University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

Graduate Research Papers

Student Work

1985

A study of residence hall students' knowledge of, and attitudes toward, safety and security policies and procedures at the University of Northern Iowa

Michael Jon Woeste University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1985 Michael Jon Woeste

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp



Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Woeste, Michael Jon, "A study of residence hall students' knowledge of, and attitudes toward, safety and security policies and procedures at the University of Northern Iowa" (1985). Graduate Research Papers. 3536.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3536

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

A study of residence hall students' knowledge of, and attitudes toward, safety and security policies and procedures at the University of Northern Iowa

Abstract

Increasingly in recent years, serious crime has emerged as a phenomenon on American college campuses (Time, 1973). Factors such as the increased crime rate in the United States, the increased heterogeneity of the college student population, and the greater openness of the college campus have resulted in more and varied crimes on college campuses, e.g., sexual assault, theft, and vandalism (Middleton, 1981). Rape on college campuses, once unheard of, is now commonplace (Thomas, 1978, Mehreu, 1983, Dowd, 1983). American colleges and universities had had little experience with crime, and were ill prepared to deal with it.

A STUDY OF RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD, SAFETY AND SECURITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

A Research Paper
Presented to
The Department of Educational Administration
and Counseling
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

by Michael Jon Woeste August, 1985 This Research Paper by: Michael Jon Woeste

Entitled: A Study of Residence Hall Students' Knowledge of, and Attitudes Toward, Safety and Security Policies and Procedures at the University of Northern Iowa

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Thomas W. Hansmeier

Director of Research Paper

Ann Vernon

Second Reader of Research Paper

Norman McCumsey

Head, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
Ι.	Introduction	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Importance of the Study	3
	Delimitations	3
	Definition of Terms	4
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	10
	Development of the Survey Instrument	10
	Administration of the Survey Instrument	12
	The Sample	13
IV.	RESULTS	15
	Student's Perceptions of Their Responsibility for the Safety/Security of Self and Others	17
	Students' Propensity to Act in Support of the Safety/Security of Self and Others	19
	Students' Perceptions of the Involvement of Others in Safety/Security Maintenance	23
	Students' Perceptions of the Role of the UNI Security Office	26
	Students' Knowledge of Safety/Security Programs and Procedures	29
	Students' Perceptions of Specific Safety/ Security Issues	33
٧.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37
	REFERENCES	38
	APPENDICES	41

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Increasingly in recent years, serious crime has emerged as a phenomenon on American college campuses (<u>Time</u>, 1973). Factors such as the increased crime rate in the United States, the increased heterogeneity of the college student population, and the greater openness of the college campus have resulted in more and varied crimes on college campuses, e.g., sexual assault, theft, and vandalism (Middleton, 1981). Rape on college campuses, once unheard of, is now commonplace (Thomas, 1978, Mehreu, 1983, Dowd, 1983). American colleges and universities had had little experience with crime, and were ill prepared to deal with it.

Open residence halls and 24-hour visitation make it difficult for housing staff to determine who is a resident and who is an outsider, and for the residence staff to maintain security. The conflict between increased pressure for security, and diminished security resulting from the relaxation of controls and regulations, is compounded by the college students' apathy toward their own self protection. Popular news media report that college students are generally unconcerned about their security in the residence halls and on the campus. They also report that students are often careless

in protecting themselves and their property (U.S. News and World Report, 1971).

The residence hall staff at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) consider student apathy to be a key issue in maintaining effective security on the UNI campus. Staff members believe that too many residents are not serious enough about their role in protecting themselves and their property, and are not adequately concerned about protecting fellow students or their property. Many students believe their safety and security are the responsibility of the residence hall staff. However, the perceptions of the residence hall staff are based on observation and personal opinion, not on research data.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to ascertain residence hall students' knowledge of, and attitudes toward, safety and security policies and procedures at the University of Northern Iowa. Specifically, data were collected pertinent to:

- students' perceptions of their responsibility for the safety/security of self and others,
- 2) students' propensity to act in support of the safety/ security of self and others,
- 3) students' perceptions of the involvement of others in safety/security maintenance,
- 4) students' perceptions of the role of the UNI Security Office,

¹R. Hartman (personal communication, September 17, 1984).

- 5) students' knowledge of safety/security programs and procedures,
- 6) students' perceptions of specific safety/security issues, i.e., walking alone at night on campus, adequacy of campus lighting, impact of alcohol consumption on students' safety/security, adequacy of fire safety equipment in residence halls, efficiency of the combination lock system, and the frequency of sexual assaults.

Importance of the Study

The safety and security of residents is ultimately the responsibility of the residence hall staff and of their administrative superiors in the Department of Residence and the Division of Educational and Student Services. University personnel who are responsible for the formulation, evaluation, and enforcement of policies and procedures designed to enhance students' safety and security need reliable information concerning students' knowledgability about, and attitudes toward, safety/security issues if student needs in this area are to be met.

Delimitations

The extent to which the results of this study may be generalized to other student populations on other college or university campuses is limited for the following reasons:

1) Data were gathered only from students living in residence halls at the University of Northern Iowa

- during the 1984-1985 academic year.
- There was limited control over the random selection of the subjects due to the cover letter instructions, and to the resident assistants' distribution of the survey instruments.

Definition of Terms

- Residence Hall On-campus housing provided by the University of Northern Iowa for single students, or for married students living alone.
- 2) House A living unit within a residence hall comprised of 25-60 students residing on one wing of one floor, or on one floor, of the hall.
- 3) <u>Safety</u> Freedom from exposure to danger, or exemption from injury or loss.
- 4) Security Freedom from danger, fear; anxiety safe.

Chapter II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It took approximately twenty years (1960-1980) to move from strictly enforced policies regulating student behavior to more open campuses, with 24-hour visitation and relatively few regulations. Blimling and Miltenberger (1984) reported that less stringent, self-governing regulations not only relax the student attitudes toward their own security, but toward others' security as well. Handley (1980) noted in his research that the effects of newly-found freedom, joined by a certain naivete about security among students, produced a safety/security problem on college campuses. During the academic year 1971-1972, crimes such as vandalism, assaults, thefts, robberies, and rape increased about 50% on college and university campuses across the nation (Gallagher, 1974).

Crime rates on college and university campuses, as reported by Middleton (1981), have continued to rise. His data reveal a 55% increase in the number of reported sexual attacks on women, from 101 in 1975 to 157 in 1980. Further, he indicated that the increase in rape, attempted rape, and other types of sexual assaults on the campuses was higher than the 46% increase reported nationwide. Middleton noted that some people see the university campus as "a supermarket

for sex related crimes, and that persons associated or not associated with the campus can often find a single girl walking somewhere 24 hours a day" (p. 5).

Dulow (1982) reported that a person who has not been a victim sees little reason to become a participant in security measures to prevent crime. Results of a survey by Lavrakas (1982) revealed similar attitudes. He found the problem to be one of individual experience. "Assaults must be perceived as individually relevant, and of significant proportions, before participation occurs. Participation of individuals with protective programs is thus highly related to the individual's previous personal experience with crime" (p. 312).

Huston's (1981) research identified three factors to consider when looking at students' lack of involvement with security measures. First, he noted that few college students have had experience with or have witnessed a crime on campus. He attributed this lack of exposure to students' work and study habits, and their spending the majority of their time in class buildings or residence halls. The majority simply are not located where the crimes take place. Secondly, Huston observed that the lack of exposure to crime causes a student to provide inaccurate or incomplete descriptions of a crime which he/she has witnessed. Third, the strain of getting involved often causes students to ignore what was seen. Huston concluded that the majority of students simply preferred not to get involved.

Student preference for noninvolvement with security programs or measures was also revealed by Hood's (1974) research. In a study at the University of Iowa, student attitudes toward residence hall security and security-related behavior Shortly after the initial sample was surveyed, were assessed. a coed was murdered in one of the residence halls. The coed had died as a result of a brutal beating that accompanied a sexual assault. A follow-up study was conducted fifteen days after the murder, and the results of the two surveys were compared to determine the event's impact upon students' security-related behavior. Seventy-five percent of the respondents reported that they had not been concerned about a lack of security, and approximately 90 percent of the men and women in both samples did not believe that a violent crime was likely to occur in their residence hall. There was virtually no change in the attitudes of the subjects as a result of the homicide. Hood concluded, "Students appeared to perceive the murder as an isolated event, devoid of any major consequences or implications for them. The brutal murder of a coed in the residence hall did not effect any appreciable change in the security-related behavior" (p. 355).

A similar lack of student concern was found by Dubiet (1974). He concluded, "Crimes in residence halls can be attributed primarily to a lack of security measures provided by the University. The best deterrant of crime is awareness on the part of the student in protecting himself and his

property" (p. 16).

This lack of student concern revealed by several researchers in the 1970's is still prevalent today. Meyer (1984), for example, stated, "Student apathy towards their role in reducing crime is a re-education problem, not one of putting more lights on campus. Students either aren't aware, or won't accept, that they are equally responsible for their own security" (p. 1). Jacobs and O'Meara (1980) reported, "The majority of crimes could be prevented if the students were aware of the problems and would follow a few practical rules of common sense, such as never walking alone at night, locking dorm rooms, and reporting suspicious characters." However, they went on to state, "Getting students to follow such advice is very difficult, unless they have already been assaulted or know someone who has been assaulted" (p. 292).

Nicholson (1981), in presenting the opinions of the Office of the Attorney General of the United States, wrote, Acts of violence and vandalism are destroying our campuses as places of learning. It will take a commitment from the entire educational community to restore safety on campus" (p. 27).

In summary, for several reasons, crime has become a more serious problem on college campuses. In spite of this situation, however, students' inactivity with and apathy toward their own and others' security continue to be prevailing conditions. Only in extreme cases of personal experience

with crime as a victim, or close contact with a victim, do these conditions of inactivity/apathy change. Finally, these conditions of student inactivity and apathy act as deterrants to the effective maintenance of safety/security on American college and university campuses.

Chapter III DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, the development of the survey instrument, the administration of the survey instrument, and the study sample will be described.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The format of the survey instrument was developed after interviews with the staff members of the Department of Residence and Security Office, and residents of each of the nine residence halls on the UNI campus. The following areas were considered by those interviewed to be of primary importance, and were, therefore, emphasized in the survey:

- 1) Students' perceptions of their responsibility for the safety/security of self and others.
- 2) Students' propensity to act in support of the safety/ security of self and others.
- 3) Students' perceptions of the involvement of others in safety/security maintenance.
- 4) Students' perceptions of the role of the UNI Security Office.
- 5) Students' knowledge of safety/security programs and procedures.
- 6) Students' perceptions of specific safety/security

issues, i.e., walking alone at night on campus, adequacy of campus lighting, impact of alcohol consumption on students' safety/security, adequacy of fire safety equipment in residence halls, efficiency of the conbination lock system, and the frequency of sexual assaults.

The instrument used in this study was designed to assess student knowledge and attitudes with a series of 40 questions, using 30 questions with a five-level Likert scale of agreement-disagreement, a series of 10 yes/no questions, and an open ended statement inviting written comment from the respondent (Appendix A).

The instrument was presented, and the following changes were made in its design:

- 1) The format of the demographic information items was altered to ensure a more complete response. On the pretest, many of the subjects failed to designate their sex.
- 2) The 30 Likert scale questions were rearranged to fit on the front side of one page of paper.
- 3) For ease of tabulation, the items were numbered, and the agree-disagree scale was moved from the right side of the page to the left.
- 4) The color of the paper was changed from sand to orchid (light purple) to make the survey instrument more visually appealing.

The pretest revealed no problems with the items themselves. Therefore, no changes were made in the wording of the items, nor in the number of items used.

Administration of the Survey Instrument

The pretest was accomplished by distributing 10 survey instruments to each of two houses in one all-male residence hall (Rider Hall), one all-female residence hall (Hagemann Hall) and one coeducational residence hall (Noehren Hall). Thus, 60 instruments were distributed to selected students in six houses. The resident assistant of each of the six houses was contacted by phone, and was instructed to distribute the instruments to two freshmen, two sophomores, two juniors, two seniors, and two graduate students within the house. The resident assistants instructed the subjects to return the forms to the residence hall main desk.

Following the pretest, and revision of the survey instrument, seven instruments were distributed to each of the remaining 86 resident assistants. Each resident assistant was instructed by cover letter (Appendix B) to distribute the forms to at least one freshman, one sophomore, one junior, one senior, and one graduate student residing within the house. The subjects were instructed by cover letter (Appendix C) to respond to the survey, and to return it to the residence hall main desk as quickly as possible. One week after distribution, a follow up contact was delivered to each hall coordinator.

These procedures elicited an excellent response. Survey instruments were distributed to 662 residents, and 404 responded for a return rate of 64%.

The Sample

The 404 subjects for this study were the 169 male (42%) and 235 female (58%) respondents to the pretest and final survey. The 404 subjects represented approximately 10% of the UNI students who lived in residence halls during the fall semester of 1984. The total residence hall population in the fall semester of 1984 consisted of 1,899 male residents (44%) and 2,450 female residents (56%). Thus, the numbers of female and male respondents were a representative sample.

The vast majority of the subjects were of traditional college age. Three hundred eighty were between the ages of seventeen and twenty-two. Only twenty four subjects were twenty-three years of age or older.

Underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores) comprised 59% of the sample; 39% of the subjects were upperclassmen (juniors and seniors). The sample included only six graduate students (2%). The total breakdown of residents by class rank consisted of 2,451 underclassmen (56%), 1,852 upperclassmen (42%), with only 46 graduate students (2%). Again, the subjects were a representative sample of class ranks in the population.

The subjects were quite evenly distributed among the residence halls. Two thirds of them (66%) had lived on campus between one and four semesters. A sizable minority

(34%) had spent five to eight semesters living in the residence halls.

Chapter IV RESULTS

The survey instrument was designed to elicit student responses in six areas deemed to be of primary importance by students and staff who are significantly involved in safety/security programming at the University of Northern Iowa.

- Students' perceptions of their responsibility for the safety/security of self and others.
- 2) Students' propensity to act in support of the safety/ security of self and others.
- 3) Students' perceptions of the involvement of others in safety/security maintenance.
- 4) Students' perceptions of the role of the UNI Security Office.
- 5) Students' knowledge of safety/security programs and procedures.
- 6) Students' perceptions of specific safety/security issues, i.e., walking alone at night on campus, adequacy of campus lighting, impact of alcohol consumption on students' safety/security, adequacy of fire safety equipment in residence halls, efficacy of the combination lock system, and the frequency of sexual assaults.

Findings of this study will be presented and discussed under each of the above categories. Students' responses to the 40 survey questions will be presented in tabular form. Sixty-eight of the 404 subjects submitted comments in response to the open-ended statement, and some of the more pertinent comments will be incorporated into the discussion which follows.

Students' Perceptions of Their Responsibility for the Safety/Security of Self and Others

The data in this category reveal that a vast majority of subjects consider themselves to be responsible for their own security. Eighty-six percent either agreed or strongly agreed that "room security is my roommate's and my responsibility," and that "I am responsible for my own security and safety in the residence hall," (Table 1).

About three-fourths of the subjects also felt responsible for the safety/security of fellow students. Seventy-seven percent strongly agreed or agreed that "I am responsible for the security of others in my residence hall," and 73% were agreed that "I am responsible for the safety of those living in my house," (Table 1). Consistent with these responses was the statement written by a female subject, "I don't feel unsafe in Campbell Hall, because I know the people around me would come if I needed help."

Statement 12 reveals a difference in the level of agreement between male and female subjects. More females (88%) than males (79%) strongly agreed or agreed that "room security is primarily my roommate's and my responsibility," (Table 1).

One female subject commented, " I feel the responsibility of safety and security is my own, although sometimes others--such as the R.A.'s, campus security, etc. have to help out. My own room I feel I am responsible for--keeping it locked to avoid vandalism, etc."

TABLE 1
Subjects' Responses to Survey Statements Designed to Elicit Their Perceptions of Their Responsibility for the Safety/Security of Self and Others.

	Survey Statement			Res	sponse Optic	ons	
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
9.	I am responsible for the	ALL SUBJECTS	73 (19%)	223 (58%)	46 (13%)	6 (1 %)	39 (10 %)
	security of others in my	MALE	31 (18%)	101 (57%)	22 (12%)	5 (2 %)	17 (10 %)
	residence hall.	FEMALE	42 (20%)	122 (58%)	24 (11%)	1 (.4 %)	22 (10 %)
12.	My room security is	ALL SUBJECTS	138 (35%)	199 (51%)	41 (10%)	10 (3 %)	5 (1 %)
	primarily my roommate's	MALE	63 (39%)	69 (40%)	25 (14%)	14 (8 %)	4 (2 %)
	and my responsibility.	FEMALE	75 (32%)	130 (56%)	19 (8%)	6 (2 %)	1 (.04%)
21.	I am responsible for the	ALL SUBJECTS	68 (17%)	221 (56%)	68 (17%)	7 (2 %)	30 (8 %)
	safety of those living	MALE	18 (10%)	103 (60%)	37 (21%)	3 (2 %)	12 (7%)
	in my house.	FEMALE	50 (23%)	118 (53%)	31 (14%)	4 (2 %)	18 (8 %)
25.	I am responsible for my	ALL SUBJECTS	102 (26%)	232 (60%)	38 (10%)	4 (1 %)	13 (3 %)
-	own security and safety	MALE	42 (24%)	105 (60%)	18 (10%)	3 (2 %)	6 (3 %)
	in the residence hall.	FEMALE	60 (28%)	127 (59%)	20 (9%)	1 (.4 %)	7 (3 %)

Students' Propensity to Act in Support of the Safety/Security of Self and Others

The students' propensity to act in support of the safety/security of themselves and others is best summarized as inconsistent. A vast majority of subjects responded in a positive, security-conscious manner to the statements eliciting their feelings towards reporting sexual assault (95%), closing exterior residence hall doors found open (71%), and reporting any person seen vandalizing hall property (82%). On the other hand, 73% of the subjects agreed or strongly agreed that they would give the residence hall lock combination to a girl/boyfriend and 56% reported that they did not consistently lock their room doors (Table 2).

Although 73% of the subjects would give the exterior door lock combination to a girl/boyfriend, only 30% would give the combination to a person from another residence hall (Table 2). Comments by two subjects provide insight into the reasons underlying these decisions: "I don't believe it's our boyfriends we have to worry about in the dorms; it's the people we don't know very well who we shouldn't be giving the combinations to." Also, "The people I would give the combination to are people I know and trust. I would never give it to a stranger or anybody that I didn't know well."

Responses to statement ten reveal that a vast majority of subjects (86%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with

allowing "strangers entrance to the residence halls who could not open the combination lock." Seventy-one percent indicated that "I would close any exterior residence hall door found propped open," (Table 2).

In the area of sexual assault, there was a marked difference in the responses of males and females. Four-fifths of the males "would confront any suspected assault situation;" 62% of the women would do so. However, 45% of the women "would confront any strangers I see in the hall," but only 31% of the men would do so, (Table 2). Two female subjects summarize the situation clearly:

In regard to the questions about confronting strangers in my house or suspected sexual assaults--I would confront them if I thought I wasn't endangering myself and I thought my intervention would do some good. I'd do something to help someone being assaulted or to get rid of a stranger in the house no matter what--but it wouldn't always be a personal confrontation.

Also, "On sexual assaults, I would try to help if I saw it happening, but if there were a group of guys committing the act, I would just run for help."

A vast majority of the subjects (83%) reported that they consider their "property ... safe when I leave and lock my door," yet 66% of them indicated that they "seldom lock my door when I leave my room and stay in my house," (Table 2).

A vasy majority of subjects indicated that they would report any person whom they witnessed pulling a fire alarm (82%) or vandalizing residence hall property (82%).

TABLE 2

Subjects' responses to survey statements designed to elicit their perceptions of their propensity to act in support of the safety/security of self and others.

	Survey Statement		St ro	ngly Agree		Respo Agree		options agree	Stron	ngly Disagree	No	Opinion
6.	I would give my residence hall lock combination to my girl/boy friend	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	54	(21%) (33%) (12%)	86	(52%) (52%) (52%)	13	(14%) (8%) (19%)	6	(10%) (4%) (14%)	7	(4%) (4%) (3%)
10.	I would allow any strangers entrance to the residence hall who could not open the combination lock.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	2	(.07%) (1 %) (.04%)	19	(8%) (11%) (5%)	75	(39%) (43%) (35%)	60	(47%) (35%) (57%)	17	(6%) (10%) (2%)
16.	I would report any person who I witnessed pulling a fire alarm.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	88	(52%) (52%) (52%)	56	(30%) (33%) (28%)	9	(9%) (5%) (11%)	ĺ	(.07%) (.05%) (.08%)	16	(8%) (9%) (7%)
17.	I seldom leave my room without locking my door.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	36	(23%) (21%) (25%)	62	(33%) (36%) (31%)	54	(31%) (31%) (31%)	14	(10%) (8%) (11%)	7	(3%) (4%) (2%)
22.	I would report any sexual assaults that I witnessed.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	111	(65%) (73%) (59%)	32	(30%) (21%) (36%)	2	(2%) (1%) (2%)	1	(.02%) (.06%) 0 -	6	(3½) (4½) (2%)
23.	I would confront any strangers I see in the hall.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	7	(18%) (4%) (28%)	45	(21%) (27%) (18%)	80	(43%) (47%) (38%)	13	(9%) (8%) (10%)	24	(9%) (14%) (5%)
24.	I would give my residence hall lock combination to a person from another hall.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	4	(2%) (2%) (2%)	58	(28%) (29%) (26%)	69	(38%) (34%) (42%)		(20%) (19%) (20%)	30	(12%) (16%) (9%)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

				Respo	nse Options		
	Survey Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
27.	My property is safe when I leave and lock my door.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	70 (18%) 33 (18%) 37 (17%)	252 (65%) 104 (60%) 148 (68%)	42 (11%) 24 (14%) 18 (8%)	11 (3%) 8 (5%) 3 (1%)	14 (4%) 3 (2%) 11 (5%)
28.	I would close any exterior residence hall door I found propped open.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	108 (28%) 39 (23%) 69 (31%)	168 (43%) 70 (41%) 98 (45%)	73 (19%) 38 (22%) 35 (16%)	9 (2%) 5 (3%) 4 (2%)	33 (8%) 19 (11%) 14 (6%)
31.	I would confront any suspected sexual assault situations.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	115 (29%) 62 (36%) 53 (24%)	157 (40%) 74 (44%) 83 (38%)	59 (15%) 14 (8%) 45 (20%)	3 (.07%) 1 (.05%) 2 (.09%)	57 (15%) 19 (11%) 38 (17%)
32.	I seldom lock my door when I leave my room and stay in my house.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	86 (22%) 39 (23%) 47 (21%)	171 (44%) 74 (44%) 97 (44%)	66 (17%) 25 (15%) 41 (19%)	61 (16%) 27 (16%) 34 (16%)	5 (1%) 2 (1%) 3 (1%)
34.	I would report any person who I witnessed vandalizing or damaging hall property.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	139 (35%) 64 (38%) 75 (33%)	186 (47%) 75 (45%) 111 (49%)	24 (6%) 12 (7%) 12 (5%)	1 (.02%) - 0 - 1 (.04%)	43 (11%) 17 (10%) 26 (12%)

Students' Perceptions of the Involvement of Others

in Safety/Security Maintenance

Although three-fourths of the subjects indicated that other residents of the house do contribute to their security, only 48% strongly agreed or agreed that there is "adequate student involvement with security in my house," (Table 3). One subject commented, "I believe that my safety can't be everyone else's concern, but if everyone looked after each other a little, things would be more easily detected."

A marked difference between males and females is found in their response to statement 11. Collectively, 68% of the women agreed or strongly agreed that "all residents should be required to evacuate the residence hall whenever a fire alarm is sounded," compared to only 35% of the men, (Table 3). One coed commented, "Something needs to be done about the fire alarms. I never go outside when one sounds because I have been conditioned to think of it as a false alarm."

Another commented:

Too many false alarms. These fire alarms are supposed to save our lives. Having so many false alarms creates a false sense of security. Now when an alarm goes off after so many false ones), people just shrug it off as being "another false alarm." In talking with other residents in Bartlett, many persons are so used to these false alarms that they actually sleep through them. I shudder to think of the time when one of these "false alarms" is a real emergency and the residents that might be injured or even killed in a fire. I, for one, am tired of being awakened at 2 and

4 a.m. and would feel much safer if the system were disconnected. It is a problem that should be looked into.

Seventy percent of the subjects responded that the residence hall staff are responsible for their safety/security within the residence halls, indicating a clear perception of that hall staffs' role, (Table 3).

TABLE 3

Subjects' responses to survey statements designed to elicit their perceptions of the involvement of others in safety/security maintenance.

				Respo	nse Options		
	Survey Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
7.	There is adequate student involvement with security in my house.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	5 27 (7%) 16 (9%) 11 (5%)	164 (41%) 80 (47%) 84 (36%)	116 (29%) 37 (22%) 79 (34%)	48 (12%) 16 (11%) 32 (14%)	47 (12%) 20 (12%) 27 (12%)
11.	I believe that all residents should be required to evacuate the residence hall whenever a fire alarm is sounded.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	3 101 (23%) 20 (11%) 81 (31%)	138 (32%) 41 (24%) 97 (37%)	120 (28%) 65 (37%) 55 (21%)	53 (12%) 38 (22%) 15 (6%)	22 (5%) 10 (6%) 12 (5%)
14.	Other residents in my house do not contribute to my security.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	8 (2%) 2 (1%) 6 (3%)	49 (13%) 22 (13%) 27 (12%)	227 (58%) 95 (57%) 132 (59%)	68 (17%) 31 (19%) 37 (17%)	37 (10%) 16 (10%) 21 (9%)
35.	Residence hall staff are responsible for my safety and security.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	61 (16%) 20 (12%) 41 (18%)	210 (54%) 91 (54%) 119 (53%)	70 (18%) 28 (16%) 42 (19%)	12 (3%) 6 (4%) 6 (3%)	38 (10%) 23 (14%) 15 (7%)

Students' Perceptions of the Role of the UNI Security Office

Subjects' responses indicate that the vast majority (83%) and 79%, respectively) believe: "A major role of UNI security is safety and/or security education of the UNI students." However, only 42% of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that "A primary role of UNI security is parking control," (Table 4).

The strength of students' feeling about the parking control function of the UNI Security Office is revealed in their comments. One subject stated,

I strongly feel that the security department is inadequately trained for their jobs. For one, security personnel, in my opinion, concentrate entirely too much on writing parking tickets. If there were enough spaces available for permits issued the problem of "illegal" parking would be minimal.

Another commented,

I seriously feel that UNI security should concentrate more on crime prevention than on parking control. The long-term consequences of a B-lot parking violation is really nothing compared to the long-term consequences of rape or even a parking lot vandalism and theft. Please convey my sentiments to the appropriate authorities.

Still another subject stated, "Security seems more involved with giving parking tickets instead of making the campus a safe place."

About one-half of the subjects (51%) strongly agreed or agreed that "UNI Security Police help to provide a safe campus."

There was a difference between male and female responses. Fifty-eight percent of the men--compared to 44% of the women--either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Considerably more women (86%) than men (67%) felt that "a major role of UNI security is safety and/or security education of the UNI students," (Table 4).

TABLE 4
Subjects' responses to survey statements designed to elicit their perceptions of the role of the UNI Security Office.

				Re	esponse Optio	ns	
	Survey Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
8.	The UNI Security Police help to provide a safe campus.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	18 (5%) 13 (8%) 5 (2%)	181 (46%) 85 (50%) 96 (42%)	91 (23%) 21 (12%) 70 (31%)	41 (10%) 23 (13%) 18 (8%)	66 (17%) 29 (17%) 37 (16%)
13.	A major role of UNI security is helping students.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	117 (31%) 44 (26%) 73 (35%)	196 (52%) 91 (53%) 105 (50%)	26 (7%) 11 (6%) 15 (7%)	9 (2%) 4 (2%) 5 (2%)	32 (8%) 21 (12%) 11 (5%)
19.	A major role of UNI security is safety and/or security education of the UNI students.	ĄLL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	97 (25%) 23 (13%) 74 (33%)	211 (54%) 93 (54%) 118 (53%)	34 (8%) 24 (14%) 10 (5%)	14 (4%) 10 (6%) 4 (2%)	36 (9%) 21 (12%) 15 (7%)
30.	A primary role of UNI security is parking control.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	62 (16%) 31 (18%) 31 (15%)	97 (26%) 40 (24%) 57 (27%)	116 (31%) 54 (32%) 62 (30%)	78 (21%) 21 (21%) 43 (21%)	24 (6%) 9 (5%) 15 (7%)

Students' Knowledge of Safety/Security Programs and Procedures

Subjects' responses to statements in this category clearly indicate that many UNI coeds either do not know about, or do not utilize, safety/security programs designed to provide a more safe and secure environment for them. For example, 100% of the female subjects reported that "I am aware of the Shull Hall Escort Service," but only 21% indicated that "I utilize the Shull Hall Escort Service." Also, only 35% of the female subjects knew the phone number for the UNI Security Office, only 39% had attended a program dealing with the safety procedures of the residence hall, and only 36% had "attended a program dealing with personal safety and self defense against sexual assaults," (Table 5).

Subject's responses also indicate that women are more knowledgeable than men about safety/security programs and procedures. Women, compared to men, report greater awareness of the Shull Hall Escort Service (100% versus 33%); and the Residence Watch Program and its procedures (51% versus 37%); knew the phone number for the Security Office (35% verses 33%); and reported that "my Resident Assistant has helped me be aware of security concerns and safety procedures" (88% versus 78%), (Table 5).

More important, subjects' responses to statements 40, 41, and 45 indicate that women are more active participants in

safety/security programs.

Responses to statement 41 reveal that although more women than men have attended a program dealing with residence hall safety procedures (29% in comparison to 19%), the majority of the subjects (76%) did not attend such a program, (Table 5). The reasons for such mediocre attendance are unclear, but one subject--after attending a security program--commented:

I did attend a security meeting in our hall. Our R.A.'s crabbed to the people attending that more should have been there then they thanked the few of us who were there for coming. I can see why so few people All I heard was that there has never been showed up. This seems to be either \overline{ill} a rape on campus. informed information or a direct lie. I don't believe that any campus can be so lucky as to go without any reports of such incidences. During the meeting we watched a short movie on protection of property and self which was ridiculous. The narrator spoke as if the audience was a group of children, and hoaky cops and robbers mystery music played in the background. know this was an honest attempt by security and our residence hall to inform students about crime on campus, but it didn't come off well at all.

Perhaps it is a lack of relevant information, well-presented--as well as student apathy--that accounts for a lack of interest and attendance.

TABLE 5

Subjects' responses to survey statements designed to elicit their knowledge of safety/security programs and procedures.

				Response Options	
	Survey Statement		<u>Ye</u> s		No
* 20.	I am aware of the proper evacuation procedures in case of fire.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	328 (85%) 131 (78%) 197 (77%)	36	(15%) (22%) (23%)
* 2 9.	My Resident Assistant has helped me be aware of security concerns and safety procedures.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	279 (83%) 123 (78%) 156 (88%)	35	(17%) (22%) (12%)
36.	I feel that UNI students are adequately informed concerning safety procedures.	ALL CAMPUS MALE FEMALE	256 (57%) 106 (62%) 150 (54%)	64	(43%) (38%) (46%)
37.	I am aware of the Shull Hall Escort Service.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	353 (91%) 135 (80%) 218 (100%	34	(9%) (20%) 0 -
38.	I know the phone number for UNI Campus Security.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	129 (33%) 57 (33%) 72 (35%)	115	(67%) (67%) (65%)
40.	I have read the booklet, 'What Every Woman Should Know About Self Protection.'	ALL SUBJECTS MALE ''FEMALE	116 (29%) 18 (11%) 98 (39%)	152	(71%) (89%) (61%)
41.	I have attended a program that deals with the safety procedures of my residence hall.		95 (24%) 33 (19%) 62 (29%)	141	(76%) (51%) (71%)

TABLE 5 (Continued)

					Response Options	
	Survey Statement		7	es		<u>No</u>
42.	utilize the Shull Hall Escort Service.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	5	(13%) (4%) (21%)	136	(87%) (96%) (79%)
44.	I am aware of the Residence Watch Program and its procedures.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	64	(45%) (37%) (51%)	107	(55%) (63%) (49%)
45.	I have attended a program dealing with personal safety and self defense against sexual assaults.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	17	(24%) (10%) (36%)	154	(76%) (90%) (64%)

^{*} The Likert response options to these statements are changed to "Yes-No" response options for consistency of format, with "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" equated to a "Yes" response and "Disagree and "Strongly Disagree" equated to a "No" response; "No Opinion" responses are not included.

Students' Perceptions of Specific Safety/Security Issues

The data in this category reveal student satisfaction with specific safety/security factors on the UNI campus. A vast majority of the subjects (96%) indicated that "my hall has sufficient fire safety equipment ... to provide a safe environment." A substantial minority (42%) feel that "the combination lock system on residence hall exterior doors contributes positively to a safe hall." However, only 29% think that the lighting on the UNI campus is adequate to provide security. Therefore, many students (15% of the men and 36% of the women) reported that "I rarely walk across the campus alone at night," (Table 6).

The adequacy of campus lighting is more of an issue among women than men. Only 23% of the female subjects (39% of the males) indicated that "there is adequate lighting on the UNI campus to provide security," (Table 6). One female subject commented, "The areas around the Ed Center, West Gym, and Campanile are bad--too dark."

Another reinforced the issue by stating, "I feel there needs to be more lighting on this campus. Examples: by Ed Center, walk from Dome to halls."

Fifty-eight percent of the subjects felt that the combination lock system does not contribute to residence hall safety and security. This issue--more than any other--elicited

comments from students who obviously have strong--largely negative--opinions on the subject:

"I don't like the combination lock system, because I don't feel secure trusting my personal safety to others. Although I wouldn't let strangers into the building, there are people who would; and this doesn't make me feel too safe."

I don't feel that the residence hall lock system works at all. Anyone who wants into a residence hall after midnight can get in by just waiting for someone who knows the combination to open the door. It also bothers me to know that if someone were chasing me, I wouldn't be able to enter a dorm other than mine because I don't know their combination.

"The combination lock system does not offer a positive security system in my opinion. I constantly am hearing people give out the combination; however, the people have been much better since the combination was changed not to tell others."

This type of security in the residence halls is very inadequate. A guy could very easily follow a girl in at night and she could do nothing about it. The combination lock numbers can get out very easily. (People who live off campus even know them). A key system would be much more appropriate.

Also:

It doesn't matter how long the combination locks are on, there are still going to be people that don't belong wandering through the hallway. I have lived here for 2½ years and this is the first time I have felt unsafe.

Nearly three-fourths (72%) of the subjects "feel that alchohol consumption contributes to the number of accidents and injuries" at UNI, (Table 6). One subject commented,

I feel that overconsumption of alcohol is a major problem as far as vandalism and harassment is

concerned. In my house there are many people who roam the halls on weekends at very late hours and cause vandalism problems and make excessive noise.

Six female subjects (2%) reported that they were sexually assaulted on the UNI campus during the fall semester of 1984, (Table 6). The criteria for sexual assault were not defined by the researcher, leaving them open to definition by the subjects. One subject defined sexual assault through her experience by stating,

Students need to be made more aware of date-rapes on campus. I said I haven't been assaulted this summer, but I was before. I finally learned through a class that it wasn't my fault, but I didn't feel at the time I could report it because I felt it to be my fault when it wasn't.

TABLE 6

Subjects' responses to survey statements designed to elicit their perceptions of specific safety/ security issues.

			Response Options			
	Survey Statement		Yes	<u>No</u>		
* 15.	I rarely walk across the UNI campus alone at night.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	166 (43%) 25 (15%) 141 (36%)	216 (57%) 137 (85%) 79 (64%)		
* 18.	The combination lock system on residence hall exterior doors contributes positively to a safe hall.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	160 (42%) 78 (48%) 82 (37%)	219 (58%) 83 (52%) 136 (62%)		
÷ 26.	There is adequate lighting on the UNI campus to provide security.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	112 (29%) 62 (39%) 46 (23%)	270 (71%) 99 (61%) 151 (77%)		
* 33.	My hall has sufficient fire safety equipment (smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, etc.) to provide a safe environment.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	364 (96%) 145 (95%) 219 (97%)	13 (4%) 7 (5%) 6 (3%)		
39.	I feel that alcohol consumption contributes to the number of accidents and injuries.	ALL SUBJECTS MALE FEMALE	279 (72%) 122 (72%) 157 (72%)	107 (28%) 47 (28%) 60 (28%)		

^{*} The Likert response options to these statements are changed to "Yes-No" response options for consistency of format, with "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" equated to a "Yes" response and "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" equated to a "No" response; "No Opinion" responses are not included.

Chapter V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The research data warrant several conclusions.

- 1) Subjects reported a strong sense of responsibility for their own safety/security and for the safety/security of others. However, their reported actions were inconsistent—in some cases supportive of and in other situations deterrents to the safety/security of themselves and others. Finally, subjects' responses reveal an alarming lack of knowledge about certain safety/security policies and procedures and an even more alarming propensity not to utilize safety/security measures of which they are aware.
- 2) Subjects' responses indicated that security and safety are more important to women than to men. However, a majority even of female subjects reported that they either did not have knowledge of, or did not utilize, many of the safety/security measures currently in effect.
- 3) Subjects' responses clearly indicate that most students perceive the proper role of the UNI Security Office to be that of helpful educators of the students, and that most students feel that the Security Office overemphasizes its parking control function. Generally, female subjects reported a less favorable impression of UNI security than did male subjects.

- 4) The subjects indicated that the involvement of others is an important factor in the maintenance of safety and security but that involvement of others is generally inadequate. The subjects' perceptions of their own responsibility, in comparison, are much more positive. In light of this finding, subjects seem more certain of their own actions and involvement in relation to self-defense, than others'.
- 5) Subjects' responses to specific safety/security issues revealed a strong feeling of dissatisfaction. The subjects also indicated that the lighting is inadequate in certain areas of the UNI campus, and that they are, therefore, afraid to walk the campus alone at night. Female subjects had especially strong feelings about this issue. Both males and females identified the consumption of alcoholic beverages as a distinctly negative factor in safety/security maintenance.

Security is vital. It is a value/condition that must be present in order to provide an environment suitable for facilitating educational growth. These conclusions not only indicate the importance of adequate security, but reveal the need for change as well. Students need to be made aware of their responsibility in protecting themselves, and the bottom line is that it will take a commitment from the entire educational community to produce any significant changes.

References

- Blimling, G., and Miltenberger, L. (1984). <u>The resident</u> assistant (3rd ed.). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
- Crime wave hits campus (1971, September). <u>U.S. News and</u>
 World Report, pp. 24-26.
- Crime wave on campus (1973, October). Time, p. 77.
- Decker, S., and Wyckoff, P. (1977). Student security for residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 7, 18-20.
- Dowd, M. (1983, September). Rape: The sexual weapon. <u>Time</u>, 00. 27-29.
- Dukiet, K (1975). Awareness is key to prevention of campus crime. College Management, 8, 16-17.
- Dulow, F. (1982). Student participation in community crime prevention. Human Organization, 41 (4), 307-314.
- Gallagher, B. (1974). Campus in crisis. New York: Jossey/ Bass.
- Garafolo, J. (1979). Victimization and the fear of crime.

 <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</u>, <u>16</u> (1),
 80-97.
- Handley, J. (1980). Crime prevention in university residence halls. Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 10, 24-28.
- Hood, A. (1974). The effects of serious crime upon the attitudes toward resident hall security. <u>Journal of College Student Personnel</u>, 14, 352-356.

- Hood, A. (1981). Fourth amendment rights in the college residence hall. <u>Journal of College and University</u>
 Student Housing, 11 (2), 13-16.
- Huston, T. (1981). Bystander intervention into crime: A study based on naturally occurring episodes. <u>Social</u>
 Psychology Quarterly, 44 (31), 14-23.
- Jacobs, J., and O'Meara, V. (1980). Security forces and the transformation of the American university. College and University, 23, 283-295.
- Lavrakas, P. (1982). Citizen participation in neighborhood crime prevention. Criminology, 20 (3-4), 479-498.
- Mehreu, E. (1983, March). A case of attempted rape. Newsweek, pp. 11-12.
- Meyer, T. (1984, December 5). Date rape: A serious campus problem that few talk about. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1, 12.
- Middleton, L (1981, October 7). Many campuses losing ground in war against crime. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 5-6.
- Nicholson, G. (1981). Pursuing campus safety in the 80's: An opinion from the attorney general's office. Thrust, $\underline{11}$, 26-27.
- Thomas, C. (1978). Getting tough about rape: Self defense.

 Human Behavior, 7, 24-26.

DEPARTMENT OF RESIDENCE: STUDENT SECURITY SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: The information you provide in this survey will be used to 1) assess student satisfaction/ dissatisfaction with currently existing services and conditions, and 2) to improve student services and conditions. (NOTE: This information is confidential; your name cannot be identified.)

Check (√) one of	each of the following categories:	
1. Age:	2. Sex:	3. Residence Hall:
a 17-19 b 20-22 c 23 or old	aMale bFemale	a. Bartlett d. Dancer g. Noehren b. Bender e. Hagemann h. Rider c. Campbell f. Lawther i. Shull
4. Number of semest	ers in residence halls:	5. Classification:
a. one do two e three f	four g seven five h eight or more six	a. Freshman d. Senior b. Sophomore e. Graduate c. Junior
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disa No Opinior		Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
	would give my residence hall lock com- ination to my girl/boyfriend.	SA A D SD NO 26. There is adquate lighting on the UNI campus to provide security.
	nere is adequate student involvement with ecurity in my house.	SA A D SD NO 27. My property is safe when I leave and lock my door.
	ne UNI Security Police help to provide a afe campus.	SA A D SD NO 28. I would close any exterior residence hall door I found propped open.
ot	am responsible for the security of thers in my residence hall.	SA A D SD NO 29. My Resident Assistant has helped me be aware of security concerns and safety procedures.
re	would allow any strangers entrance to the esidence hall who could not open the ombination lock.	SA A D SD NO 30. A primary role of UNI security is parking control.
re	believe that all residents should be equired to evacuate the residence hall henever a fire alarm is sounded.	SA A D SD NO 31. I would confront any suspected sexual assault situations.
SA A D SD NO 12. My	y room security is primarily my roommate's nd my responsibility.	SA A D SD NO 32. I seldom lock my door when I leave my room and stay in my house.
SA A D SD NO 13. A	major role of UNI security is helping tudents.	SA A D SD NO 33. My hall has sufficient fire safety equipment equipment (smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, etc.) to provide a safe environment
	ther residents in my house do not contribute o my security.	SA A D SD NO 34. I would report any person who I witnessed vandalizing or damaging hall property.
	rarely walk across the UNI campus alone at ight.	SA A D SD NO 35. Residence hall staff are responsible for my safety and security.
	would report any person who I witnessed ulling a fire alarm.	Circle YES or NO for the following items:
	seldom leave my room without locking my	YES NO 36. I feel that the UNI students are adequately informed concerning safety procedures.
e	he combination lock system on residence hall xterior doors contributes positively to a afe hall.	YES NO 37. I am aware of the Shull Hall Escort Service. YES NO 38. I know the phone number for UNI Campus Security. YES NO 39. I feel that alcohol consumption contributes to the
	major role of UNI security is safety and/or ecurity education of the UNI students.	number of accidents and injuries.
	am aware of the proper evacuation procedures	YES NO 40. I have read the booklet, "What Every Woman Should Know About Self Protection."

in case of fire.

witnessed.

hall.

MJW 11/20/84

SA A D SD NO 21. I am responsible for the safety of those

SA A D SD NO 22. I would report any sexual assaults that I

SA A D SD NO 23. I would confront any strangers I see in the

SA A D SD NO 25. I am responsible for my own security and

SA A D SD NO 24. I would give my residence hall lock combination

to a person from another hall.

safety in the residence halls.

living in my house.

41. I have attended a program that deals with the

43. I have been sexually assaulted this semester at

safety and self defense against sexual assaults.

NO 44. I am aware of the Residence Watch Program and its

safety procedures of my residence hall.

42. I utilize the Shull Hall Escort Services.

YES NO 45. I have attended a program dealing with personal

Use the back side of this sheet for any additional

UNI.

procedures.

comments you may wish to make.

YES NO

YES NO

YES

YES

Appendix B

TO: The Resident Assistant

FROM: Mike Woeste

DATE: November 28, 1984 RE: SECURITY SURVEY

My name is Michael Woeste, and I am a graduate student at the University of Northern Iowa in College Student Personnel Services.

I am in the process of conducting research in determining levels of satisfaction with security and safety in the residence and campus environment, and I need your help in distributing and collecting the survey.

Your role is to distribute these surveys to any members of your house, making certain that you choose at least one freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate student if applicable.

All information they need will be supplied in the cover letter. I realize that you are burdened at this time of the year, but your time and participation are vital to my research.

Thank you.

/bjh

TO: UNI Students

My name is Michael Woeste and I am a graduate student at the University of Northern Iowa, in College Student Personnel Services.

I am in the process of conducting research in determining levels of satisfaction with security and safety in the residence and campus environment, and your input is vital.

I realize that you are burdened at this time of the semester, but I would really appreciate your time in filling out this survey and returning it to your residence hall main desk as soon as possible.

This questionnaire is a very integral part of my research and through your participation, relevant data can be evaluated and subjected to further investigation.

Thank you very much,

Michael Woeste

/bjh