DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 648 HE 031 101

AUTHOR Santucci, Kimberly B.; Gable, Robert K.
TITLE Student Perceptions of Campus Safety at a Large Rural University.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Research Association (Ellenville, NY, October 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Campuses; College Buildings; *College Students; Dormitories; Higher Education; On Campus Students; Rural Areas; *Rural Schools; Safety; *School Safety; School Security; Sex Differences; Stealing; *Student Attitudes; Universities; Victims of Crime; Violence

ABSTRACT

This study examined student attitudes and behaviors regarding campus safety at a large rural university. A 31-item instrument was developed, and a panel of eight expert judges reviewed the survey items. A total of 16 residence halls participated in the study, and 970 surveys were distributed with 529 returns. A principal components analysis (varimax rotation) derived four components "factors" -- theft and violence in the residence halls, sense of safety on campus, sense of safety in the residence halls, and university contributions to safety. The factor of university contributions to safety was discarded due to low reliability. Females felt less safe than did males on campus and in residence halls, and females perceived theft and violence to be more likely to occur in their residence hall. Students living in co-ed halls felt less safe than did males who lived in all-male halls with respect to campus safely. Males walked alone after dark more frequently than did females. Females used the university escort service more frequently than did males, while underclass students used the escorts more often than did upperclass students. A plan of action to enhance safety on campus will be developed based on the study data. A survey form and statistical findings are appended. (SW)

Student Perceptions of Campus Safety at a Large Rural University[1]

Kimberly B. Santucci Robert K. Gable

University of Connecticut

Abstract

This study examines issues of campus safety at a large rural university. Many colleges and universities have reported increased concern about campus safety in recent years. Campus police departments, residential life staff and educational services at many institutions are working to enhance student safety. A 31 item instrument was developed to assess student attitudes and behaviors regarding campus safety issues. A panel of eight expert judges reviewed the survey items. A total of 16 residence halls participated in the study and 970 surveys were distributed with 529 returns (55%). A principal components analysis (varimax rotation) derived four components "factors" (Theft and Violence in the Residence Halls, Sense of Safety on Campus, Sense of Safety in the Residence Halls, University Contributions to Safety). Alpha reliabilities of the first three factors ranged from .78 to .82. The University Contributions to Safety factor was discarded due to low alpha reliability. Significant findings indicated that females felt less safe than males on campus and in residence halls and perceived theft and violence to be more likely to occur in their residence hall. Students living in co-ed halls felt less safe than males living in all-male halls with respect to campus safety. Males walk alone after dark more frequently than females. Females use the University Escort Service more frequently than males, while underclass students use the University Escort Service more often than upperclass students. The intercorrelations between attitudes and behaviors indicated that students who feel very safe on campus and in the residence halls tend to walk alone after dark. The Department of Residential Life will develop a plan of action to enhance safety on campus based on the results of the data.

---

[1]Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Research Association, October, 1997, Ellenville, NY.

Statement of the Problem

The issue of student safety on college campuses has become one of importance in recent years. This paper will report on the development of a student attitude survey, along with an assessment of perceptions of safety issues at a large rural Northeastern university.

A study conducted by Beeler (1991) at 701 universities and colleges across the United States reported that most institutions have experienced increased concern about campus safety. In this study, parking lots and pathways proved to be some of the more unsafe areas on campuses. Lighting in these areas was frequently reported to be inadequate. Beeler also found that emergency telephones at several institutions were not typically placed in appropriate locations. In addition, it was reported that many campuses were not doing enough to keep non-residents and strangers out of residence hall buildings. For example, most residence halls did not have alarm systems that alert staff members when exterior hall doors are propped open after dark. Only a third of the institutions that Beeler studied reported installing safety screens on ground level residence hall windows or security phones outside residence halls for delivery calls. Fewer than half the institutions required log records to be kept for non-resident guests.

Safety education programs are common at institutions with residence halls (Beeler, 1991). One university Women's Center that offers such safety awareness programs reports that acquaintance rape is a serious problem on campuses nationwide. Studies show that sexual assaults occur more frequently among college-age women than any other population (UConn Women's Center, 1995).

In an effort to promote safety on campus, a university police department at a large Northeastern university located in a rural setting produced a safety brochure that is distributed to all students living in residence halls. They strongly recommended that students not walk alone after dark and cautioned that students not stay in academic buildings late at night. Further, they emphasized that students living in residence halls should lock their door at all times (UConn Police Department, 1995).

Methodology

Instrument

An instrument was developed to assess student attitudes and behaviors regarding campus safety issues (see Appendix A). Following some demographic questions, the first section contains 20 items responded to on a 4-point Likert agreement scale to assess student attitudes toward campus safety; the second section contains 11 items responded to on a 5-point Likert frequency scale and assesses student behaviors and experiences with respect to campus safety.

Content Validity. Content validity of the survey was based on a review of literature and discussion with the Assistant Director of Residential Life. Four a priori categories were determined and items were developed for the attitude measure (Physical Safety in Residence Halls; Physical Safety on Campus; Physical Safety at Parties; Safety of Personal Possessions). The behavior items reflected the same categories. A panel of eight expert judges reviewed the item stems including the Director of Residential Research, the Assistant Director of Residential Life, the Complex Coordinator, a Hall Director, an Assistant Hall Director, the Chief of Police, and a police officer. The review required item stems to be added, deleted and modified to enhance clarity. To allow for a reasonable instrument length, the category Physical Safety at Parties was removed.

Construct Validity. To examine construct validity, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to empirically derive factors reflected by the items and to determine if there was a relationship between the judgementally developed categories and the empirically derived factors. A principal components analysis with varimax and oblique rotations was carried out using SPSS (Gable & Wolf, 1993).

Sampling

Table 1 contains the sample demographic data. A total of 16 residence halls including one all-female, one all-male and 14 co-ed halls participated in the study. Survey administration was conducted by 29 male and female resident assistants (RAs), who were asked to obtain representative samples of male and female students. A total of 970 surveys were distributed and

534 (244 males, 283 females identified their gender) were returned to the RAs (55%).

Analyses

Table 2 summarizes the results of a principal components analysis (varimax rotation) which derived four components (to be called "factors" in this study) accounting for 54% of the total variance. Factor I was called *Theft and Violence in the Residence Halls (Theft & Violence).* A high scoring person would be very 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. Factor II was named *Sense of Safety in the Residence Halls (Hall Safety).* A high scoring person would feel a strong sense of physical safety in the residence hall at all times and in all areas of the building. Factor III was called *Sense of Safety on Campus (Campus Safety).* A high scoring person would feel a strong 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. Factor IV was named *University Contributions to Safety.* A high scoring person would feel that the university does an excellent job contributing to campus safety and is pleased with the role of the police, Escort Service and residential staff in terms of providing a safe environment.

The first three factors were conceptually very similar to the judgementally derived categories. The fourth factor emerged as a new construct. The factor correlation matrix did not suggest combining any factors. Table 3 contains the item analysis and alpha reliabilities for Factors I, II & III, which ranged from .78 to .82 and can be considered high. However, the reliability for Factor IV was only .42. Since this content area was not adequately addressed by the items in the survey, it was reasonable to simply discard Factor IV for the current study.

Results

Student Attitudes

This section will present the student attitude data for gender, class year and type of hall.

Gender by Class Year. A 2-way ANOVA (gender by class year) was run for each of the three factors Theft & Violence, Hall Safety, and Campus Safety (see Tables 4, 5 & 6

respectively). Significant findings were as follows: Females scored lower than males ($p = .00$) with respect to their attitude toward Theft and Violence in the Residence Halls. Examination of the item-level means ($p = .000$) suggested that the largest differences were found for three items indicating that females more than males believe that theft (especially of clothing items in the laundry room) and sexual assaults are more likely to occur in their residence hall. There was also a statistically significant main effect difference among class year ($p = .03$) with respect to their perceptions of Theft & Violence. Although freshman and seniors appeared to have higher scores regarding the possibility of theft and violence occurring in the residence halls, follow-up Scheffé analyses indicated the differences among the class years were not statistically significant.

Females also scored lower than males ($p = .03$) with respect to their Sense of Safety in Residence Halls. Examination of the item-level means ($p = .008$) suggested that the largest difference was found for one item indicating that females feel less safe in the laundry room. There was no statistically significant interaction between gender and class year for Sense of Safety in Residence Halls.

Females scored significantly lower than males ($p = .00$) with respect to their Sense of Safety on Campus. Examination of the item-level means ($p = .000$) suggested that the largest differences were found for three items indicating that females feel less safe both in campus parking lots and walking alone after dark and are more likely to feel that the campus is not well-lighted. While there was no statistically significant interaction between gender and class year, we note a trend for upperclass females to have less of a Sense of Safety on campus than underclass females. Males tended to remain constant in their Sense of Safety on Campus regardless of year in school.

Type of Hall. Residence hall data were recoded to reflect all-male, all-female and co-ed halls. A 1-way ANOVA by hall was run for each of the three factors (see Table 7). Regarding perceptions of Campus Safety, differences were found among the types of halls ($p = .001$). Students living in the all-male hall scored significantly higher (i.e., felt safer) than students living in co-ed halls ($p = .05$). Item-level 1-way ANOVAs by hall indicated that residents in the co-ed hall felt less safe walking alone after dark and in academic buildings at night ($p = .000$). In addition, students living in co-ed and all-female halls feel significantly less safe ($p = .000$) in campus parking lots after dark than males living in the all-male hall. There were no differences among hall groups with respect to perceptions of Hall Safety and Theft & Violence. It was found,

though, that students living in the all-female hall scored significantly lower ($p = .008$) than students living in the co-ed halls with respect to sense of safety in the laundry room. Upon further inquiry, it was discovered that the laundry room in the all-female hall was located below ground-level in the basement in a secluded area. Laundry rooms in the co-ed halls were located at ground level or above ground on floors where residents live.

Student Behaviors

This research also examined the relationship between student attitudes and behaviors. This section will first report on the behavior data by type of hall, gender and class level. Relationships among the attitudes and behaviors will then be described.

Type of Hall. A 1-way ANOVA by hall was run for each of the behavior items in Section II of the survey (see Table 8). Significant findings were as follows:

Students living in the all-male hall scored significantly higher ($p = .001$) than students living in either all-female or co-ed halls with respect to the frequency with which they walk alone on campus after dark. Students living in the co-ed halls scored significantly higher ($p = .028$) than students living in all-male halls with respect to the frequency with which they carry mace or pepper spray.

Gender. Table 9 contains results of item-level t-tests that were run to study differences between males and females for the behavior items. Results indicate that females use the Escort Service significantly ($p = .000$) more often than males. Males walk alone after dark significantly ($p = .000$) more than females. Females lock their door when they are not in their room and when they are sleeping at night significantly ($p = .000$) more often than males. Females also carry pepper spray or mace significantly ($p = .007$) more frequently than males.

Class Level. Table 10 contains results of item-level t-tests that were run to study response differences between underclass students (freshman and sophomores) and upperclass students (juniors and seniors) for the behavior items. Results indicate that underclass students use the Escort Service significantly ($p = .002$) more often than upperclass students. In addition, upperclass students scored significantly ($p = .001$) higher than underclass students with respect to the frequency with which they walk alone after dark.

Relationships Between Attitudes and Behaviors

Psychologists have often studied and supported the link between attitudes and behaviors (see e.g., Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Severy, 1974; Triandis, 1971). It seems reasonable to examine how student attitudes toward issues regarding campus safety relate to their actual behaviors on campus.

Table 11 contains the intercorrelations among the three attitude factors (Theft & Violence, Campus Safety, Hall Safety) and the six student behaviors identified at the bottom of the table. Two correlations between the attitude factors and student behavior items were associated with medium effect sizes. These correlations are bolded in Table 11. Students who tended to feel a very strong sense of safety on campus and in the residence halls indicated that they walk alone frequently at night (r = .43, item 4 and Campus Safety; r = .33 item 4 and Hall Safety). While not reaching the medium effect size standard, it is interesting to note that students who tended to feel a strong sense of safety on campus and in the residence halls indicated that they do not carry mace or pepper spray (r = -.27, item 6 and Campus Safety; r = -.29, item 6 and Hall Safety). In addition, students having a strong sense of safety on campus also indicated that they do not lock their door while sleeping at night (r = -.25, item 9 and Campus Safety). While these relationships appear to exist, it may not be wise for students to exhibit these behaviors.

Based on the results of the data, the Department of Residential Life will develop a plan of action to enhance safety for residents living in the complex area and may distribute the survey campus-wide to assess the safety needs of other residential complex areas. The assessment process employed in this study, as well as the findings, should be of interest to other college and university communities.

References

Beeler, K. (1991). *Campus safety: A survey of administrative perceptions and strategies.* National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gable, R. K., and Wolf, M. B. (1993). Instrument development in the affective domain. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Severy, L.J. (1974). *Procedures and issues in the measurement of attitudes* (TM Report 30). Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Triandis, H.C. (1971). *Attitudes and attitude change.* New York: Wiley.

University of Connecticut Division of Public Safety. (1995) *Campus safety: The uniform campus crime report* [Brochure]. Storrs, CT.

University of Connecticut Women's Center. (1995). *Sexual assault and acquaintance rape* [Brochure]. Storrs, CT.

Appendix A

Campus Safety Survey

Year: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Grad

Gender: Male Female

Residence Hall:_____

Room Type: Single Double Triple

Section I: This section contains statements that address student attitudes about campus safety. Please read each statement and circle the number that indicates **how much you agree** with the statement.

SD=Strongly Disagree **D=Disagree** **A=Agree** **SA=Strongly Agree**

	SD	D	A	SA
1. I feel safe walking alone on campus after dark.	1	2	3	4
2. Theft is not likely to occur in my residence hall.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
3. I feel safe in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4
4. The campus is well-lighted.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
5. I feel safe when I am sleeping at night.	1	2	3	4
6. I feel safe in the laundry room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
7. The UConn police are visible on campus.	1	2	3	4

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

	SD	D	A	SA
8. I feel comfortable keeping valuable items in my room.	1	2	3	4
9. The University Escort Service is convenient and accessible.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
10. The UConn police contribute to the safety of the University.	1	2	3	4
11. I feel safe in academic buildings at night.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
12. Sexual assaults are not likely to occur in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4
13. My personal possessions are safe when I am not in my room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
14. I feel safe in campus parking lots after dark.	1	2	3	4
15. I feel safe in my residence hall on weekends.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
16. I trust people that live in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4
17. Emergency telephones are in appropriate locations around campus.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
18. The presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall.	1	2	3	4
19. My clothing items are not likely to be stolen from the laundry room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
20. Physical assaults (fights) are not likely to occur in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4

Section II: This section contains statements that address student behaviors and experiences with respect to safety issues. Please read each statement and circle the number that indicates the frequency for which each statement holds true.

N=Never R=Rarely O=Occasionally F=Frequently VF=Very Frequently

	N	R	O	F	VF
1. I use the University Escort Service after dark.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The doors in my residence hall are propped at night.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3. I lock my door when I am not in my room.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I walk alone after dark.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5. Solicitors enter my residence hall selling T-shirts, magazines, posting flyers etc..	1	2	3	4	5
6. I carry pepper spray or mace with me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7. Safety education programs are offered in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Items have been stolen from my room.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9. I lock my door when I sleep at night.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
10. I attend safety awareness programs that are offered in my residence hall.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Strangers enter my residence hall.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. There is space on the back page for comments. Please return this survey to your RA.

Comments:

Table 1

Demographic Data

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	244	46.1
Female	283	53.5
Missing	2	.4

Year	Frequency	Percent
Freshman	206	38.9
Sophmore	146	27.6
Junior	90	17.0
Senior	76	14.4
Grad	2	.4
Missing	9	1.7

Type of Hall	Frequency	Percent
All Male	39	7.4
All Female	27	5.1
Co-ed	463	87.5

Table 2
Principal Components Analysis
with Varimax Rotation

Component ("Factor")	Item Number	Stem	Loading
Factor 1			
	2	Theft is not likely to occur in my residence hall.	.75
Theft & Violence in Residence Halls	20	Physical assaults (fights) are not likely to occur in my residence hall.	.74
	12	Sexual assaults are not likely to occur in my residence hall.	.68
	13	My personal possessions are safe when I am in my room.	.63
	19	My clothing items are not likely to be stolen from the laundry room.	.63
	8	I feel comfortable keeping valuable items in my room.	.52
	16	I trust the people that live in my residence hall	.46
Factor 2			
	5	I feel safe when I am sleeping at night.	.75
My Sense of Safety in the Residence Halls	15	I feel safe in my residence hall on weekends.	.70
	3	I feel safe in my residence hall.	.70
	6	I feel safe in the laundry room.	.68
Factor 3			
	14	I feel safe in campus parking lots after dark.	.76
My Sense of Safety on Campus	1	I feel safe walking alone on campus after dark.	.76
	17	Emergency telephones are in appropriate locations around campus.	.63
	4	The campus is well-lighted.	.63
	11	I feel safe in academic buildings at night.	.50
Factor 4			
	10	The police contribute to the safety of the University.	.69
University Contributions to Safety	9	The University Escort Service is convenient and accessible.	.68
	18	The presence of my RA contributes to the safety of the residence hall.	.51

Table 3

Item Analysis and Alpha Reliability Data

Response Percentages

Factors	Item Number	SD	D	A	SA	Mean	Std Dev	r within Factor	Alpha if Item Deleted	Factor Alpha Reliability
Factor I *Theft and Violence in Residence Halls*	2	12	31	48	9	2.55	.816	.62	.79	.82
	20	9	32	47	11	2.61	.803	.61	.79	
	12	9	32	45	13	2.64	.813	.58	.80	
	13	5	17	64	13	2.87	.692	.67	.78	
	19	9	28	53	7	2.60	.764	.48	.81	
	8	3	18	67	11	2.86	.645	.58	.80	
	16	3	16	59	21	2.99	.698	.44	.82	
Factor 2 *My Sense of Safety in Residence Halls*	5	2	4	57	37	3.30	.620	.64	.73	.80
	15	1	7	66	24	3.14	.588	.66	.73	
	3	1	6	61	32	3.26	.580	.60	.76	
	6	2	10	59	28	3.14	.661	.55	.78	
Factor 3 *My Sense of Safety on Campus*	14	16	35	40	8	2.40	.860	.66	.70	.78
	1	9	24	50	16	2.73	.843	.66	.70	
	17	6	28	57	7	2.67	.703	.47	.77	
	4	11	38	44	6	2.48	.757	.52	.76	
	11	2	17	64	15	2.94	.637	.51	.76	
Factor 4 *University Contributions to Safety*	10	4	22	63	10	2.79	.668	.34	.19	.42
	9	12	28	48	9	2.56	.820	.25	.33	
	18	5	21	58	14	2.81	.740	.18	.45	

Table 4

Gender and Class Year Means and ANOVA Results for

Theft and Violence in the Residence Halls

		Gender		
		Male	Female	
Year	Fresh	2.97	2.68	2.80
	Soph	2.75	2.60	2.66
	Junior	2.77	2.55	2.66
	Senior	2.75	2.68	2.72
		2.83	2.63	

Source Table

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Prob
Main Effects					
Gender	5.62	1	5.62	20.95	.00
Year	2.45	3	.82	3.04	.03
Interaction	.77	3	.26	.96	.41
Residual	136.45	509	.27		
Total	144.87	516	.28		

Table 5

Gender and Class Year Means and ANOVA Results for

Sense of Safety in the Residence Halls

		Gender		
		Male	Female	
Year	Fresh	3.28	3.17	3.22
	Soph	3.22	3.18	3.22
	Junior	3.16	3.16	3.16
	Senior	3.35	3.14	3.27
		3.27	3.17	

Source Table

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Prob
Main Effects					
Gender	1.18	1	1.18	5.09	.03
Year	.43	3	.14	.61	.61
Interaction	.43	3	.14	.61	.61
Residual	177.88	509	.23		
Total	120.01	516	.23		

Table 6

Gender and Class Year Means and ANOVA Results for

Sense of Safety on Campus

		Gender		
		Male	Female	
Year	Fresh	2.99	2.40	2.64
	Soph	2.98	2.40	2.64
	Junior	2.86	2.27	2.55
	Senior	2.95	2.26	2.71
		2.95	2.37	

Source Table

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Prob
Main Effects					
Gender	44.68	1	44.68	195.12	.00
Year	1.29	3	.43	1.87	.13
Interaction	.17	3	.06	.25	.86
Residual	116.57	509	.23		
Total	162.42	516	.32		

Table 7

Summary of Mean Differences Among Anova Scheffé Results by Type of Hall

Item		Type of Hall[a]			F Ratio	Prob	Summary of Significant Differences
		Male(1)	Female(2)	Co-ed(3)			
Student Attitudes							
Campus Safety	M	2.96	2.68	2.61	7.49	.001	1 > 3
	SD	.42	.58	.56			
Hall Safety	M	3.19	3.18	3.22	.12	.884	—
	SD	.56	.45	.48			
Theft & Violence	M	2.76	2.76	2.72	.16	.852	—
	SD	.50	.59	.53			
1. I feel safe walking alone after dark.	M	3.26	2.78	2.69	8.27	.000	1 > 3
	SD	.64	.80	.85			
6. I feel safe in the laundry room.	M	3.18	2.78	3.16	4.38	.013	3 > 2
	SD	.68	.64	.66			
11. I feel safe in academic buildings at night.	M	3.18	2.96	2.92	3.05	.048	1 > 3
	SD	.56	.66	.63			
14. I feel safe in campus parking lots after dark.	M	2.95	2.38	2.36	8.80	.000	1 > 2, 1 > 3
	SD	.72	.85	.85			

[a] Type of hall designations were "all male", "all female" and "co-ed".

Table 8

Summary of Mean Differences Among Anova Scheffé Results by Type of Hall

Item		Type of Hall[a]			F Ratio	Prob	Summary of Significant Differences
		Male(1)	Female(2)	Co-ed(3)			
Student Behavior							
1. I use the University Escort Service after dark.	M	1.65	2.00	1.88	.96	.383	—
	SD	.95	1.13	1.11			
3. I lock my door when I am not in my room.	M	3.43	3.38	3.43	.03	.972	—
	SD	1.04	.94	1.00			
4. I walk alone after dark.	M	3.86	3.15	3.14	7.35	.001	1>2, 1>3
	SD	.92	.97	1.13			
6. I carry pepper spray or mace with me.	M	1.14	1.81	1.62	3.59	.028	3>1
	SD	.42	1.39	1.16			
9. I lock my door when I sleep at night.	M	1.46	1.81	1.63	1.18	.308	—
	SD	.77	.80	.91			
10. I attend safety awareness programs that are offered in my residence hall.	M	3.46	3.50	3.38	.23	.792	—
	SD	1.07	.99	1.04			

[a] Type of hall designations were "all male", "all female" and "co-ed".

Table 9

Differences Between Male and Female Students for Behavior Items

Item		Gender		t	Prob	Effect Size
		Male(1)	Female(2)			
Student Behavior						
1. I use the University Escort Service after dark.	M	1.60	2.10	5.40	.000	.48
	SD	.89	1.21			
3. I lock my door when I am not in my room.	M	3.56	3.91	3.51	.000	.31
	SD	1.17	1.10			
4. I walk alone after dark.	M	3.69	2.77	10.18	.000	.90
	SD	1.03	1.02			
6. I carry pepper spray or mace with me.	M	1.45	1.72	2.69	.007	.24
	SD	.96	1.27			
9. I lock my door when I sleep at night.	M	3.50	4.51	8.79	.000	.78
	SD	1.51	1.09			
10. I attend safety awareness programs that are offered in my residence hall.	M	1.64	1.61	.38	.704	.03
	SD	.92	.87			

Note: Sample Sizes: Males, N = 244; Females, N = 283. Effect size guidelines are as follows: small = .20, medium = .50, large = .80.

Table 10

Differences Between Underclass and Upperclass Students for Behavior Items

Item		Class Level		t	Prob	Effect Size
		Underclass(1)	Upperclass(2)			
Student Behavior						
1. I use the University Escort Service after dark.	M	1.98	1.65	3.18	.002	.32
	SD	1.18	.87			
3. I lock my door when I am not in my room.	M	3.74	3.74	.04	.969	0
	SD	1.16	1.12			
4. I walk alone after dark.	M	3.07	3.41	3.21	.001	.31
	SD	1.09	1.13			
6. I carry pepper spray or mace with me.	M	1.56	1.66	.96	.335	.09
	SD	1.15	1.15			
9. I lock my door when I sleep at night.	M	4.01	4.15	1.13	.261	.10
	SD	1.42	1.35			
10. I attend safety awareness programs that are offered in my residence hall.	M	1.60	1.66	.76	.450	.07
	SD	.90	.88			

Note: Sample Sizes: Males, N = 244; Females, N = 283. Effect size guidelines are as follows: small = .20, medium = .50, large = .80.

23

Table 11

Intercorrelations Among Survey Factors and Behavior Items

Factor / Item	Theft & Violence	Campus Safety	Hall Safety	Item 1	Item 3	Item 4	Item 6	Item 9	Item 10
Theft & Violence	1.00								
Campus Safety	.44	1.00							
Hall Safety	.53	.51	1.00						
Item 1	-.07	-.17	-.12	1.00					
Item 3	-.10	-.10	.01	-.07	1.00				
Item 4	.16	**.43**	**.33**	-.25	.08	1.00			
Item 6	-.14	-.27	-.29	.07	-.02	-.15	1.00		
Item 9	-.13	-.25	-.06	.01	.50	-.10	.07	1.00	
Item 10	-.11	-.11	-.11	.13	.01	-.14	.29	.01	1.00

Note. For this large sample size, most correlations are significant. Therefore, emphasis for interpretation was placed on medium effect sizes or larger ($r \geq .30$). Effect size (r^2) guidelines are as follows: small = .01, medium = .09, large = .25

Item 1 I use the University Escort Service after dark.
Item 3 I lock my door when I am not in my room.
Item 4 I walk alone after dark.
Item 6 I carry pepper spray or mace with me.
Item 9 I lock my door when I sleep at night.
Item 10 I attend safety awareness programs that are offered in my residence hall.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Student Perceptions of Campus Safety at a Large Rural University.

Author(s): Kimberly B. Santucci ; Robert K. Gable

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Kimberly B. Santucci

Printed Name/Position/Title: Kimberly B. Santucci

Organization/Address: University of Connecticut, Storrs, Ct. 06269

Telephone: (860) 648-1008

FAX:

E-Mail Address: KBS94002@UConnVm.UConn.edu

Date: 1/30/98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
210 O'Boyle Hall
The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com