws within their jurisdiction (Reaves, 2008). The same researchers found that fewer than 42% of private college campuses had a sworn police officer, and even fewer had armed patrol officers on campus (Reaves, 2008).

Regardless of the size of the institution or the type of campus police force, contact with campus police officers is likely to take place at some point during the student’s college career (Gaudreault & Riggs, 2010). The relationship between the student and the campus police department is an important factor in ensuring the safety of the student body (Gaudreault & Riggs, 2010). Student perception of campus police officers and the campus police department is largely determined by whether students classify their experiences with campus police officers as positive or negative (Gaudreault & Riggs, 2010). If students have a poor experience with campus police officers and, therefore, may have a negative perception of the campus police department, then students are less likely to communicate with campus police officers about criminal activity (Johnson & Bromley, 1999). To gain a better understanding of student satisfaction with campus
safety, it is necessary to explore external variables that influence student perceptions of campus safety (Gaudreault & Riggs, 2010).

Although administrators and policymakers have responded to the proliferation of crime on college and university campuses with legislation, policy, and adding sworn officers, there is a lack of research on the relationship between student perceptions of campus police departments. Further, there needs to be research on leadership characteristics of campus police officers. The lack of research gives an opportunity to conduct the research which could then yield findings that might lead to policy change at the two private colleges in northern New Jersey.

Statement of the Problem

Only in the past forty years have college campuses exhibited campus police departments, which resemble a traditional law enforcement agency (Hopkins & Neff, 2014). Most college campuses in the United States have either a sworn police department or a security department (Chow, 2012). The security departments that are on the college campus are limited in police powers (Chow, 2012). This is important when the higher education institution have contracted a private security company to ensure the safety of the students (Chow, 2012). While some of the private security may be armed they do not gain the same respect from the student community as a sworn police officer demonstrates (Chow, 2012). Even though a small number of private security companies can detain an individual during a crime, they still need to wait until a sworn police officer arrives on the scene to process the suspect (Chow, 2012). As the crime on campus has been in the media for the past decade, a higher education institution cannot establish a
sworn police department with full arrest authority by their own merit, it must be granted through the state in which the campus is located (Hopkins & Neff, 2014).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative survey study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. Once the survey was completed, a detailed report was presented to the two higher education campus police/security leaders. The purpose of presenting the surveys in a detailed report was to provide campus police/security leaders better insight on the perceptions of safety on the campus environment. The schools are different because one school will have a security guard department providing security and the second school will have a New Jersey certified police department providing security. In order to measure student perceptions of campus security, this study utilized a Santucci and Gable (1998) survey instrument. Within the Santucci and Gable (1998) Campus Safety Survey instrument, a fear of crime and overall safety measures within each campus environment will be investigated. The analysis of the survey yielded a detailed description of student satisfaction with campus police leadership. Findings from the study could help campus police departments, administrators, and policymakers make better-informed decisions about the development of leadership characteristics in campus police officers. A better understanding of the relationship between student perceptions of the campus safety could help add to the safety programs on college and university campuses, as well as leadership training for campus police officers.
Research Question and Hypotheses

To examine the relationship student perception of campus safety, correlation and descriptive analysis were used. A survey instrument was utilized to gather data from the participants. This data was then analyzed to test the study hypotheses which will be further discussed in Chapter 3 and to answer the research question.

RQ. What can college administrative leaders learn from student perceptions of campus safety?

H1a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to feel more secure from theft and violence.

H2a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive residence halls as safer.

H3a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the campus as safer.

H4a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to believe that the police contribute to the safety of the campus.

H5a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the university escort service as convenient and accessible.

H6a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the presence of an RA as contributing to the safety of the residence hall.

Significance of the Study

There were 3,771 reported sexual assaults on college campuses across the United States in 2011, which is the most recent documentation of sexual assault reports on college campuses from Education Department (Lauerman, 2013). This represents an
almost 14% increase from the figure of reported sexual assaults in 2010 and a 30% increase from the figure of reported sexual assaults in 2009 (Lauerman, 2013). With criminal activity on college and university campuses increasing, the risk of harm to students, as well as the risk of civil litigation against the colleges and universities, is a significant social cost to the American higher education system (Wolf, 2001). Flanagan (2014) estimated that 15% of all fraternity liability claims are from sexual assault cases involving one of the members. To place this percentage in context, Flanagan (2014) estimated that hazing accounted for a 7% of the liability insurance claims made against fraternities (Flanagan, 2014). A current survey by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention found that 20% of all adult women have been a victim of a rape within their life time (Norman & Dazio, 2014). Hate crimes are occurring in a widespread manner throughout the United States; on campuses students are using slurs to offend other students (Wessler & Moss, 2001). From 1995 to 2002, a seventeen-year period, there was nearly 479,000 victims of crimes in the college setting within the United States (Carr, 2005). There were 92,695 crimes in 2010 that were reported to campus police departments: Nearly 97% of these crimes were property crimes, and only 3% were violent crimes (Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010). With the rise of campus crimes, a better understanding of the student’s perceptions of campus safety could aid campus police leaders to further understand safety measures to help deter the increasing crime rate on U.S. college and university campuses.

**Aim of the Study**

The aim of this study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey: one college that had employed an unarmed
police force and one college that had employed an armed police force. With the findings from this study, school administrators and policy makers will be better able to determine the merits of implementing an armed police force.

**Methodology Overview**

This study utilized a quantitative correlational survey research design to discover the relationship between student’s perceptions of the campus safety at two private New Jersey higher education institution campuses. The sample was composed of a cross-section of students attending two private colleges in northern New Jersey. To answer the research question and test the hypotheses, this study employed Pearson correlations and Pearson chi squares to analyze responses from the students about their perceptions of the campus police officers currently policing their campuses. Obtaining an enhanced understanding of student’s perceptions of the campus safety may influence positive change in the professional development of campus police leadership within colleges and universities. Also, with the knowledge that would be gained within the survey instrument result, recommendations in the higher education institution policies could improve safety in the two college settings.

**Definition of Relevant Terms**

The following definitions are used in this study:

*Campus police leadership:* Any member of the police administration who can make substantial changes in the policing model at a public or private college or university. For the purpose of the study, campus police leadership and campus law enforcement leadership will be used interchangeably.
Campus police officer: An individual who has graduated from a New Jersey Police Training Commission academy. The training is the same training municipal police officers in the state of New Jersey receive, which includes arrest and handgun qualifications (Rutgers University, 2010).

Campus security officer: An individual whose main job responsibility is to provide security on a college or university campus. This individual is not a member of a police department and does not have law enforcement authority (Randolph College, 2014).

College Administrator: An individual who works full-time at a college or university and can make significant changes to procedures within the campus environment.

“Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act” (Clery, 2014, p.1): The federal law once acknowledged as the Campus Security Act, which mandates all higher education facilities in the United States to reveal any and all information about crimes that have taken place on campus and near the campus (Clery 2014).

“New Jersey Police Training Commission” (State of New Jersey, n.d., p.1): The Police Training Committee is commonly considered to be the leading agency in New Jersey to train and educate law enforcement personnel (State of New Jersey, n.d.). Under the authority of New Jersey the Police Training Commission develops the education and the certification of most of law enforcement positions within New Jersey (State of New Jersey, n.d.). The Police Training Commission regularly has several instructor development courses for current police officers (State of New Jersey, n.d.).
Perceptions: Defined as responsiveness, emotion, or sense of an individual on a definite question relating to a setting (Muscat, 2007).

Private university or college: A university or college that is funded through private investments. These schools are usually smaller than public universities (Peterson’s, 2014). Most private colleges and or universities that have a religious affiliation; whereas public universities do not (Peterson’s, 2014). For the purpose of the study, private university and private college will be used interchangeably.

Public university: A university funded mainly by the state taxpayers. The size of the public university varies from school to school (Grove, n.d.). Public universities often have lower tuition for in-state students than private colleges (Grove, n.d.).

Students: People who are enrolled in a college or university either full or part time (Student, n.d.).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

It was assumed that the research instruments used in the study were valid, reliable instruments that measured the phenomena of interest. It was also assumed that the students responded honestly on the survey without ulterior motives, agendas, or biases. This study employed a correlation and descriptive statistic design, utilizing a convenience sample to test the hypotheses. Because of financial constraints and time constraints, a cross-sectional design was used instead of a longitudinal design. A longitudinal design would have required more time and resources than available for completion of the doctoral dissertation; therefore, the scope of the study was limited to measurement at a single point in time. The correlation and descriptive statistic design was selected for similar reasons. Participants in the study were students from two private colleges in
northern New Jersey. The limitations of the study include the nature of the sample, the instruments used, and the timeframe for completion. Participants in the study were limited to currently enrolled college students at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. Therefore, the results of the analysis will not be generalizable to college campuses in the rest of New Jersey or the United States. The demographics of the colleges surveyed may vary and may not be representative of the demographics of students in other colleges. The transient nature of the college population also means that participating students may have been attending the college anywhere between one day and four years at the time of the survey. They may not have been enrolled long enough to have developed an opinion of the campus police department. In addition, this transient nature means that the findings may not be applicable to populations at the same colleges in future years. The Santucci and Gable (1998) instrument will be used to maintain a clear and concise manner for the students to respond to the survey. This was deemed necessary to gather the minimum number of participants needed to complete the analysis. The shorter instrument will limit the amount of information that can be gathered and analyzed for the study.

**Summary**

The study examined student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. The overall goal of the study was to allow the leadership at the higher education’s facility to increase a superior understanding of campus security from the climate of the students. The campus police leaders were provided a detailed description of the survey results to help add in the overall security on the campus environment. The objective of the literature review is to provide a base of knowledge on
the major theories and concepts that are important to understanding the research problem of this study. Many members of the community are unaware that there are numerous restrictions put in place on the campus police departments. With the rise in campus crimes and terrorist attacks, it is not a surprise that all members of the student body, faculty, and staff demand a high level of security on the campus setting. Many of the student body only have experience with their municipal police department and are unaware of the reason for a lack of security on a campus environment.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

An immense amount of the existing research on campus policing has focused on student’s perceptions of campus police as it relates to violence at the elementary and high school levels (Scalora, Simons, & VanSlyke, 2010), creating a need to evaluate the connection of student’s perceptions of campus safety in a college environment between an armed police force and a security department. The objective of the literature review is to provide a context for the study by outlining the major theories and concepts that are important to understanding the research question.

Organization of the Chapter

This chapter discusses relevant studies, articles, websites, and books that this researcher reviewed. These studies and documents provide information that will be helpful in examining the research problem and conducting the study. In a process of comparing and contrasting, this researcher will explore previous research on campus police leadership to determine what can still be learned about the research problem.

The literature review will include a history of policing and campus policing to provide the context for the research problem. By presenting the history of campus policing in a chronological manner, readers will understand how campus policing began and what its role is in universities and colleges in the United States (Sloan & Fisher, 2014). Currently, there are minimal studies that focus on the campus police leadership on a New Jersey college campus. In this chapter, this researcher will discuss how the research questions were developed based on what is known about campus policing, what is not known about campus policing, what is missing from the studies about campus policing, and what should be studied in campus policing, specifically in New Jersey.
Documentation

The search for relevant information about the nature of campus policing, as well as the importance of campus policing in colleges and universities, was established through a vast selection of document sources. This researcher examined various journal databases, online libraries, peer-reviewed journals, books and brick-and-mortar libraries to gather information for the analysis of the existing studies on campus policing and the significance to campus and university life for overall safety. This was done to provide a clear picture of what has been studied about the topic and what can still be learned about the topic. The research was also the most efficient way to filter out studies that did not provide relevant information to this study.

In order to gather as much information as possible, this researcher used specific keywords that are significant to the study. Most of the studies included in the review were published from 2009 to the present. There are some studies included that are not current but were deemed significant, especially in the discussion of the history of policing and campus policing.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative survey study will be to examine student’s perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. Once the survey will be completed a detailed report will be presented to the two higher education campus police/security leaders. The purpose of presenting the surveys in a detailed report is to provide campus police/security leaders a better insight on the perceptions of safety on the campus environment. The schools are different because one school will have a New Jersey certified police department providing security, while the second
school has a security guard department providing security. In order to measure student perceptions of campus security, this study will utilize a Santucci and Gable (1998) survey instrument. Within Santucci and Gable (1998) Campus Safety Survey instrument, a fear of crime and overall safety measures within each campus environment will be investigated. The analysis of the survey will yield a detailed description of student satisfaction with campus police leadership. Findings from the study could help campus police departments, administrators, and policymakers make better-informed decisions about the development of leadership characteristics in campus police officers. A better understanding of the relationship between student perceptions of the campus safety could help add to the safety programs on college and university campuses, as well as leadership training for campus police officers.

**Aim of the Study**

The aim of this study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey: one college that had employed an armed police force and one college that had employed an unarmed police force. With the findings from this study, school administrators and policy makers will be better able to determine the merits of implementing an armed police force.

**Background of the Study**

The first documented presence of law enforcement officers on a college campus was in 1894 when the Yale University employed two active New Haven police officers to guard the university grounds (Yale University, 2015). At present, campus police organizations are focused on safety, protection, and law enforcement at college and university settings in the United States (Yale University, 2015). Throughout the history
of campus police, the role of campus policing changed, at first campus security would conduct campus watch and patrol functions (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). Currently campus police officers needed to be trained to provide services such as law enforcement and crime prevention (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). The growing needs of modern colleges and universities have placed additional demands on campus police organizations (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). These demands of the students and the rise in crime on campuses have required a paradigm shift from the early role of campus police officers, one wherein campus watch and patrol was the only responsibility (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). The demands are that student body wants to have safety measure in place in all areas of the campus, without factoring in budgetary concerns (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). However, the current role of campus police officers requires extensive training to meet the demands of their jobs, which include law enforcement and crime prevention (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012).

Campus police agencies share the same organizational and operational features as law enforcement agencies; campus police agencies also face unique challenges within the campus setting (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Some of the unique challenges are a large student body, numerous entrances into the campus, and minimal check points for security screening (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Due to the expansion, as well as increased expertise, of their role on university and college campuses, the future of campus police agencies will involve further revisions to provide for the needs of each university and college campus to provide overall safety (Wada, Patten & Candela, 2010).
History of Policing

Since the origins of campus policing can be found in traditional policing (Sloan, 1992 as cited in Archbold, 2013), it is appropriate to research the history of traditional policing in the United States to better appreciate how campus policing might transform in the future (Archbold, 2013). As was the case with campus policing, traditional policing began with a community watch group and transformed into formal police agencies that integrate progressive technology and problem-solving techniques into their daily law enforcement procedures (Wada et al., 2010). This section will provide a summary of the history of the traditional American policing system, including the effect of the English system on the American policing system, early enforcement efforts, and variations in the police system over time. The first policing system of the United States was adapted pre-17th century from the English policing structure that integrated the watch, the constables, and the sheriffs into a single community-based organization (Stevens, 2011). According to Kelling and Moore, (1988) there are three policing eras in the United States, which they describe as Political, Reform and Community.

Political Era

The political era was named because of secure alliance with the political parties within their community and the influence the political parties had within law enforcement (Hooper, 2014). The political era of policing only lasted commencing in the 1840s to the 1900s (Hooper, 2014). Throughout the political era, the police departments were associated with the political and social aspects of the communities they patrolled (Peak, 2012). The police officers recruited individuals within the same ethnic group and political group to become police officers in their community (Peak, 2012). Police
officers had close relationships with the community, political figures and the community members controlled the police departments (Peak, 2012). In this era of policing, foot patrol was the most utilized form of policing (Peak, 2012). It was believed that foot patrol a good manner of policing because the officers could deal with issues each time one arose (Peak, 2012). Foot patrol had a huge contribution from the citizens and the police management within the organization (Peak, 2012). Kelling and Moore (1988) stated that during this time period, the police department had an improper organizational control of law enforcement as a result of political parties and decentralization organization, which cause shortcomings within the police organization.

This system made police officers susceptible to bribery and coercion in exchange for their selective implementation of the law (Peak, 2012). There was limited supervision of police officers and no accountability to the citizens of the community (Peak, 2012). The Lexow Commission of 1894 was one of the first groups who investigated police corruption (Archbold, 2013). During this time, the commission concluded that police officers were not protectors of the public (Archbold, 2013).

**Reform Policing Era**

The reform era started in 1930s due to a number of problems within the political era and had declined during the 1970s (Hooper, 2014). During the reform era, the close relationship between the policing system and the political organizations was perceived as a problem by the community (Peak, 2012). As such, reformers lobbied for a policing system that operated independently of the political organizations (Peak, 2012). The reformers sought to eradicate the power of political organizations in the policing system, to hire police leaders worthy of their positions, and to increase the requirements of
employment as a police officer (Peak, 2012). With the change amongst the reformers, police agencies became more centralized and bureaucratic (Peak, 2012), and attempts were made to have a standardized police patrol function along with a more downward flow of communication between the officers and upper management (Peak, 2012).

The police officer during the reform era became a professional in the eyes of the community, and the managerial effectiveness of police leaders became increasingly important (Peak, 2012). Peak and Glensor (2004) stated that police professionalism is defined by managerial efficiency, whereas as administrators focus is to have a detailed grasp of the lower ranking members of the department. During the reform era, there was limited input by the community members of the crime control services in their community (Hooper, 2014). However, police departments adopted a top-down approach during this era, in the form of a hierarchical management style, which allowed to improve officer accountability and even changing what it protocol is to be a police officer (Fisher-Stewart, 2007).

However, as investigative techniques and technologies advanced for law enforcement, so did the criminal’s ability to evade the police (Fisher-Stewart, 2007). At the end of the reform era, police departments found that their relationship with the community was important and sought to improve the relationship to combat crime in the community (Fisher-Stewart, 2007). Two landmark cases in the Supreme Court led to the many changes in the community: Katz v. United States and Miranda v. Arizona (Fisher-Stewart, 2007). Due to the new laws that were enacted from the two previous stated landmark cases, the Community Policing Era began in the 1970s (Fisher-Stewart, 2007).
However, Community Policing was not adopted by police agencies until the mid-1980s (Fisher-Stewart, 2007).

**Community Policing Era**

Community policing was put into practice throughout the United States to deter and reduce crime in the community and to advance the relationship among the police and the community (Maguire & Wells 2009). Community policing reformers attempted to transform policing in a manner that allowed police departments and the organizational structures to adapt to the demands of the community, believing that by altering their administrative policies, police officers could be more flexible and respond to calls in a more sufficient manner (Maguire & Wells 2009). Building on a belief of trust between the community members and law enforcement in the community policing era, police officers were better able to address the desires of the community and maintain open communication with community members, using intelligence gathered from community members to prevent and stop illegal activities in the community (Chapman & Schneider, n.d.). In addition, community members collaborated with police departments to identify and prevent racial profiling in their neighborhoods (McDevitt, Farrell, & Wolf, 2008). Police officers constantly undergo training to prepare to meet the different needs of the citizens and face the challenges of the different problems and situations. Therefore, campus police officers should mimic their counterparts on the municipal police level.

**History of Campus Policing**

In 1884, Yale University started a campus police department, which is the oldest in the United States (Yale University, 2015). It began when two New Haven police officers volunteered to be exclusively appointed to the Yale University Campus (Yale
During that time, there was a strained relationship between Yale University and the community (Yale University, 2015). It stated that Yale students in the medical field were exhuming recently deceased bodies from cemeteries to use for medical purposes (Yale University, 2015). After the community started to understand the importance of safety for the Yale students, the university examined the role of the police department more seriously (Yale University, 2015).

Modern campus police agencies are a result of decades of evolving to meet the altering needs of colleges and universities and their students. During the first decades of the 20th century, crime within a college and university setting was uncommon, and there was no reason for colleges and universities to employ campus police officers (Wada et al., 2010). During this time, watchmen fulfilled the role of campus police officers, patrolling only at nights and on weekends and considered to be part of the upkeep department of the campus, protecting campus buildings and property (Wada et al., 2010). The responsibilities of the watchmen expanded in the 1930s and 1940s to include the enforcement of the college and university rules and the monitoring of students for code of behavior violations (Wolf et al., 2009). It wasn’t until the 1950s that administrators on college and university campuses realized a need for better-trained, more professional watchmen (Wolf et al., 2009).

During the 1950s, administrators at colleges and universities saw an influx of World War II veterans on campus (Greene, 2007). By the staggering numbers of veterans returning from war, it forced the higher management to focus on a more formal campus law enforcement department in order to provide safety (Greene, 2007). It was during this age that official security departments and police departments began to appear
on university and college campuses (Mayhew, Caldwell, & Goldman, 2011). The campus watchmen were separated from campus maintenance, and campus administrators who were either former police officers or current officers from local law enforcement agencies were hired by colleges and universities to lead campus security departments and campus police departments (Mayhew et al., 2011). Familiar with the traditional police organizational model, these campus administrators implemented a similar system in the campus police departments (Mayhew et al., 2011).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the protest by the students led to the need of increased security in higher education institutions in the United States in order to gain control of the community (Sloan, 1992). The tumultuous 1960s and 1970s also served as a reason to bring a clearer perspective on the responsibilities for campus police officers in a college environment to provide safety (Sloan, 1992). Under pressure to maintain order in the changing higher education climate, college and university presidents allocated additional resources to campus policing to ensure that the campus police departments were staffed to address influx of crime (Peak, 2008). In some states, colleges and universities sought to grant full police power to campus police systems, and as the state governments agreed to the requests, a formal campus policing system was established (Mayhew et al., 2011).

During the 1980s, there was an increased development in the students who were enrolled within the university setting, which may be linked to the rise in campus crimes within the past twenty-five years (Griffith et al., 2004). Further during this era there were social groups that pressured legislators to hold campus leaders liable for any crimes that occurred on their campuses (as cited in Woolnough, 2009). As the desire for legislation developed to hold colleges liable, campus police agencies sought to promote
professionalization of campus police officers (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). To achieve that, the minimum qualifications of campus police officers were increased; campus police officers were required to undergo formal training, and a majority of the campus police agencies developed specialized units within the agencies (e.g., a theft unit or a rape unit) (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). Some campus police agencies adopted not only the tactical methods of traditional law enforcement agencies but also their operational methods dealing with the hiring practice for police officers (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012). As campus police agencies became more adept at policing, many were recognized nationally as performing at the top of their field, further increasing their positions on the college and university campuses (Randazzo & Cameron, 2012).

Although most college campus police departments have existed for almost half a century, their capabilities and resources are still incomparable to local municipal police departments (Powell, 1981, as cited in Peak, 2008). Griffith et al. (2004) discussed the massive development of college campus security as a response to the increasing number of incidents of crime within colleges and universities in the past twenty-five years (as cited in Woolnough, 2009). During the 1980s and 1990s there were social movements towards holding college and university administrators liable for crimes committed in campus (Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007).

By the 1990s, campus law enforcement agencies started to shift their strategies from being reactive to being preventive (Hopkins & Neff, 2014). Following this shift, campus police officers evolved to employees who were qualified to protect and serve the community (Hopkins & Neff, 2014). Additionally, campus police became a larger entity...
from being part of the maintenance unit to being a detached department within the college or university campus (Hopkins & Neff, 2014).

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Police and Campus Crime Statistics Act mandated all higher education intuitions to inform the student body of security issues related to the crimes committed on the campus (Gross & Fine, 1990). This became a federal law in 1990 and has gone through a number of changes to protect the students of higher education institutions by providing more information to the students (Gross & Fine, 1990). Most of the changes that occurred allow the students to know what crimes had taken place and where the crimes occurred on the campus (Groos & Fine, 1990).

The Jeanne Ann Clery law was inspired by a Leigh University freshman who was killed five days after returning from spring break in April 1986 (Gross & Fine, 1990). Jeanne Ann Clery was “raped, sodomized, beaten, bitten, strangled with a metal coil and mutilated with a broken bottle during the attack” (Gross & Fine, 1990, p. 1). The parents of Jeanne Ann Clery lobbied for federal and state officials to require colleges and universities to make public the criminal activity and statistics on campuses in the United States (Gross & Fine, 1990). The bill was formerly documented “as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990” (Gross & Fine, 1990, p.1). In 1988, Pennsylvania Governor Casey signed a bill instructing that every state college and university distribute crime statistics for at least the last three years (Gross & Fine, 1990).

Furthermore, the law mandates that every colleges and universities in the United States have a clear policy on the consequences of drug and alcohol use on college campuses (Gross & Fine, 1990). According the U.S. Department of Education (2010),
from 1997-2009 there were 335 homicides on a college campus in the United States. Further in 2011, the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report stated that there were 2,696 violent crimes events and 87,160 property crime offenses within the area of U.S. college campuses in school year of 2011 (Rodgers & Lubin, 2012).

**Fear of Crime on a College Campus in the United States**

Campus law enforcement is different from traditional law enforcement in a variety of ways, especially within their job functions. Specifically, the main focus of campus law enforcement is that it protects the colleges and universities within their jurisdiction (Dempsey & Forst, 2011). Often not studied is the fear of crime on a higher education institution which varies from traditional law enforcement (Burruss, Schafer, & Giblin, 2010). However, the matter of fear of crime on a college campus is imperative in this study because it is one of the reasons campus policing exists in the college or university.

One of the most frequent forecasters of fear of crime is gender (Truman, 2005). Often, females fear crimes more often their male counterparts (Truman, 2005). Ferraro (1995) established and tested the “shadow of sexual assault hypothesis” in which he claimed that women encompass a terror of sexual assaults, in turn guides women to have a superior heighten thought of fear of crime in general then men (as cited in Scott, 2003, p.204). Keane (1995) stated there were two types of “women’s fear: a concrete fear and formless fear” (as citied in Scott, 2003, p.204). Keane (1995) stated that concrete fear is the fear that women associate with a specific crime (as cited in Scott, 2003). It is the belief that some criminal activities instill more fear than other type of criminal activity on an individual (Scott, 2003).
Many women are uncertain about the precise definition of sexual assault and whether specific occurrences should be reported to law enforcement (Sloan & Fisher, 2014). Additionally, many women blame themselves for the assault they experienced and often refuse to identify their attackers (Sloan & Fisher, 2014). Copeland and Wolfe (1995) stated fewer than 5% of females in college would report any type of sexual assault to a police officer (as cited in Ratti, 2010). School administrators should seek ways to encourage sexual assault victims to report occurrences of abuse or assault to campus security to not only to apprehend perpetrators but also to help campus security officials to better address the problem on the campus setting. Bohmer and Parrot (1993) discussed in detail why sexual assaults on campuses are not reported. They stated most victims believe that the sexual assault was their fault because of the use of illegal drugs or alcohol or because they went out with the perpetrator voluntarily (Bohmer & Parrot, 1993).

Furthermore, the victims of sexual assault also worry if they tell police about the incident the police officers may place guilt on them (Ratti, 2010). Lee and Croninger (1996) stated that there is dissimilarity among the student being safe on a campus and feeling safe on a campus. Numerous researchers believe that fear of crime exists as a larger social dilemma than crime alone (Crowl, 2013). Throughout the past ten years, there have been a great deal of campus shootings, which is the reason that campus safety needs to take a more police-type model and train officers with the ability to handle a wide range of investigations on the college campus (Wolf et al., 2008).

**Sexual Victimization on a College Campus**

Sexual victimization is a significant issue among college students (Thompson, Koss, Kingree, Goree, & Rice, 2011). Sexual victimization is three times higher for
females attending a university than they are for members of the community in the United States (Thompson et al., 2011). A study of nearly 6,000 students enrolled in 32 higher educational institutions stated that they 27% of the women that had responded, 12% had encounter an attempted rape, and 15% had an experienced a completed sexual assault within their lifetime (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Further, national samples stated that nearly 20% to 25% of college men reported that they were a part of a type of sexually manipulated behavior in the college setting (Koss et al., 1987).

A concern for many parents, researchers have stated that nearly 33% of all students who attend college at some point find themselves a victim of crime on a college campus (Fisher, Sloan, & Wilkins, 1995). Green (1999) stated parents have shown concerns for students on college campuses, both for their safety and the effects of illicit drugs on the campus. Hesel (1997) stated that safety on campus was as important to the universities as in their academic reputations.

In response to the increase in crimes on campuses, the community has placed a major emphasis on campus police officers. Data from the National Crime Victimization Survey during a ten-year span from 1995 to 2005 showed that over 4 million college students became a victim of a violent crime (Hart & Colavita, 2011). A formal campus police department has a unique responsibility to provide law enforcement and to adapt to private security standards across the campus (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). The area and physical security necessities of a higher education intuition unswervingly impacts the police organization (Woolnough, 2009). An open campus of a higher education institution in an urban environment where the general population has access to the neighborhood community such as streets or roads, presents a security challenges and
safety issues for campus policing (Woolnough, 2009). Further, the challenges of an urban area are much more difficult than a gated campus in a rural environment (Woolnough, 2009).

According to responses to the National Crime Victimization Survey, 75% of the women who partaken in the survey who stated a sexual assault were less than 25 years of age at the moment of their sexual assault (Hart & Colavita, 2011). Further, the study stated that more than 25% of the reported sexual assaults were among 18- to 24-year-olds (Hart & Colavita, 2011). In 2009, the preponderance of campus police agencies in the United States did not contain certain tools within their police agencies, i.e., SWAT teams, counter surveillance, to help protect student safety, because of public opinion would deem those tools as a negative attribute (Wolf et al., 2009).

**Juvenile Perceptions of Police Officers**

As many juveniles will enter into the college setting during their freshman year, it is imperative to discuss the perceptions they may have on police officers and campus police officers to gain an enhanced understanding of students’ perceptions. The majority of police encounters with juveniles are usually for minor offense, stemming from routine police functions to control order in community (Yolander, Hurst, & Browning, 2000). Juvenile males viewed police officers in a more negative manner than juvenile females (Yolander et al., 2000). Juveniles believed that police are the reason why the condition of their community is getting worst instead of better, relating to crime (Yolander et al., 2000). Minorities and juveniles inhabit in urban areas have an additional negative perception of the police officers than do Caucasiens residing in less densely populated communities (Yolander et al., 2000). Characteristically, male juveniles tend to have a
more negatively attitude to police officers than females juveniles (Yolander et al., 2000). Studies understanding juvenile perceptions of police officers have stated that the participation in delinquent behaviors is straightforwardly associated with an unenthusiastic attitude regarding the police (Yolander et al., 2000). However, the reason juveniles boast a negative attitude or perception against police officers are results of the police officers restrictions on juvenile’s behaviors that are unpopular by the young people (Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, & Winfree, 2001).

Public Perceptions of Police Officers

If police officers are to provide the community efficiently, a positive working affiliation ought to exist between both parties (Worrall, 1999). Studies have showed that the community is undecided and at times divided in overall satisfaction with police; there are numerous independent variables that are taken into account in understanding the satisfaction levels (Worrall, 1999). Some members of the community may feel that safety is a primary function of the police department, whereas another community member may feel that order maintenance is a primary function (Worrall, 1999). Other community members may stress the significance of maintaining a helpful and equal law enforcement system (Worrall, 1999).

The Montana Highway Patrol and Montana State University studied how law enforcement personal throughout the United States are observed by the community it serves (Tooley, Linkenbach, Lande, & Lande, 2009). The study utilized a survey instrument, and throughout the study it became clear that the issue of trust in police officers should be further studied in order gain a better understanding of community perceptions (Tooley et al., 2009).
In the New York area, following the Diallo shooting, citizens became extremely upset with the police department (Weitzer, 2002). In California after the Rodney King abuse event caused the resignation of Chief Daryl Gates of the Los Angeles Police Department, due to the actions of his police officers (Weitzer, 2002). While these incidents are not a norm, police officers and administrators should be worried about how the public view their actions in an effort to help save their careers (Brown & Benedict, 2002).

Student Perceptions of Campus Police Officers

In a study of 20 colleges, Chekwa, Thomas, and Jones (2013) found that the college students were concerned with their safety as they walked around campus and recommended that college institutions create a safe and secure environment. Hummer, Austin, and Bumphus (1998) conducted a study wherein they examined the students, faculty, administrators, and other employees’ perceptions of campus police carrying firearms at the State University of New York, Fredonia. During that study, they had 38 percent of the people surveyed against arming campus police officers; 36 percent of the people surveyed were for arming the campus police officers; and 26 percent were undecided (Hummer et al., 1998). The study showed that the student body is becoming more willing for police officers to patrol the campus setting instead of security guards (Hummer et al., 1998).

Ratti (2010) examined the University of Mary Washington students’ perceptions of campus safety and found that most students did not utilize the campus security services offered on campus including an emergency lighting system, emergency phone service, and even self-protection classes to help protect students in violent situations. When the
participants responded they stated that majority of the student body was neutral towards the lighting on the campus grounds (Ratti, 2010). The study also stated the presence of police officers had the smallest percentage (just over 40%) stating that the students were satisfied or extremely satisfied (Ratti, 2010). Contrary to the findings of Ratti (2010), a study conducted by Burruss et al. (2010) with more than 5,000 students enrolled at six Illinois colleges, revealed that students in general were pleased with police performance and the excellence of the public safety within their college campuses.

Turner (1998) examined students in their freshman and sophomores years at the East Central University during the spring semester of 1998. Turner (1998) examined the connection among students’ perceptions of crime on campus and the students’ participation of campus affairs to see if there was a relation to the crime rates. Turner (1998) stated that student perceptions of crime considerably influence students’ extracurricular activities within the campus setting. The study also stated that nighttime activities were found to be the most meaningfully impression by the fear of crime within the student population (Turner, 1998). Further, students’ perceptions of crime had a large impact on plays, concerts, outside events and evening hours (Turner, 1998).

**Negligence and Liability of Campus Policing**

In 2007, in possibly the most horrible crime to occur on a college campus, Seung-Hui Cho of Virginia Tech killed over 32 students and injuring 17 students on the campus setting (Adrienne, 2009). The next year, a student at a Northern Illinois University murdered six people in a hall on the campus (Adrienne, 2009). Both of these incidents required higher education leadership to understand how to handle the procedures when their campus is being a target of a shooting (Adrienne, 2009). Because both of the
incidents occurred on a college setting, campus police departments and campus security departments began to reevaluate the protocols too ensure safety to the students (Adrienne, 2009).

In 2007, after a number of meetings and discussions, previous “Cabinet Secretaries Michael Leavitt and Margaret Spellings, and the Attorney General Alberto Gonzales”, presented detailed reports on the problems of the Virginia Tech tragedy to the President of the United States (Drysdale et al., 2010, p.1). The report stated, with the collaboration of three important federal government agencies, the U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Justice, they would all be used to research the increased violence in higher education (Drysdale et al., 2010). Further, the three agencies will communicate any threat assessments to any higher education’s facility that would voluntary be interested in the methodology of crimes on campus (Drysdale et al., 2010).

Parents of deceased students that were victims of crimes on campuses have sought legal actions against the higher education institutions, stating that the higher education institution could have done more to protect their children’s campus setting (Adrienne, 2009). The state of Virginia and many other stakeholders, including parents, students, university supporters, and taxpayers in the state of Virginia, had to pay a total of $48.2 million dollars (Green & Cooper, 2012). Of that amount, the stakeholders distributed the money to numerous parties involved in the shooting, either deceased, injured or other related items due to the shooting (Green & Cooper, 2012). Further the State of Virginia had to fund money for the prevention of campus shooting on the Virginia Tech campus setting (Green & Cooper, 2012). Of the $48 million, over $2 million was used for safety
and security of the campus (Green & Cooper, 2012). Virginia Tech hired 11 more full-
time campus police department employees bringing the total number of full time campus
police officers to 53 employees (Green & Cooper, 2012). The five-year cost analysis for
all of the employee’s salary was just under $3 million (Green & Cooper, 2012). Also, the
university has a joint dispatch office that costs almost half a million dollars – part of a
joint venture with other local police agencies in the area (Green & Cooper, 2012).
Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Justice provided Virginia Tech a $2.65 million
contribution to help the sufferers of the gunfire and provide additional aid for the
recovery (Green & Cooper, 2012). In the early part of 2012, a court in Montgomery
County, Virginia, made a decision that Virginia Tech University was negligent for the
shootings that occurred on the campus and granted $4 million to two different families
that were victims of the shooting incident (Green & Cooper, 2012). The judgment in the
Cho case proves that there is a legal obligation to the higher education institutions to
provide a safe campus environment.

**Importance of Training Police Officers in a Leadership Position**

An organization should be held accountable for training its employees to the best
of its ability in areas that relate directly to the employees’ positions. Stewart and Brown
(2011) discussed the proactive needs assessment wherein the organization seeks relevant
strategies about training and to understand that each employee may have different skills,
knowledge, and attitudes. Baldwin and Ford (1988) provided a definition of “positive
transfer of training as the degree to which trainees effectively apply the knowledge, skills
and attitudes gained in a training context to the job” (p. 63). Initial training needs to be
implemented within an organization; however, due to financial constraints, additional training may not be permitted.

Mosel (1957) stated, “Trainees must not only be motivated to learn, they must also be motivated to use their learning” (p. 57). Training is useful for employees as it allows the organization to have the most qualified personnel. An effective and operational employee-training program is needed for the long-term success of a business, especially within the law enforcement communities (Baldwin & Ford, 1988).

Police organizations need to take a slow and deliberate approach to understand that campus crimes change depending on the crime within society. Within the series of changes on the campus setting, campus leadership must adapt a thought process to ensure safety to the students. Technology is changing how law enforcement operations it has allowed the administrators to manage and deploy resources in a timely manner to ensure safety to the community (Roberts, 2012). Technology has allowed law enforcement to monitor crime trends accurately and intervene objectively with a great deal of success (Roberts, 2012). If a campus police organization does not transform and become accustomed to the technologies that are available, then they will not be doing a service to the community it serves (Roberts, 2012).

Organizational change may be essential to uphold a competitive edge or become accustomed to changing economic conditions, such as a recession; however, the change is not always a smooth process (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). If an organization that has primarily been reluctant to change adapts the concept of change, it may be difficult for some employees to adapt quickly to the new concepts of the organization (Marsee, 2002). This is in part due to the employee’s resistance to change within the organization.
(Marsee, 2002). The needs of community members and the fast growth within technological advancements, along with the changing arrangement of law enforcement organizations, demands that the agencies progresses (Peak, 2012).

Changes within society cause law enforcement personnel to become more stressful of protecting the community (Peak, 2012). Since September 11, 2001, law enforcement and technology has been used as a tool to serve the community (Peak, 2012). Most community members would concur that law enforcement has changed and adapted to events that have unfolded in the past, forcing intelligence operations to be reevaluated (Peak, 2012). Security is not the same as it was prior to September 11, 2001, within the metamorphosis, there needs to be a strong leadership at all levels of law enforcement. Security is critical in the campus environment, the entrance and residence areas face enormous obstacle to the campus security (Peak, 2012). Technology such as closed circuit television is now improved and extremely detailed which allows the campus environment to become a safer environment for the students as well as the employees (Green, 1999).

**Challenges Faced by Campus Police Officers**

Scalora et al. (2010) stated that campus police departments face numerous challenges as the college and university grounds because they are vulnerable to threats. One distinct challenge involves federal crime coverage needs. Because of the Clery Act, campus police/security departments are mandated to report crime figures to the Federal Bureau of Investigation every year (Clery, 2014). The campus police agency has to report campus crime statistics in order to allow the parents, students, prospective students, and the community to understand the overall safety of the campus. If the
campus police agency does not comply with this policy, it could face sanctions and reductions in government aid to the college or university (Clery, 2014). As such, campus police agencies are responsible for thorough and comprehensive recordkeeping, as well as the systematic dissemination of information about campus crime (Clery, 2014).

An additional distinctive challenge for campus police officers is the temporary status of the school campus. Unlike traditional law enforcement agencies, campus police agencies are responsible for policing a population that changes frequently, with students enrolling and graduating every year. Lastly, even though there have been efforts to professionalize campus police agencies by increasing the educational and training requirements of campus police officers, as well as rebranding campus police agencies as modern law enforcement agencies, many individuals still perceive campus police officers as security guards (Scalora et al., 2010). This perception likely stems from the early role of campus police officers as watchmen and employees of campus maintenance departments (Scalora et al., 2010).

**Residence Hall Safety**

As in the general population within the community, Bromley (2005) stated that there were three types of violence that existed on a college campus homicide case; “domestic, intimate, and workplace violence” (Drysdale et al., 2010, p. 4). The U.S Secret Service and the U.S Board of Education conducted a survey of campus violence from 2005-2008 (Drysdale et al., 2010). During that survey there was 174 homicides, 13,842 sex by force crimes, and 21,675 aggravated assault cases that have occurred in the campus residences (Drysdale et al., 2010). Handguns were utilized in half of all the
murders this is the same rate as the general community in the rate of murders with a handgun (Drysdale et al., 2010).

Many resident directors and campus housing directors may not report incidents that are handled internally by residence staff (Asagba, 1992). Alcohol has been attributed to half of the assaults dealing with campus relationships, and alcohol is a factor in majority of all campus violence (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985). Campus closeness is a theory that is a characteristic of social closeness that connects to individual in an environment (Lee, Keough, & Sexton, 2002). Carr (2007) stated that in 41% of violent crimes and 79% of sexual assaults of college students, the offender was thought to be utilizing an illegal substance during the commission of the crime. Sellers and Bromley (1996) stated that 32% of college students reported violence in a dating setting, 21% of violence in the occurred with a current partner in a relationship.

In 2014, Ohio State University police issued alerts following three different sex crimes against women on or near the campus in early 2014 (Mallett, 2014). Despite the alerts that are put out by Ohio State University, some students are stating that the students themselves need to take a position in preventing sexual violence on campus (Mallett, 2014). The most recent crime report stated there were 25 rape cases at Ohio State in 2013, compared to 21 in 2012 and 28 in 2011 (Mallett, 2014). The U.S. Justice Department estimated that there are less than 5% of actually completed rapes of college women that are every documented to police departments whereas the general population is nearly 40% of all sexual assaults are informed to the police departments in the United States (Mallett, 2014). The Campus Dating Violence Fact Street stated that nearly 21% of all violence occurred by a current partners (Sellers & Bromley, 1996). Also 51% of
college males stated that they had one or more sexual assault events during their time at a college setting (Berkowitz, 1992).

**Campus Policing and Traditional Law Enforcement in a Modern Age**

Campus security and safety are at the forefront of campus issues as acts of violence continue to occur daily across colleges and universities in the country (Thompson, Price, Mrdjenovich, & Khubchandani, 2009). Security and safety issues include gun control, mental health services available to students, dissemination of information about students with potential risk of committing crime, and active and preventive safety procedures (Thompson et al., 2009). The task of addressing these issues lies largely on the shoulders of college administrators and campus law enforcement officers (Thompson et al., 2009). In recent years, these entities have often been criticized for having insufficient and inadequate proactive measures for preventing criminal acts within campuses (Thompson et al., 2009).

Scholars state that the inadequacy of campus security stems from the widely held perception that administrators and law enforcement have a greater interest in maintaining their institution’s reputation than protecting their constituents; hence, criminal acts are often addressed by institutional disciplinary committees and without police involvement (Thompson et al., 2009; Wilson, & Wilson, 2011). However, such criticism often results from people assuming that campus law enforcement has the same role and is held to the same standards as traditional municipal law enforcement, which is incorrect (Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

Campus law enforcement agencies provide many services that are similar to those provided by the police: they conduct community-oriented policing, escort students and
teachers when needed, and have direct interactions with the people they serve (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). The main difference between campus police officers and government law enforcement is that campus police adhere to both law enforcement standards and private security standards, which is a difficult task because security standards have additional restrictions on search and seizure (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Campus law enforcement further serves a wide range of constituents and assumes various roles and responsibilities within the campus setting (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). These roles include being officers of peace, security guards for buildings and grounds, policy enforcers, and public relations officers (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). In cases of criminal activity within the university or college campus, campus police officers act as first responders and as investigators (Thompson et al., 2011). Such activity varies widely from disturbances (e.g., noise caused by parties and organization events) to domestic disputes (e.g., disputes between dormitory roommates or fights in progress in communal areas), suspicious or unidentified persons and vehicles seen within the campus, stolen vehicles and other property, and reports of substance abuse and sexual assaults (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). However, as campus law enforcement officers are often unarmed, firearm-related violence on campus is delegated to the police, and campus law enforcement are mandated to await response from armed law enforcement (Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

Hart and Colavita (2011) conducted a survey of 160 college students in Nevada to determine the effects of students’ willingness to report crime committed within their campus. Collective efficacy, within the social disorganization framework, has two areas (Hart & Colavita, 2011). First, is the social control measures where is the probability that bystanders or neighbors can be relied on to take action in various scenarios (Hart &
Colavita, 2011). The second area is the social cohesion whereas it is measured by degrees of trust, willingness to help, and share values within a community (Hart & Colavita, 2011). Consequences of the study showed that perceived social control had a significant result on, if and when a student will report a crime to the campus police department (Hart & Colavita, 2011). This implied a growing sense of apathy among students in colleges and universities, as the respondents showed a lack of interest to get involved or intervene in cases of crime committed on the campus, except in incidents perceived to be very severe (Hart & Colavita, 2011). The authors suggested that for campus police to address this apathy, they must be aware of both reported and unreported crime, and use this knowledge to design and implement policies with which students can be expected to comply in future cases of crime (Hart & Colavita, 2011).

As society moves towards the 21st Century of policing, handling security breaches and the treat of terrorist, campus policing must also adapt to the changing climate of the culture. For example in, Central Florida and Hinds Community College received weapons launchers to be providing to their campus police departments (Bauman, 2014). The two higher education institutions received their launchers from the Department of Defense (Bauman, 2014). There are over 124 colleges and universities in the United States that have received equipment from the 1033 federal program (Bauman, 2014). The program provides law enforcement personnel access to obtain military equipment from men’s pants to 23 assault rifles at Central Florida University (Bauman, 2014). The 124 colleges demonstrated to the students that the higher education institutions are attempting to provide additional security by combating any treat to the campus environment (Bauman, 2014).
Organizational Structure of Campus Police Agencies

Campus law enforcement agencies are different from mainstream law enforcement agencies (i.e., local, state, or federal agencies) in several aspects such as the way the police officers are trained within their methods of ensuring safety and security, their constituents, and their organizational structures (Wada et al., 2010). Due to these differences, it is often difficult to compare the statistics and characteristics of law enforcement agencies in postsecondary academic institutions (Drysdale et al., 2010). The first large-scale study of law enforcement services in campuses was executed via the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1995 and was repeated in the 2004-2005 academic year (Reaves, 2008). Referred to as the Survey of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, this survey by the Bureau of Justice Statistics presents information and statistics about “campus law enforcement agency personnel, pay and expenditures, operations, equipment, computers and information systems, policies, and special programs” (Reaves, 2008, p.11). The Bureau of Justice Statistics gathered data from law enforcement organizations in four-year universities and colleges with the minimum number of 2,500 enrollees and two-year colleges with at least 10,000 students (Reaves, 2008).

According to the Survey of Campus Law Enforcement 2004-05, 74% of the 750 campus law enforcement agencies in four-year higher education institutions employed sworn law enforcement officers (i.e., officers who have the authority to make arrests as granted by their respective state or local governments; Reaves, 2008). Notably, approximately every public institution surveyed (93%) used sworn officers, and only 42% of surveyed private institutions used sworn officers (Reaves, 2008). Regarding the
Two differences, the use of sworn officers versus non-sworn officers, and the use of armed patrol versus the use of non-armed patrol led to further differences among campus police officers (Reaves, 2008). As sworn and non-sworn officers are trained by various institutions and are subject to different standards, their methods in addressing criminal situations and investigating after-the-fact are also different (Reaves, 2008). Additionally, campus law enforcement agencies with sworn officers reported to perform tasks similar to those performed by mainstream law enforcement, such as conducting background checks for criminal records and references and investigating past employment of both teaching and non-teaching personnel, especially those applying for sworn positions (Reaves, 2008). Campus law enforcement agencies also varied in their emergency protocols (Reaves, 2008). While 90% of surveyed agencies had a written emergency preparedness plan, only 58% participated in emergency preparedness training (Reaves, 2008). In terms of the size of campus law enforcement agencies, differences were observed between private and public institutions, between small and large institutions, and among campuses of different land sizes of crimes on the campus (Reaves, 2008).

The survey also revealed certain similarities among the various campus law enforcement agencies (Reaves, 2008). These include the commission of 24-hour patrol, the use of a three-digit emergency number, and the availability of blue light phones (Reaves, 2008). Additionally, campus law enforcement officers performed varied functions that were similar across institutions, which included providing security for
special functions and events, dispatching calls, traffic enforcement, investigating property
crime, locking and securing buildings and facilities, and investigating violent crimes
(Reaves, 2008). In terms of pay, sworn officers were shown to have incurred salary
increases between the first survey in 1994-95 and the second survey in 2004-05 (Reaves,
2008). Consequently, 28% of all campus police agencies surveyed reported to require
their officers to possess a college degree (Reaves, 2008). The college degree requirement
was important to campus law enforcement to allow the employees to increase their
knowledge of the educational system and bring a sense of professionalism to the
department (Reaves, 2008).

**Campus Police Officers Responsibility**

As college and university campuses and adjacent areas are perceived to be
vulnerable to criminal behavior, campus police agencies have the responsibility to take
measures to prevent crime and ensure safety and security for all students, teachers,
administrators, and personnel (Scalora et al., 2010). However, as campus police officers
are bound by different rules, trained by different institutions, and have various
responsibilities to the institution and their constituents, all campus police officer deal
with the same goal, to maintenance of peace and safety within their jurisdictions
(Hopkins & Neff, 2014).

One commonly cited challenge faced by campus police is related to
inconsistencies regarding jurisdictional limits and power within jurisdictions (Hopkins &
Neff, 2014). Because campus police officers answer to college or university officials and
not to government agency officials, their actions are bound by both rules of law
enforcement and rules set forth by their parent institutions, which can become conflicting
and confusing for campus policemen (Wada et al., 2010; Wilson & Wilson, 2011). For example, in some higher education institutions when a student reports a crime to a campus police officer, the police officer would then forward the report to a pre-selected school officer (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Further the campus police officer would have to strictly obey the school officer’s resolution on the matter, regardless of whether this adheres to common law or not (Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

Another recent issue in campus law enforcement is the legality of the powers held by campus police officers in religious or sectarian colleges and universities (Lipka, 2010). While a campus police officer may arrest an offender just like any mainstream police officer, community members have questioned whether campus police officers in religiously affiliated educational institutions were violating the separation of church and state (Lipka, 2010). This is currently a contested issue in the state of North Carolina where 16 religious colleges employ sworn or commissioned police officers (Lipka, 2010). While North Carolina’s Campus Police Act, enacted in 2005, allows the state attorney general to give authority to campus law enforcement agencies in private not-for-profit higher education institutions, the state court of appeals found the law unconstitutional (Lipka, 2010). Thus, at present, the legality of campus police in religious colleges is still a matter to be decided in court (Lipka, 2010).

**Comparing Campus Crime in New Jersey College Settings**

In New Jersey, the Campus Security Task Force was established to examine the emergency plans of the 59 colleges and universities all of which are mandated to report any and all crimes that occur on or near a college campus (State of New Jersey, 2007).
All of the 59 colleges and universities are also mandated to prepare a campus emergency plan that is annually assessed and evaluated (Sabattis, 2012).

Following the Clery Act, campus security officers must report all campus crimes to local law enforcement agencies (Nobles, Fox, Khey, & Lizotte, 2013). However, compelling student victims and witnesses to come forward to report crimes often proves to be difficult (Hart & Colavita, 2011). Because a significant level of crime goes unreported to campus security, statistics on campus crimes are an understatement of actual crime rates within a specific jurisdiction (Hughes, Elliott, & Myers, 2014).

“The New Jersey Institute of Technology publishes an annual campus security report and annual fire safety report”, in accordance with the Clery Act, that details crimes and fire-related incidents that occurred on the campus within a specific year (Sabattis, pg.1, 2012). In 2009, there were 13 reported cases of robbery on the campus, three reported cases of burglary, and eight reported cases of motor vehicle theft (Sabattis, 2012). In both 2010 and 2011, the highest reported crime was motor vehicle theft, but other variety of crime as robbery, burglary, and aggravated assault were also reported (Sabattis, 2012).

At New Jersey City University, the top two crimes reported by students to campus law enforcement officers were forcible sexual assault and aggravated assault (College Factual, 2014). In 2011, there were five reported cases of sexual offence and four reported cases of aggravated assault (College Factual, 2014). Robbery, on the other hand, was reported only twice in 2011 (College Factual, 2014). Lastly, there was one reported case of a liquor law violation and two cases of drug law violation (College Factual, 2014).
In 2014, at Rutgers University, campus police expand the area in which campus police provide security notices because they overhauled their security system in order to better protect the study body (Heyboer, 2014). This was in part because Rutgers University did not send out security alerts after a former Rutgers student was killed near the campus (Heyboer, 2014). From 2009 to 2011, 29 hate crimes were committed on the Rutgers campus (Heyboer, 2014).

In 2014 at William Paterson University and Ramapo College, according to police reports, two alleged serious crimes took place (Di Ionno, 2014). According to reports, at Ramapo College a female student was intoxicated and could not resist rape by two men at a frat party (Di Ionno, 2014). At William Paterson University, reports stated that a female was held against her will in a campus dorm room and forced to have intercourse with five men in the dwelling (Di Ionno, 2014).

**Significance of Perceptions of Students on Campus Safety**

Colleges and universities upper managers are dealt with an apparently difficult duty to offer a safe and secure college setting for all associates of the campus population and still preserving an optimistic and unobstructed college environment (Cooper, 1997). The input by the media demonstrates that college’s student’s perception of safety is an important aspect to examine when choosing a college within their seniors years (Bosworth, Ford, & Hernandez, 2011). Perceptions of the occurrence of crime on a college campus environment and the anxiety for student safety have intensified since the 1980s (Wilcox et al., 2007). Gauging campus police reports for discipline issues, and suspensions are a small facet in which campus leaders can understand campus safety (Bosworth et al., 2011). However, the felling of safety is much more difficult in defining
if a school is safe just by the means if there is a lack of violence that is disregard within the intricate authenticity of student and faculty understanding (Bosworth et al., 2011). A more significant measure of safety within a school or college environment is the perceptions of safety amongst the campus setting including students, faculty and staff (Bosworth et al., 2011). Thus understanding the perceptions allows the school community to understand the perceptions encapsulate the emotion and familiarity of the whole higher education environment (Resnick et al., 1997). Nevertheless school safety research included that perceptions of school safety amongst the students boasted larger influences than the tangible incidents that are calculated through statistical measures (Godstein, Young, & Boyd, 2008). It is stated that students’ academic performance is hinder when the students’ view the school setting as a hazardous place (Godstein et al., 2008). Also when the students’ view the setting as treacherous, the student’s overall self-confidence, inspiration, obligation, and attendance are impeded (Godstein et al., 2008).

Ferraro (1995) stated that as perceptions of safety decrease, community member are likely keep away from circumstances where possible issues may happen and become more suspicious while taking part in normal everyday activities. Because of perceptions of students in colleges, who feel unsafe within their college setting; tend to attended less college functions, then students who felt safe on the campus setting (Bowen & Bowen, 1999).

According to Currie (1994), college administrations believed that both men and women can access such campus resources, such as the library or other student centers on campus, however, the study stated that women travel less to those spaces since they felt dangerous. In turn, if college students especially women are apprehensive of areas of
their college campus community, thus they cannot be involved in the campus setting activities (Currie, 1994). Libraries, parking lots and other open areas on a college setting were directly found to relate to a student’s belief of unsecure environment on the campus setting (Currie, 1994). Within the same survey, nearly two-thirds of women indicated that if they felt safe on campus, the women would use the campus setting more frequency especially during the night time hours (Currie, 1994).

After the Clery Act, many crimes go unreported to campus security or police because they report only victimization incidents (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, & Turner, 2002). The Clery report does not include other groups that usually have an elevated incident rates, for instance larceny theft (Fisher et al., 2002). Within the boundaries that were set forth, some students may feel disheartened within the post-Clery era (Wilcox et al., 2007). Believing that this is the case, the fear of crime could be exclusive to college women, since fear is second-rate as contrasting to the risk factors within the college setting (Wilcox et al., 2007). Thus understanding a student’s fear or perceptions would be paramount to college law enforcement leadership to help provide a safe campus setting.

In current surveys, citizens acknowledged school safety as the greatest issue dealing with the U.S. schools (Rose, 2000). Within the same poll, students stated that they feel unsafe at school at times (Rose, 2000). Student perceptions of feeling unsafe on in a school setting have been associated with poor grades and attendance of students (Bowen & Bowen, 1999). A detailed search of recent literature revealed that there has been little research on the factors that predict student and parent perceptions of safety in a school setting. Student perceptions of campus setting are influential once it draws closer
to providing safety and security in the campus environment (Muscat, 2007). Perceptions can be measured, by the use of a number of questions that can measure the agreement or disagreement in a narrow statement that is asked (Muscat, 2007). The importance for campus law enforcement leaders to measure student’s perception of safety on the campus settings is that higher education’s facilities, know exactly if they are meeting the needs of the student body within their campus (Muscat, 2007).

Research has demonstrated that student perceptions affect their motivation and achievement in the college settings (Loukas, 2007). Additional, research shows that perceptions of school climate also have a direct effect on behavioral and emotional issues within students (Loukas, 2007). Some examples of behavioral problems are usually demonstrated by the students acting out in a manner that is in the manner or fighting or cheating on a test (Loukas, 2007). The opposite of behavioral problems which are likely to be displayed externally for the students, some other types of problems for students are emotional issues that are additionally intricate to identify (Loukas, 2007). If students have emotional issues they can also contain anxiety or worthlessness (Loukas, 2007).

**Importance of Campus Police Leadership in the United States**

Previous studies have explored how the evolution of the different styles of leadership affects organizations (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2009). Organizational leaders utilize several leadership theories which include situational leadership, charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, and path-goal leadership (Bass et al., 2009). Some campus law enforcement agencies incorporate policing concepts on a campus setting such as; give escort services to students, and community safety procedures (Griffith et al., 2004). As society becomes advanced and crimes become
more complex, law enforcement are tasked with ensuring safety throughout the area (Peak, 2012).

Most literature relates leadership and management; however, there is a vast difference between the two concepts (Kotterman, 2006). Kotterman (2006) discussed a difference between leadership and management and stated that management personnel would have supervisory responsibilities; meanwhile, leadership skills are the ability to get the job done within the organization. In this study, leadership in campus police is important because all the stakeholders (i.e., campus police, campus administrators, faculty, staff, students, and parents) have the shared vision of a safe and secure environment (Kotterman, 2006). Leaders should have a foundation of a common purpose with their counterparts, and persuade originality to allow growth to materialize (Deal & Peterson, 2010). Kouzes and Posner (2007) argued,

> When it comes to innovation, the leader’s major contributions are in the creation of a climate for experimentation, the recognition of good idea, the support of those ideas, and the willingness to challenge the systems to get new products, processes, services, and systems adopted (p. 19).

Campus police leaders should be aware that their leadership affects the image of the campus police throughout the university. If the campus police leaders demonstrate effective leadership towards achieving the shared vision of the campus, then the stakeholders, particularly the students, should be satisfied with the services.

Previous studies have explored how the evolutions of the different styles of leadership within an organization are beneficial (Bass et al., 2003). Thompson and Vecchio (2009) stated that there no single leadership style may be deemed best in all contexts; rather, effective and efficient leadership is task-relevant, context-based, relationship-oriented, and situational. Charismatic leadership is a form of leadership
wherein the leader is able to guide or influence his subordinates because of a perceived charismatic authority (i.e., an authority that is based solely on the belief in, and devotion to, the exemplary characteristics and perceived heroism of an individual, and on his statements, actions, and orders) (Bass et al., 2003).

Situational Leadership

Under the contingency theory, the most prevalent model of leadership is believed to be The Situational Leadership Model (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). In the 1960s to the early 1980s, Situational Leadership was deemed the most prevalent in a leadership position within an organization (Bryan, 2002). Studies have showed that leaders, who change their behavior to fit the need of the situations, including upper management, could be the most effective leadership (Campbell & Kotz, 2011).

In Situational Leadership, there are four leadership styles that allow various mixtures of traits for a leader to exhibit both directive and supportive behaviors (Blanchard, 2008). Directive behavior is described as the manner a leader engages in interaction with the subordinates in an attempt to spell out the role of the employees’ position, or provide positive support (Blanchard, 2008). Supportive behavior is the amount in which a leader engages in a two-way communication with the subordinates (Blanchard, 2008). Further, the supportive behavior will allow the leader to provide a place to listen and provide support to the employee (Blanchard, 2008). In the coaching method of leadership, the leader will provide direction however they will also listen to the employee’s suggestions (Blanchard, 2008). Nevertheless, in the coaching method, the leader still makes the final decision (Blanchard, 2008). Supporting the leader provides recognition and provides problem-solving solutions (Blanchard, 2008).
Delegating is when the leader commissions an employee to handle the task, since they have the knowledge to complete the task in a quick manner (Blanchard, 2008). While in situational leadership, a different style may be used for each employee based upon the employees’ different level of development in the organization; however, there is no one perfect fit for all situations (Blanchard, 2008).

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Weber (1947) described the original charismatic leadership theory as the manner in which a leader of an organization exhibits the special attribute of charisma and how the follower tends to appreciate such leadership (Weber, 1947). Weber’s (1947) thoughts have been refined in extensive research on charismatic leadership theory in recent years (Shamir, House, and Arthur, 1993). Charismatic leadership theory explains what leaders and followers anticipate from the two parties within the organization (Bell, 2013). Leaders tend to engage in exceptional traits and demonstrate expertise in the subject matter (Bell, 2013). Some areas where charismatic leaders succeed are in crisis situations because it is conducive for the emergence of such traits in order to be useful (Bell, 2013). Followers within the organization believe that remarkable behaviors are in part of the greater context that attributes the charismatic leaders (Bell, 2013).

Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership

The philosophy of transformational and transactional leadership was developed by Burns (1978). In transformational leadership, the leader motivates subordinates, or employees, to work towards goals set for the benefit of the larger group or institution, and inspires them to view the task from the perspective of the entire group (Odetunde, 2013). Following this course, intrinsic motivation of subordinates increases, and leader-
subordinate relationships are strengthened (Odetunde, 2013). On the other hand, transactional leadership is exemplified by motivating subordinates with the use of reward and praise (Odetunde, 2013). There are three forms of transactional leadership (Odetunde, 2013). The first is contingent rewards which refer to leaders’ explicit expression that rewards will be provided when results are achieved (Odetunde, 2013). Second is the passive management by exception, is when leaders intervene only when problems are encountered by their subordinates (Odetunde, 2013). Lastly, active management by omission refers to the vigorous observation of the work and tasks of subordinates in order to guarantee that outcomes are up to standards and goals are achieved on time for the organization (Odetunde, 2013).

**Path-Goal Leadership Theory**

Other modern theories on leadership include the path-goal leadership theory and the distributed leadership theory (Komives & Dugan, 2010). Path-goal theory is focuses on task- and person- oriented leadership behavior; focus is placed on how leaders influence and motivate their subordinates individually, not as a group (House & Dessler, 1974). This theory posits that leaders ought to make clear for subordinates the path to attaining organizational goals by reducing barriers within the organization, and allow for personal goals to be achieved (House & Dessler, 1974). Finally, in the distributed leadership theory, states that there is more than one leader, and that leadership tasks and actions are communal between employees and across the organization (Harris & Spillane, 2008). Thus, focus is placed on interactions, instead of on actions, between those in assigned and acquired leadership roles (Harris & Spillane, 2008).
Leadership Styles of Law Enforcement Officers

An immense amount of research has been accomplished to decide the result of each leadership style, and how certain people react to each style. It is imperative that the leadership skills of managers in the organization coincide with the subordinate’s personality traits. However, leadership as a construct is difficult to categorize and succinctly define (Osaghae, 2010). Subsequently, leadership skills are difficult to train consistently in individuals even with extensive training and experience (Osaghae, 2010). In the context of colleges and universities, perceptions of campus police legitimacy, leadership, and authority are important as these influence constituents’ propensity to follow rules, report crimes, and feel safe and secure within campus grounds (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Additionally, positive perceptions of campus police lead to continued support for campus police training, recruitment, financing, and various programs (Nobles et al., 2013; Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

In recent literature, researchers have examined the leadership styles of law enforcement officers, effective leadership within policing, and the traits and habits of both successful and unsuccessful leaders (Sarver & Miller, 2014; Schafer, 2013). In the study by Sarver and Miller (2014), police chief responses ranged across identified leadership styles, with transformational leaders, i.e. those that use intrinsic motivation to influence their subordinates as being rated as mainly effective. The same study stated that transformational leaders were perceived to be confident and unbiased (Sarver & Miller, 2014). Additionally, demographic variables such as age and gender had very little predictive power on leadership styles, while personality characteristics showed to be significant predictors of leadership style (Sarver & Miller, 2014).
In another survey of police supervisors, respondents indicated that effective leaders and ineffective leaders showed contrasting behaviors (Schafer, 2013). Specifically, effective leaders were perceived to maintain integrity, exhibit good work ethics, use appropriate and effective communication techniques, and show ample concern for subordinates (Schafer, 2013). Additionally, the respondents indicated that developing into an effective leader is a continuous process that requires training, education, field experience, and adequate feedback from both subordinates and superiors (Schafer, 2013). Lastly, the respondents indicated that known hindrances to effective leadership were often cultural, political, or structural (Schafer, 2013). However, these studies focused on mainstream, or traditional, law enforcement officers such as policemen, sheriffs, and federal agents and not campus policing (Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

Few studies have been conducted within the context of colleges and universities as campus security officers and policemen are often trained differently across institutions, unlike those in traditional or mainstream law enforcement agencies (Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). Additionally, studies on the perceived legitimacy and efficiency of campus police are often conducted from the professor’s and other school personnel and not always examined by the perceptions of the students (Jacobsen, 2015). Thus, there is a need to understand the leadership styles of campus law enforcement leaders, to gauge if the leaders will receive the student’s perceptions of safety survey in a serious manner and they would be willing to make changes within their higher education institution.

Numerous criminal cases in higher education institutions in recent years have brought to light the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of campus security measures and law enforcement protocols (Thompson et al., 2009). Specifically, campus law enforcement
and administrators have been criticized for insufficient and ineffective handling of criminal cases committed within their campuses (Thompson et al., 2009; Wilson & Wilson, 2011). One of the most popular examples of such cases is the Pennsylvania State University scandal wherein a longtime former football coach Jerry Sandusky was tried and convicted of sexually abusing underage boys for fifteen years (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). This specific criminal complaint had a number of issues: first, although investigations started in 1998 and the police had adequate evidence, the district attorney’s office declined to prosecute Sandusky; second, the athletic director and the senior vice president for business and finance were allegedly aware of Sandusky’s misconduct and concealed such knowledge; and third, the college president’s decision not to inform the full board of trustees about the investigations raised scrutiny over academic leaders’ responsibilities to their constituents and to the reputation of the school (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). With the circumstances that faced the Universities that were previously discussed it is extremely important to understand the students’ climate of the campus leadership within all Universities settings. This will allow the participants to address any concerns they may or may not have about the security and provide valuable input to campus leadership, which in turn might negate some of the terrible crimes that have occurred on campus settings.

**Summary**

In this chapter, a review of related studies and documents was obtainable in order to supply the context for the study and to be able to determine the gap, if there is a gap, in the literature. The history of policing was discussed because it is closely associated with the history of campus policing. Campus policing was also differentiated from traditional
law enforcement in order to determine the resemblance and dissimilarity between the two. Campus law enforcement gains the trust of the community by being part of non-law enforcement activities in the college setting.

In this study, campus police safety is important to leadership in campus administrator because of all the stakeholders (i.e., campus police, campus administrators, faculty, staff, students, and parents) that have the shared vision a safe and secure environment. It was revealed in the literature review that campus policing is an important part of campus life it has direct impact on the student population. There is a need to study campus policing in an aim to lessen the campus crimes in New Jersey colleges and universities by gaining a better understanding of the student’s perceptions. There were only a handful of studies concerning the perceptions of college students about campus safety however only a minute amount of studies compared armed vs. security departments.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research procedures and datasets used to examine student perceptions of safety at two higher education institutions in northern New Jersey. The participant perceptions were measured to understand if they felt safe on campus and how that feeling was related to the leadership of the police officers on campus. The unique part of the study was that each institution operated a different type of campus police department. The one campus site had a security department that did not have any arrest authority and whose employees were not permitted to carry a firearm or enforce New Jersey Criminal Statute and New Jersey Motor Vehicle infractions. The second campus site had an armed police force, where their employees were able to enforce New Jersey Criminal Statute and New Jersey Motor Vehicle infractions. The students were the focal point of the study because they were directly impacted by the security measures within their higher education’s institutions. This researcher attempted to survey 100-150 students from each higher education institution to have a better understanding of the perceptions level of campus safety within the two college settings.

Research Question and Hypotheses

To examine the relationship between student perceptions of campus safety, correlation and descriptive analysis was used. A survey instrument was utilized to gather the data that was used in the analysis to answer the research question and test the study hypotheses.

RQ. What can college administrative leaders learn from student perceptions of campus safety?
H1a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to feel more secure from theft and violence.

H2a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive residence halls as safer.

H3a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the campus as safer.

H4a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to believe that the police contribute to the safety of the campus.

H5a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the university escort service as convenient and accessible.

H6a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the presence of an RA as contributing to the safety of the residence hall.

Method

This cross-sectional study utilized a quantitative correlation research design to answer the research questions. The purpose of the survey instrument was to aid in determining whether there was a correlation between perceptions of student safety in the campus setting within two college campuses and the leadership of the campus police force. The survey measured student perceptions and attitudes relating to campus safety and campus police (Santucci & Gable, 1998). Personal identifiers were not utilized in this study to improve the likelihood of collecting truthful responses.

Description of the Sample

The study was conducted at two private higher education institutions in northern New Jersey. The purpose of the study was to gain a better understanding of campus
security and student perceptions of campus safety. Participation in the study was voluntary. For some of the participants, the professor distributed the survey in the classroom setting. In this study, a convenience sample was utilized, allowing the researcher to utilize any participants that were available to partake in the survey (Crossman, n.d.). The goal was to survey 100-150 students from each college campus.

**Data Collection Tools**

The instrument utilized for this study was the Campus Security Survey (Santucci & Gable, 1998). The instrument was developed by the researchers to assess student attitudes and behaviors in regards to campus safety issues (Santucci & Gable, 1998). After the demographic questions, the first section of the survey contained 20 questions on a 4-point Likert scale (Santucci & Gable, 1998). The 20 questions assessed student attitudes towards campus safety on their respective campus (Santucci & Gable, 1998). The second section of the survey contained 11 questions that were based on a 5-point Likert Scale (Santucci & Gable, 1998). The second area of the survey was used to assess student behaviors and experiences with campus safety or campus police as it pertained to their campus setting (Santucci & Gable, 1998).

**Description of Sites**

Site A was one in which an unarmed police department was employed and was a private college located in northern New Jersey. Site A offered undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral degrees. Approximately 2,000 students were enrolled in the classes at Site A. Site B was one in which an armed police department was employed and was also a private college located in northern New Jersey. Site B offered undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral degrees. Approximately 5,000 students were enrolled in classes at Site B.
Content Validity

Polit and Beck (2004) stated that content validity is the extent to which an instrument contains an acceptable amount of sample items for the construction to be assessed. Lynn (1986) stated that no less than three experts within the field is a fair number to achieve content validity; however, 10 experts were not needed to establish content validity. The content validity of the Santucci & Gable (1998) study was established by eight experts from Northeastern University (Santucci & Gable, 1998). The experts on the board for the Santucci and Gable stated that some items needed to be moved or added to enhance the clarity of the survey for the students (Santucci & Gable, 1998).

Construct Validity

Construct validation tests are important to understand if a theory has validity and is able to measure specifics within a study (Strauss & Smith, 2009). The validity is the reason why the test can be utilized within the study, and the validity provides a specific measurement in order to understand the outcomes. Within Santucci and Gable (1998) study, the researchers conducted an “exploratory factor analysis that conducted to empirically derive factors reflected by the items and to determine if there was a relationship between the judgmentally developed categories and the empirically derived factors” (p. 4). Further, the researchers conducted an analysis utilizing varimax and oblique rotations with SPSS (Santucci & Gable, 1998).

Data Collection Procedures

The participants completed the survey by paper copy and handed it to the professor or researcher when finished. Participants had 20 minutes to complete the
survey instrument. By having the participants complete the survey, a greater number of participants were included in the study. The survey was composed of approximately 31 questions that evaluated each participant’s satisfaction with campus safety within their higher education institution. The questions were answered on a 4-point Likert-type scale. Once completed, surveys were returned to this researcher via mail or handed directly to this researcher by the monitor. The survey was the same for each student. The students provided their age, year of study, and optional ethnicity identifiers. The data was imported into SPSS for analysis.

Data Analysis Plan

This quantitative correlational study utilized Pearson correlations and Pearson chi squares to test the study hypotheses. If the assumption of normality for the Pearson correlations was not met, a non-parametric equivalent, such as the Spearman rho correlation, was considered as an alternative. Traditional paper surveys were administered to the students by the professor proctoring the survey or this researcher. The completed surveys were then delivered to the researcher, at which point the responses were entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The data was then imported into SPSS 22 for analysis. Descriptive statistics were conducted on the demographic characteristics of the sample and all of the study variables. For categorical variables, for example ethnicity, the frequency of responses and the percentage of responses was calculated. For interval variables, for example theft and violence, the mean and standard deviation of the variables were calculated. The internal reliability of the composite scales was also assessed with Cronbach's alpha. Following this analysis, six hypotheses were tested. Three Pearson correlations were conducted to test Hypotheses 1-3, and three Pearson chi
squares were conducted to test Hypotheses 4-6. Prior to testing each hypothesis, the assumption of normality will be assessed by examining histograms of the variables in order to determine if the distribution of responses create a bell-shaped curve. If $p \leq .05$ for the Pearson correlation and Pearson chi square conducted to test the hypotheses, the relationship between the variables will be considered statistically significant. Six hypotheses were tested in this study.

H$_{1a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to feel more secure from theft and violence.

H$_{2a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive residence halls as safer.

H$_{3a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the campus as safer.

H$_{4a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to believe that the police contribute to the safety of the campus.

H$_{5a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the university escort service as convenient and accessible.

H$_{6a}$. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the presence of an RA as contributing to the safety of the residence hall.

The following procedures were undertaken to test each hypothesis:

- For Hypothesis 1, the variables in the correlation were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the interval level theft and violence factor derived from averaging responses to Questions 2, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, and 20.
- For Hypothesis 2, the variables in the correlation were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the interval level safety in residence halls factor derived from averaging responses to Questions 3, 5, 6, and 15.
- For Hypothesis 3, the variables in the correlation were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the interval level safety on campus factor derived from averaging responses to Questions 1, 4, 11, 14, and 17.
- For Hypothesis 4, the variables in the chi square were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the nominal responses to Question 10, The university police contribute to the safety of the university (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree).
- For Hypothesis 5, the variables in the chi-square were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the nominal responses to Questions 9, The university escort service is convenient and accessible (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree).
- For Hypothesis 6, the variables in the chi-square were the dichotomous police force variable (unarmed vs. armed) and the nominal responses to Question 18, The presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree).

**Assumptions**

It was assumed that the participants answered the survey questions honestly, to the best of their ability, and without prejudice. The participants in this study may have had preconceived beliefs or sentiments about campus law enforcement or law enforcement in general, and it was assumed that the participants did not allow these
beliefs and sentiments to influence their responses to the questions on the survey. It was also assumed that the instrument being used for this study measured the phenomenon of interest in the selected sample of participants.

The extent of this research was restricted to a sample of students attending two private colleges in northern New Jersey, and, therefore, the findings may not be generalizable to the population of college students in the United States or even the entire population of college students in the state of New Jersey. The demographic characteristics of the participants in this sample may not be representative of student populations at other colleges. In addition, time limitations and financial constraints limited the potential research designs to a cross-sectional design. Therefore, the findings from this study will not account for changes in student perception over a period of time, as a longitudinal study might. These constraints also required that the sample in the study be a convenience sample comprised of self-selected student participants, further limiting the generalizability of the findings. However, the findings from this study may significantly contribute to the body of knowledge concerning the relationship between student perception of campus safety and the type of on-campus law enforcement.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations ensure that the participants answered the questions in a manner that was suitable. In turn, the participants may not have given honest answers to the study questions because they may have felt there would be repercussions for honest answers. The participants may also have felt forced to participate in the study if college instructors were proctoring the survey because they could have been fearful of consequences in the grading system. At that time the instructors reinforced to the
participants that the survey did not reflect their grade in their course, in either a positive or negative manner. Other ethical considerations were that the participants would not complete the survey. The participants were told that they did not have to answer the questions and could stop taking the survey at any time through an informed consent document approved by the Creighton Institutional Review Board.

Protecting Anonymity of Participants

To protect the anonymity of the participants, the professor handed out the survey and left the classroom to allow the participants to answer the questions honestly. This was so the participants knew that their answers to the survey questions could be honest and that there would not be repercussions for their answers. Once the participants were finished, they placed the survey instrument in a blank folder. After all participants were finished, one participant retrieved the professor to re-enter back into the classroom. All personal identifiers were eliminated from the survey instrument, (i.e., names and addresses). The survey responses were stored in an encrypted file, and all data will be destroyed five years after the completion of the study. This researcher, committee members, and school administers had access to the survey responses during this period.

Summary

A survey was utilized to measure the student perceptions of campus safety in two private colleges in northern New Jersey. The survey results were offered to the campus police/security leadership to allow them to possibly make changes within their higher education setting. The participants were provided with a paper copy of the survey instrument by the professor or the researcher. The survey instrument that was used by this researcher was the Campus Safety Survey created by Santucci and Gable (1998).
The survey was composed of 31 questions, which took the students approximately 20 minutes to answer. With this survey, Santucci and Gable (1998) provided a clear and concise manner to effectively gain insight into student perceptions of campus safety.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND THE EVIDENCE-BASED SOLUTION

The purpose of this quantitative survey study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. Once the study was completed a detailed report was presented to the two higher education campus police/security leaders. The purpose of presenting the surveys in a detailed report is to provide campus police/security leaders a better insight on the perceptions of safety on the campus environment. The schools are different because one school had a New Jersey certified police department providing security, while the second school had a security guard department providing security. In order to measure student perceptions of campus security, this study utilized a Santucci and Gable (1998) survey instrument. Within Santucci and Gable (1998) Campus Safety Survey instrument, a fear of crime and overall safety measures within each campus environment was investigated. The analysis of the survey responses yielded a detailed description of student satisfaction with campus police leadership. Findings from the study will help campus police departments, administrators, and policymakers make better-informed decisions about the development of leadership characteristics in campus police officers. A better understanding of the relationship between student perceptions of the campus safety could help add to the safety programs on college and university campuses, as well as leadership training for campus police officers.

Summary and Presentation of the Findings

This study utilized the Santucci and Gable (1998) survey instrument titled the Campus Security Survey. The survey was composed of 31 questions that were created to evaluate each participant’s satisfaction with campus safety within his or her higher
educational institution. The survey was administered to participants at two different post-secondary education institutions within the state of New Jersey, carefully following the protocol stipulated by the IRB of each site. Among the two sites referenced in this chapter, Site A utilized a security department, where employees did not have any arrest authority and where employees were not permitted to carry a firearm or enforce New Jersey Criminal Statute and New Jersey Motor Vehicle infractions. Site B utilized an armed police force, where employees were able to enforce New Jersey Criminal Statute and New Jersey Motor Vehicle infractions. After completing the survey, participants handed the completed survey directly to the researcher, at which point the responses were entered into an Excel spreadsheet and then imported the Excel spreadsheet into SPSS. The findings from an analysis of these responses can be found in this chapter.

In the first section of the chapter, a description of the sample, including the gender, ethnicity, and year in college of participants at Site A and Site B can be found. Next, a discussion of the results, including the reliability of the composite factors utilized in the hypothesis testing and the results of the statistical analysis conducted to test each of the six hypotheses is presented.

**Description of the Sample**

Overall, over half of the participants in the study were female (58.2%) and of White ethnicity (59.3%), and over one-third of the participants were enrolled as a senior at the institution (39.7%). Nearly two-thirds of the participants at Site A were female (61.3%) and White (64.2%). Nearly one-third of the participants at Site A were enrolled as a sophomore (30%), and nearly a third of the participants at Site A were enrolled as a senior (35.8%). Over half of the participants at Site B were female (54.7%) and White
(53.4%), and nearly half of the participants at Site B were enrolled as a senior (44%). Although the participants were demographically similar in composition, a higher percentage of the participants at Site A were female and White. It is important to note that although the sample was composed of 120 participants at Site A and 110 participants at Site B, some participants skipped questions, meaning that the number of responses varied for each of the questions. The demographic characteristics of the participants in the sample can be found in Table 1.
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the Results

Overall, participants at Site B scored higher on average than participants at Site A on each of the three factors used in the Pearson correlations conducted to test Hypotheses 1-3. This indicated that participants at Site B tended to feel safer on campus and in
residence halls. For the factor Theft and Violence, participants at Site B ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .53$) scored higher than participants at Site A ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .57$). The same was true for the factor Safety in Residence Halls, where participants at Site B ($M = 3.61$, $SD = .47$) scored higher on average than participants at Site A ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .48$). Finally, for the factor Safety on Campus, participants at Site B ($M = 3.52$, $SD = .52$) scored higher on average than participants at Site A ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .56$). Average scores were also calculated for each of the three questions used in the chi-square tests conducted to test Hypotheses 4-6. For each of the questions, participants at Site B scored higher than participants at Site A, indicating a higher level of agreement with the statements in the questions for the participants at Site B. Average scores on the three factors used in the three Pearson correlations conducted to test Hypotheses 1-3 are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

*Average Scores on the Three Factors and Three Questions Used in the Hypothesis Testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Unarmed</th>
<th>Armed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and Violence</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in Residence Halls</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety on Campus</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18</td>
<td>111†</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability

To assess the internal reliability of the three composite factors used in the three Pearson correlations conducted to test Hypotheses 1-3, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each of the factors. Cronbach’s alpha for each of the three factors was higher than .80, indicating that the combination of items for each of the three factors was a consistent measure of the phenomenon. Cronbach’s alpha values for each of the three factors are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

*Cronbach’s Alpha for the Three Composite Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft and Violence</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in Residence Halls</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety on Campus</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypotheses in this study, Pearson correlations and chi-square tests were conducted. To test Hypotheses 1-3, three Pearson correlations were conducted. If the Pearson correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level the hypothesis was accepted. To test Hypotheses 4-6, three chi-square tests were conducted. If the chi-square tests were statistically significant at the .05 level the hypothesis was accepted. The findings for the Pearson correlations are presented in Table 4. The findings are then discussed for each of the first three hypotheses.
Table 4

*Pearson Correlations Conducted on Responses From Participants at Both Site A and Site B to Test Hypotheses 1-3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Theft and Violence</th>
<th>Safety in Residence Halls</th>
<th>Safety on Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.265*</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft and Violence</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.606*</td>
<td>.637*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in Residence Halls</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.677*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* ≤ .01 for a two-tailed test.

H1a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to feel more secure from theft and violence.

To test Hypothesis 1, a Pearson correlation was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the interval-level factor theft and violence, derived from averaging responses to Questions 2, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, and 20. The results of the Pearson correlation conducted to test Hypothesis 1 were statistically significant, *r* (204) = .265, *p* = .0001, indicating that there was a positive relationship between Location (Site A vs. Site B) and the factor theft and violence. The findings indicated that participants at Site B felt more “ trusting of other residents living in the hall. Acts of violence are not perceived to occur in his/her residence hall. Personal possessions are safe in his/her room and are not likely to be stolen or vandalized” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 5). Since the results of the Pearson correlation were statistically significant, the hypothesis was accepted.

H2a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive residence halls as safer.
To test Hypothesis 2, a Pearson correlation was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the interval-level factor Safety in Residence Halls derived from averaging responses to Questions 3, 5, 6, and 15. The results of the Pearson correlation conducted to test Hypothesis 2 were not statistically significant, $r(210) = .075, p = .28$. Although the results of the Pearson correlation were not statistically significant, the relationship between Location (Site A vs. Site B) and the factor safety in residence halls was positive. The findings indicated that participants at Site B did not feel any safer in the residence halls than participants at Site A. Since the results of the Pearson correlation were not statistically significant, the hypothesis was rejected.

H3a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the campus as safer.

To test Hypothesis 3, a Pearson correlation was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the interval-level factor Safety on Campus, derived from averaging responses to Questions 1, 4, 11, 14, and 17. The results of the Pearson correlation conducted to test Hypothesis 3 were statistically significant, $r(218) = .304, p = .000004$, indicating that there was a positive relationship between Location (Site A vs. Site B) and the factor Safety on Campus. The findings indicated that participants at Site B felt a greater sense of “physical safety on campus. Walking alone after dark is not a problem, and the campus is very adequately lighted. Parking lots are safe and emergency phones are appropriately located” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 5). Since the results of the Pearson correlation were statistically significant, the hypothesis was accepted.
H4a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to believe that the police contribute to the safety of the campus.

To test Hypothesis 4, a chi-square test was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the nominal responses to question 10 of the survey “the university police contribute to the safety of the university” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11). The results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, $\chi^2(3) = 18.34, p = .0003$, indicating that actual responses were different from what would be expected to occur by chance. The responses indicated that a larger percentage of participants at the location with the armed police force strongly agreed with the statement “the university police contribute to the safety of the university” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11). Fifty-five percent of the participants at the location with the armed police force strongly agreed with the statement and 33.1% of the participants at the location with the unarmed police force strongly agreed with the statement. For each of the other categories (agree, disagree, and strongly disagree), the percentage of participants at Site A selecting each category exceeded the number of participants at Site B selecting each of the other categories. Overall, the percentage of participants agreeing with the statement (strongly agree and agree) was higher for participants at Site B (97.2% vs. 83.1%). The results of the chi-square test conducted to test Hypothesis 4 are presented in Table 5. Since the results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, the hypothesis was accepted.
Table 5

Pearson Chi-Square Conducted to Test Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. University police contribute to the safety of the university.</th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5 (3.1)</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15 (8.8)</td>
<td>2 (8.2)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59 (54.6)</td>
<td>46 (50.4)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>39 (51.5)</td>
<td>60 (47.5)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 (3) = 18.34, p = .0003$. Number in parentheses is expected count.

H5a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the university escort service as convenient and accessible.

To test Hypothesis 5, a chi-square test was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the nominal responses to Question 9 of the survey “the university escort service is convenient and accessible” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11). The results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 11.485, p = .009$, indicating that actual responses were different from what would be expected to occur by chance. As was the case in the chi-square test conducted to test Hypothesis 4, the responses indicated that a larger percentage of participants at Site B strongly agreed with the statement “the university escort service is convenient and accessible” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11): 39.6% of the participants at Site B strongly agreed with the statement and 25% of the participants at Site A strongly agreed with the statement. For the strongly disagree and disagree categories, a higher percentage of the
participants from Site A selected these categories. Overall, the percentage of participants agreeing with the statement (strongly agree and agree) was again higher for participants at Site B (87.1% vs. 70.7%). The results of the chi-square test conducted to test Hypothesis 5 are presented in Table 6. Since the results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, the hypothesis was accepted.

Table 6

*Pearson Chi-Square Conducted to Test Hypothesis 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The university escort service is convenient and accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11 (6.9)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23 (18.2)</td>
<td>11 (15.8)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53 (54.0)</td>
<td>48 (47.0)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29 (36.9)</td>
<td>40 (32.1)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 (3) = 11.485, p = .009$. Number in parentheses is expected count.

H6a. Students on campuses with armed police forces will tend to perceive the presence of an RA as contributing to the safety of the residence hall.

To test Hypothesis 6, a chi-square test was conducted using the dichotomous location variable (Site A vs. Site B) and the nominal responses to question 18 of the survey “the presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11). The results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 9.454, p = .024$, indicating that actual responses were different from what would be expected to occur by chance. As was the case in the chi-square tests conducted to test
Hypotheses 4 and 5, the responses indicated that a larger percentage of participants at Site B strongly agreed with the statement “the presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11): 44.4% of the participants at Site B strongly agreed with the statement, and 33.3% of the participants at Site A strongly agreed with the statement. For the strongly disagree and disagree categories, a higher percentage of the participants from Site B selected these categories. Overall, the percentage of participants agreeing with the statement (strongly agree and agree) was again higher for participants at Site B (88.8% vs. 72.6%). The results of the chi-square test conducted to test Hypothesis 6 are presented in Table 7. Since the results of the chi-square test were statistically significant, the hypothesis was accepted.

Table 7

*Pearson Chi-Square Conducted to Test Hypothesis 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. The presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall.</th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12 (8.1)</td>
<td>3 (6.9)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20 (15.2)</td>
<td>8 (12.8)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46 (48.8)</td>
<td>44 (41.3)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>39 (45.0)</td>
<td>44 (38.0)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2 (3) = 9.454, p = .024$. Number in parentheses is expected count.

**Summary**

After conducting three Pearson correlations to test Hypotheses 1-3 and three Pearson chi squares to test Hypotheses 4-6, it was found that Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6
were supported. The findings indicated that students attending college at Site B felt safer than students attending college at Site A. Students at Site B felt safer from theft and violence in the residence halls, including theft or vandalism of their personal possessions. In addition, students attending college at Site B

- were unafraid to walk home in the dark,
- indicated that they felt a greater sense of safety because of the campus police department,
- were confident in the effectiveness of the university escort system, and
- indicated that they felt a greater sense of safety because of the RA.

These findings indicated that an armed police force did contribute to a greater sense of safety for the students attending that college, potentially improving their focus on academics and creating an academic environment that is more conducive to learning. Because of these findings, null Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were rejected and alternative Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were accepted.

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. The findings indicated that students attending college at Site B did not feel any safer than students attending college at Site A. In this case, the presence of an armed police force did not create a greater sense of safety for students in the residence halls of the two colleges. However, since the prominent presence of an RA contributed to a greater sense of safety in the residence hall, a relationship tested in Hypothesis 6 and found to be significant, a more prominent police presence in the residence hall could contribute to an even greater sense of safety. The conclusions and recommendations drawn from the findings from this study are presented in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of student perceptions of campus safety in two private colleges in northern New Jersey. This study could be useful for campus police leaders as a guide for improving their current methods of policing on college and university campuses. The lack of research on campus safety within New Jersey colleges and universities was the basis for this study. Within the first two weeks of the school year in 2014 there were 11 campus shootings in the US therefore, it is imperative that New Jersey campus police leaders have a better understanding of how students feel about campus safety and perceive campus police forces (Ohlheiser, 2014). The campus police leaders at both of the colleges included in this study can use the results of this study to improve safety standards within their institutions. In this chapter, recommendations based on the findings from the study will be presented. In addition, the recommendations presented in this chapter will include four recommendations for campus police leaders at the first site and one solution at the second site: the addition of a part-time, armed police officer; the creation of an armed police department; arming only the police supervisors on the campus; or hiring more unarmed security officers and positioning them in high visibility areas; more armed police officer in the residence hall to deter crime and a safer feeling within the campus setting.

Overview of the Study

Based on the data collected from students at the two sites, which included responses from 230 students, it appeared that students at the college with the armed police officers felt safer in the campus setting. Although this was consistent with what
was expected to occur, the responses and the results may have been different if the participants in the sample were demographically diverse. In future studies, this could be remedied by emailing the survey to a larger group of students instead of limiting participation to those who were available to complete survey in-person. However, since many of the participating students indicated that they may not have completed the survey if it was administered electronically, this may not have improved the diversity of the sample. The time of year during which the survey was administered could have contributed to the limited participation in the study. In addition, the lack of involvement by college administrators and faculty members also contributed to lower-than-expected participation in the study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative survey study was to examine student perceptions of campus safety at two private colleges in northern New Jersey. The survey was completed by 230 students and the analysis of their responses will be provided to the two higher education campus police leaders or security leaders. The purpose of presenting the analysis to these leaders is to provide campus police leaders or security leaders with better insight into student perceptions of safety in the campus environment. The two schools selected for participation in this study were different because one school utilized armed police officers certified by the New Jersey police department, and the second school utilized unarmed individuals as part of a security guard department to provide security. In order to measure student perceptions of campus security, this study utilized a survey instrument designed by Santucci and Gable (1998).
Aim of the Study

The findings from this study may provide campus police leaders throughout northern New Jersey with a better understanding of how students perceive their services and could aid police leaders in developing a campus police force that improves student perception of campus safety. The student participants at each university were asked to complete a traditional paper survey in which they were asked a series of questions intended to measure student perceptions of the climate of campus safety. The advantage of asking the student participants to complete the paper survey was to ensure a greater number of participants in the study. The survey was composed of approximately 31 questions created to evaluate each participant’s satisfaction with campus safety at his or her college. The questions were answered on a 4-point Likert-type scale.

In Chapter 1, an introduction to the problem and the purpose of the study was presented. In Chapter 2, a review of prior research on the subject was presented to provide a theoretical basis for the study. In Chapter 3, the methodology of the study was presented and included the use of SPSS to analyze the collected data. In Chapter 4, the results of an analysis of the collected responses was presented and demonstrated that students at the campus with the armed police officers felt safer on campus.

Implementation of Recommendations and Considerations

To aid in the improvement of the campus police forces at the two participating colleges, a detailed report on the findings from this study will be provided to the campus police leaders at each university. Of note was the finding that students at the location with the armed police force felt safer than students at the location with the unarmed
police force. Four recommendations are suggested for the unarmed site, and one recommendation is suggested for the armed site.

**Recommendation One for Higher Education Institutions With Unarmed Police Forces**

The first recommendation is to eliminate the campus security department and implement a new, armed police force. However, changing an entire organization’s structure in order to implement an armed security force is not always easy or feasible. In order to implement a new, armed police force, police leaders should be aware that arming formerly unarmed security guards requires the consideration of a number of dynamic factors (King, 2006). If these dynamic factors are not considered in the implementation, there may be conflict among the university community and its stakeholders (King, 2006). Institutions must weigh the risk of implementation, the cost implementation, and the training required for successful implementation in order to successfully change the organization (King, 2006). Many campus police officers at public universities throughout the country currently carry guns and different types of mechanical force weapons (Bonner, 2015). A U.S Justice Department report stated that more and more private universities are attempting to allow their police or security departments to carry weapons (Bonner, 2015). The rate at which public university police and security forces are transitioning to armed police forces is nearly twice as high as the number of private universities transitioning to armed police forces (Bonner, 2015). This could be because a majority of private school leaders do not feel the need to have an armed police force and may not be as concerned about student safety in their campus setting. According to Campus Police Chief David Perry, from Florida State University, he stated that the
university has made improvements to provide a more professional staff and to become better responsive to the needs of the community setting versus ten years (Bonner, 2015, p. 1).

The cost to arm a formerly unarmed campus police or security force may be high. According to campus police leaders at the University of Rhode Island, $157,000 has been budgeted for the implementation of firearms for the new officers in the department (Farrelly, 2014). Included in this budget was the cost to rebuild the police station, secure the firearms, purchase the firearms, overtime accrued during the implementation, and training for the newly armed police officers (Farrelly, 2014). Furthermore, nearly $22,000 will be spent twice a year on firearms training for the police officers and equipment, including new bulletproof vests (Farrelly, 2014). The amount of time needed to implement the changes will vary by university and will depend on how committed university leaders are to arming their campus police force.

Many school leaders are concerned about the cost of the equipment for an armed campus police force. Because of the high cost of equipment, handguns, vehicles, and training, implementation of an armed campus police force can sometimes take several years (Smith, 2014). The University of Rhode Island needed over a year to implement an armed police force, including the training, policies, and the use of force manual set for by the state governing body (Smith, 2014). Portland State University administrators estimated that it would take nearly three years and over $1 million to transition from an unarmed to an armed police department (Morgen, n.d.).
Recommendation Two for Higher Education Institutions With Unarmed Police Forces

The second recommendation is the implementation of one or two armed police officers from a local municipality. The local police officers would be tasked with policing high-risk events or maintaining a presence in common areas throughout campus. The local armed police officers would work only the events or shifts deemed appropriate by the director of campus safety. To implement this, the school would have to budget for compensation of the officers. This addition to the budget would need to be discussed with various university administrators and the local municipality. In essence, selective implementation of armed police officers would serve as a deterrent for future crimes within the institutional setting.

The contracted officers should be visible and work in the capacity of a community policing officer. Their presence would provide a sense of security that, although not as high as a full-time armed police force, may still be sufficient to provide students with a sense of security at particularly vulnerable times and in particularly vulnerable places. This could be beneficial at times when participants do not want the overall feel of a locked-down environment on campus.

In order for this implementation to be effective, school administrators and neighboring law enforcement agencies have to define the roles and responsibilities of the contracted police officers (King, 2006). These discussions should include developing and updating a memoranda of understanding, critical incident or emergency plans, and standard operating procedures (King, 2006). They should also clearly define the jurisdictional authority of the contracted police officers (King, 2006). Once completed,
local law enforcement should share this memoranda of understanding with all officers in the precincts and stations surrounding the university (King 2006). This is necessary, even for universities employing an unarmed campus police force, in the event that an active shooter or a serious issue on campus requires the assistance of an armed police officer. The memorandum of understanding has become increasingly important in helping university administrators quell concerns about campus safety. A memorandum of understanding can be implemented in a short time period and at a relatively low cost when compared to the cost of implementing a full-time, armed campus police force.

**Recommendation Three for Higher Education Institutions With Unarmed Police Forces**

The security officers at the unarmed site could be issued mechanical weapons and trained to use them in the campus setting when needed. The U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Tennessee v. Garner* caused a paradigm shift in the recommended method of dealing with threats to public safety and the adoption of less-lethal weapons by law enforcement officers (Murgado, 2013). Examples of non-lethal mechanical weapons are Tasers and pepper spray. Law enforcement officers often use pepper spray to incapacitate suspects or disperse large crowds (Ury, 2009).

Tasers are readily used by many state law enforcement organizations throughout the US to incapacitate individuals with nearly 50,000 volts of electricity sent through a wire that can be fired into a suspect as far as 25 feet away (Ury, 2009). Researchers have found that campus police and security officers are not utilizing the correct weapons in the campus policing setting (Gray, 2012). Other mechanical weapons include low-velocity
rounds, which include rounds made from beanbags or wax bullets (Ury, 2009). Low-velocity rounds stun the suspect without mortally wounding the suspect (Ury, 2009).

**Recommendation Four for Higher Education Institutions With Unarmed Police Forces**

Security guards should be strategically located to increase visibility on campus and improve safety in high-risk areas. The security officers would need to be strategically placed throughout the university to deter criminals from committing crimes of opportunity. To achieve this, campus security leaders would need to improve the mobility of their officers through increased foot coverage by utilizing bicycles or motorized vehicles (Rosenberg, n.d.). Security guards need to understand the safety needs of the students and the staff in order to provide a sense of security to the students. Students would value additional training for campus police officers to aid them in understanding the needs of the students.

By requiring security officers to leave the office and walk around the campus, campus security leaders can make security officers a part of the community (Rosenberg, n.d.). In addition, their presence will project a type of safety and security to the student body on the campus setting (Rosenberg, n.d.). When visible, the security officer will act as a deterrent to individuals seeking to commit a crime of opportunity, including the theft of an unattended bag, (Rosenberg, n.d.). Furthermore, by better understanding the needs of the students, security officers will become more approachable and students will be more likely to feel comfortable talking to the security officers in the campus setting (Rosenberg, n.d.).
Recommendation Five for Higher Education Institutions With Armed Police Forces

There are a number of smaller changes that would enhance the safety of students at universities with armed campus police forces. Although students at the college with an armed police force felt more secure from theft and violence, perceived a greater sense of physical safety on campus, felt that college police contributed to the safety of the campus, felt that the escort service was convenient and accessible, and felt that the RA contributed to the safety of the residence hall, students at the college with an armed police force did not feel any safer in residence halls than students at the college with an unarmed police force. Since the results of the Pearson correlation were not statistically significant, null Hypothesis 2 was retained. The solution is to increase the visibility of police officers, increase the number of security cameras, and communicate the school’s emergency plans to students in the residence halls. Another possible solution would be to implement stricter guidelines for guests visiting the residence halls. As was the case in Solution 4, campus police officers should be more active in the residence halls to deter crime. The cost of this implementation would be minimal but would require a restructuring of personnel to strategically locate campus law enforcement officers at high-risk points throughout residence halls.

Also to increase the number of video surveillance cameras can provide students with an overall sense of safety within the residence halls. Smaller institutions with smaller budgets are often unable to hire additional personnel to provide security and often rely on video surveillance cameras to improve security (Buck, 2013). However, surveillance cameras used in a university setting can often be costly. When implementing video surveillance cameras, implementation of video surveillance is often
done under challenging circumstances and is susceptible to vandalism, poor lighting conditions, and the person monitoring and recording the video (Horvath & Pisciotta, 2015). For example, Contra Costa College and Los Medanos College in Pittsburg have spent approximately $1 million and $1.5 million respectively to install 40 to 60 video surveillance cameras to deter crime (White, 2015). Patrick Fiel stated that when he was the chief of security for the Washington D.C school system, he was in charge of 163 campus settings and that the implementation of video surveillance decreased crime by 90% on inner city campuses (Goral, 2011).

At Oswego State University, a series of video surveillance cameras have been installed on the campus, and school administrators have submitted another proposal to install cameras in common areas, in the 13 residence halls, and in parking lots to provide additional safety for the students (Parsnow, 2013). The student-run residence hall advisory board at Oswego State University supported the cameras to address safety concerns expressed by the study body (Parsnow, 2013).

At Pennsylvania State University, school administrators have approved the installation of nearly 600 video surveillance cameras in the residence life areas and dining areas at their main campus at a cost of $1.4 million (Snyder, 2013). These cameras will deter crime and provided additional security to college campuses (Snyder, 2013). Additionally, the university will be installing cameras in 60 buildings on the state college campus (Snyder, 2013). Currently Pennsylvania State University has eight dorms with surveillance cameras installed (Snyder, 2013). The student body comprises roughly 14,000 students living on campus and nearly 5,000 students living on the other campuses.
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS SAFETY


The Eastern New Mexico University Police Department is hoping to reduce crime on campus by installing nearly 100 interior and exterior video surveillance cameras (Edds, 2014). The cameras were installed to deter crimes on campus in an effort to provide additional security (Edds, 2014). Since the installations of the video cameras in the campus setting, auto burglaries have been reduced in great numbers (Edds, 2014).

Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players in Implementation

In order for the implementation of these recommendations to succeed at the two campuses, the campus police chief or director will need to approve the recommendations. With a growing number of university police forces transitioning towards armed security, it is imperative that campus police leadership understand the climate of the student body. Because the complexities and demands of law enforcement are changing, and campus policing is developing, Portland State University voted to implement an armed police force in 2015 (Christy, 2015). The success of efforts to implement an armed campus police force at the campus with the unarmed police force will be dictated by the student body and the current campus police leadership. Implementation of an armed campus police force does not follow a one-size-fits-all model to be implemented within every campus setting; it requires ratification by school administrators, input from the student body, and input from members of the community.

Leader’s Role in Implementing Proposed Recommendations

In order for a leader to bring about change through the five recommendations offered in this chapter, the leader will need to take a lead from the front of the
organization (Francis-Nurse, 2007). The leaders will need to develop strategies to recruit personnel and retain the employees in order for the implementation to be successful (Francis-Nurse, 2007). While the leaders may allow a part-time, armed officer to patrol the campus, implementation of a new department consisting of full-time armed police officers will require a strong leader. Leaders will need to have the confidence and enthusiasm to undertake a new approach and involve other members of the university and community throughout the process (Morreale, 2004). However, this style of leadership is unfamiliar to many leaders within many organizations (Morreale, 2004). Some leaders believe that they were promoted or appointed to their positions with the authority to make all the decisions without the input of others in the organization (Morreale, 2004). However, important decisions, including the decision to implement a full-time, armed police force, should be made by more than one person in the organization (Morreale, 2004).

In order for the change to take place within the university, campus law enforcement officers need to engage in planning and critical thinking (Morreale, 2004). Morreale (2004) found that in a study by the Center for Leadership Studies, transformational leaders often act as a role model and gain the trust of people within their organization (Morreale, 2004). Furthermore, transformational leaders question the status quo of the organization and empower people to achieve their full potential within the organization (Morreale, 2004). Thus, for widespread change to occur within an organization, leaders should demonstrate the characteristics of a transformational leader.

In order for any proposed recommendation to work both sites need to have a strong relationship with the campus community. In addition, all of the stakeholders on
the campus need to embrace a proactive approach to ensure the safety of the students by arming the campus police. However, law enforcement agencies and college leaders have personal motivations and perspectives of how the agency should operate (Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center [UDETC], 2011). Due to the nature of the law enforcement on campus, campus police need to operate with consideration of the goals of the college or university (UDETC, 2011). With a solid foundation of senior organization leaders and a strong organizational structure, the next step is to address campus safety issues in the community. Thus, the leaders of the police organization need to understand the cultures and concerns of those within the college setting in order to succeed (UDETC, 2011).

At John Carroll University, the decision to train and arm their campus police came after a five-year process of understanding the needs of the campus (Niehoff, 2013). In order to ensure that the process would succeed in the 2012-2013 academic year, school administrators held open forums to discuss what measures would be implemented to ensure campus safety (Niehoff, 2013). At the open forums, the community, including the staff, faculty, and students, were allowed to voice their thoughts on how to provide a safer campus setting (Niehoff, 2013). Furthermore, the student union approved a resolution to provide firearms to the campus police officers (Niehoff, 2013). In order for the armed police at John Carroll University to succeed, they sought the advice of the neighboring police department (Niehoff, 2013).

In order for any solution to succeed, police leaders need to work with a number of individuals, including the members of the student body, politicians, citizens, and police officers, and need to have strong people skills (Wagner, n.d.). For some, people skills
may come naturally, but others will have a more difficult time persuading people from various backgrounds (Wagner, n.d.). A majority of police chiefs will need to communicate constantly on a number of different issues that will arise in their community setting (Wagner, n.d.). Law enforcement must understand and take the time needed to learn the issues that are important to campus police leaders, because if they do not address their concerns, the opportunity to cooperate with campus police officer will be lost (Udetc, 2001).

In order to fully understand both divisions within the campus setting, campus authorities need to understand the culture and parameters within which law enforcement agencies need to operate in order to be successful (UDETC, 2001). Campus police leaders need to understand that law enforcement officers are often dealing with outside pressures from local businesses, the community, and politicians (UDETC, 2001). Law enforcement officers and campus police leaders must take advantage of the opportunities presented during student body meetings by providing the student body with a forum to meet and interact with the law enforcement officers as members of a single campus community (UDETC, 2001). In order for any solution to succeed, law enforcement and campus administrators must form a common trust in order to be able to provide input on critical issues (UDETC, 2001). Allowing input from both parties will effectively lead the campus police leadership into an era that will be fully transparent within the higher education environment.

**Opponents of Armed Campus Police Solutions**

While there are many who criticize the arming of campus police officers, it appears that a growing number of colleges and universities are arming their campus
police officers. According to the American Civil Liberties Union (2010), residents of Rhode Island have been worried that there are too many police officers patrolling the state’s high education institutions. Thus some people in the community could feel that they are being over policed by the law enforcement agency within their community. The American Civil Liberties Union found that reports of an armed gunman on the University of Rhode Island campus were false, sparking a conversation about the merits of armed police officers on a college campus (ACLU, 2010). Opponents argued that having armed police officers on the University of Rhode Island campus could be dangerous for students and change the way students feel about their college experience (ACLU, 2010). Furthermore, opponents to armed campus police officers voiced concerns that arming campus police officers could alter the academic atmosphere of the campus (ACLU, 2010).

In Oregon, opponents argued that the reasons for arming campus police officers were based on flawed research (Hotchkiss, 2012). Currently, the Portland State University public safety department works with limited authority and does not have jurisdiction outside of the campus setting or outside property that is not owned by the university (Hotchkiss, 2012). The Portland State University police chief stated that he does not want to arm the campus police officers but instead reorganize the force to meet the needs of today’s students (Hotchkiss, 2012).

With the findings from this study, police leaders at colleges and universities throughout the United States can better understand student perception of police leadership at both campuses with armed police forces and campuses with unarmed police forces. This study utilized responses from a total of 230 students enrolled at two higher
education institutions in New Jersey: one with an armed police force and one with an unarmed police force. It was originally believed that students at the institution with the unarmed police force would feel less safe than students at the institution with the armed police force, and this belief was confirmed with the findings from this study. All but one of the null hypotheses were rejected, indicating that the students at the institution with the armed police force felt safer than students at the institution with the unarmed police force, with the exception of residence halls. The findings indicated that students at the location with an armed police force did not feel any safer in the residence halls than students at the location with an unarmed police force. This could be due to the lack of involvement in the residence halls or the lack of student interaction with campus police in the residence halls. The responses indicated that a larger percentage of students at the location with the armed police force strongly agreed with the statement “the university escort service is convenient and accessible” (Santucci & Gable, 1998, p. 11). Overall, the percentage of students agreeing with the statement (strongly agree and agree) was again higher for students at the location with an armed police force (87.1% vs. 70.7%).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

While studies have been conducted on student satisfaction with campus police officers, more research needs to be conducted on New Jersey colleges and universities and those throughout the nation due to the limited scope of this dissertation. With close proximity to the infrastructure of the New York Tri-state area, New Jersey higher education institutions could be a potential target for an active shooter or terrorist threat. Future research could compare the satisfaction and or perception levels of students at public and private higher education institutions. While this study focused on two private
higher education institutions in New Jersey, the perceptions of students at public higher education institutions may be different. Therefore, a study should be conducted comparing responses from students enrolled at both public and private higher education institutions.

Future studies should include a larger sample consisting of students, administrators, and support staff. Support staff at a higher education institution serves an important role as stakeholders in the organizations. Therefore, it is important to solicit input from support staff to assess the security of the students on campus. Often, the support staff will not have insight into the safety of residence halls but will have insight into the overall safety of the campus. Additionally, future research should employ electronic surveying methods to increase the number of participants in the study. Future studies could also be conducted on higher education institutions that have transitioned to armed campus police forces to analyze student perceptions of safety prior to arming campus police officers and after arming campus police officers. While the research is mixed, it appears that students on campuses with armed police forces feel safer than students on campuses with unarmed security guards.

Summary

Throughout the course of this study, much research has been conducted on student the perceptions of campus safety, and the research suggests that students on higher education campuses patrolled by armed police officers feel safer than students on higher education campuses patrolled by unarmed police officers. The findings from this study indicated that at a location where an armed police force is utilized students feel safer from theft and violence in the residence halls, are more likely to be unafraid to walk
home in the dark, have greater confidence in the campus police department and the university escort system, and attribute at least some of their safety to the prominent presence of an RA. Interestingly, students attending college at a location with an armed police force were no more likely to attribute their safety in the residence halls to the campus police department than students attending college at a location with an unarmed police force. This indicated that a greater police presence in the residence halls could create a greater sense of safety among students.

Based on the findings from this study, implementation of an armed campus police force could improve the academic atmosphere of the college by allowing students to focus more on academics and less on their personal safety and the safety of the personal possessions. Therefore, it was recommended that colleges and universities without an armed police force

(a) implement an armed police force;
(b) contract with the local municipality for police services;
(c) arm the campus police officers with nonlethal weapons, such as Tasers pepper spray, and low-velocity rounds made of beanbags or wax bullets; and
(d) strategically position campus police officers to increase their presence on campus and deter crime.

Although the findings from this study indicated that armed campus police forces were superior to unarmed campus police forces at creating a sense of safety on a college campus, there are still areas in which armed campus police forces can improve. This is consists primarily of increasing the police presence in the residence halls to create a greater sense of safety. However, there are other ways in which armed campus police
forces could leverage their presence and ensure the safety of students: Campus police forces could

(a) increase the number of security cameras,

(b) communicate the school’s emergency plans to students in the residence halls, and

(c) implement stricter guidelines for guests visiting the residence halls.

In many states, public higher education institutions are making the transition to armed security. However, more research needs to be conducted on private universities to better understand student perceptions of campus safety before implementing armed campus police officers. While a majority of public universities are already armed, it would be interesting to assess whether students feel safer in the residence halls. Despite the cost of implementing an armed campus police force and improving campus security, it is likely that the return on the investment will yield benefits that are worth 10 times the initial investment. This is especially true if the investments save even one life.
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Appendix A: Bill of Rights for Research Participants (Creighton University)

**Bill of Rights for Research Participants**

As a participant in a research study, you have the right:

1. To have enough time to decide whether or not to be in the research study, and to make that decision without any pressure from the people who are conducting the research.
2. To refuse to be in the study at all, or to stop participating at any time after you begin the study.
3. To be told what the study is trying to find out, what will happen to you, and what you will be asked to do if you are in the study.
4. To be told about the reasonably foreseeable risks of being in the study.
5. To be told about the possible benefits of being in the study.
6. To be told whether there are any costs associated with being in the study and whether you will be compensated for participating in the study.
7. To be told who will have access to information collected about you and how your confidentiality will be protected.
8. To be told whom to contact with questions about the research, about research-related injury, and about your rights as a research subject.
9. If the study involves treatment or therapy:
   a. To be told about the other non-research treatment choices you have.
   b. To be told where treatment is available should you have a research-related injury, and who will pay for research-related treatment.
Appendix B: Permission to Use and Modify the Campus Security Survey

On Wed, Apr 15, 2015 at 1:31 PM, Robert Gable - Bob Gable 
Sent via the Samsung GALAXY S4, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone.

Original message
From: Anthony Acoste
Date: 4/15/2015 1:31 PM (EDT-04:00)
To: Robert Gable
Subject: Re: Research

Good afternoon Dr. Gable,

On 9/22/14 you granted me permission to utilize your Campus Safety Survey (Sanucci, K. & Gable, R. 1998 January 1. Student perceptions of campus safety at a large rural university (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED417648; Retrieved April 3, 2009, from ERIC database) As part of my doctoral dissertation I will be utilizing your survey. I just wanted to gain your permission to change questions #7 and 10 to reflect the university police department that I will be surveying instead of Uscmn police. Thank you in advance for your time.

Anthony Acoste

On Mon, Sep 22, 2014 at 2:51 PM, Robert Gable - Bob Gable 
With this email you have permission.
Good back Bob

Sent via the Samsung GALAXY S4, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone.

Original message
From: Anthony
Date: 9/22/2014 2:03 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: Robert Gable
Subject: Research

Dr. Gable

Good morning: First I would like to state that I truly enjoy reading your article.


I am a Doctoral student and I am attempting to review recent survey instruments that were utilized on campus law enforcement. Your survey instrument is an amazing tool and one that with your permission may be perfect fit for my monograph.

A little bit about myself, I have been in law enforcement for the past 13 years. I started my career with the United States Customs Service as an Officer in 2001. In 2005, I accepted a Detective position with the Passaic County Prosecutor's Office and have been employed there ever since. I am currently assigned to the United States Department of Homeland Security and wherein my group focuses on International Money Laundering. I received a Master's Degree in Professional Studies with a concentration in Clinical Justice leadership from St. John's University. I am currently enrolled in Citytech University, Doctorate of Education in leadership program. Also, I have been an Adjunct Professor at Caldwell University since 2011 where I teach a full range of law enforcement studies. I have currently completed all the required course work of my doctoral studies and I am in the middle stages of my dissertation proposal. My dissertation topic is STUDENT PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS POLICE OFFICERS AND CAMPUS POLICE LEADERSHIP IN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY COLLEGES.

Within my research, I am attempting to conduct a correlation study of two different college environments. One college has full-time armed police officers, whereas the second university has campus security. I want to attempt to research if there is any correlation between the two schools, and if not, what can be done to form a better relationship with the campus police departments for each university. Please let me know what you think and thank you for your time.

Respectfully,
Anthony M. Acoste