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Introduction

The safety of college campuses has become an issue of widespread concern in recent years. This could be due to more women going to college today than ever before, as women are often perceived as being more vulnerable than men, or because of a higher perception of risk due to several high profile cases being covered by the national media in recent years. Whatever the reason, safety is a growing concern that must be addressed by college campuses, particularly by administrators. In order for college administrators to address safety concerns, they must be aware of the types of safety issues present on their campus.

This study focuses on student perceptions of safety at the University of Mary Washington. By focusing on student perceptions, this research aims to reveal the types of safety issues students are concerned about, as well as how students perceive safety on campus and how they use and perceive various security services on campus. Investigation of student perceptions of safety on campus is more useful than, for example, focusing solely on crime statistics on campus. This is because, ultimately, college administrators should address both student concerns as well as reported incidents. The results of this project could prove to be a useful tool to help the University of Mary Washington administration understand the types of safety issues students are concerned about on campus.

Literature Review

Considerable research has been conducted on the broad field of perceptions of safety, particularly on the relationship between women’s fear of crime and public space. In recent decades, much more focus has been directed toward the specific topic of student perceptions of safety on college campuses, however, there are gaps in the literature and the field is still growing. This topic falls within several subfields of human geography, with most of the literature
relating to social geography. There have also been specific studies on this topic related to urban and transportation geography. Most of the literature relevant to this topic is in the form of scholarly studies, which include both quantitative and qualitative data. Other relevant literature for this topic includes campus crime statistics and related news articles, such as the University of Mary Washington (UMW) 2009 Annual Security Report, as well as campus safety articles from The Bullet, the UMW student newspaper. The main themes evident among the literature include: perceptions of safety relating to physical structures (including lighting, buildings, and landscaping), perceptions of safety relating to specific types of incidents (including sexual assaults, harassment, physical violence and abuse, theft), precautions taken by students relating to safety, and issues with campus security services and administrations. Nearly all of the literature on this topic explores, to a varying degree, the differences in perceptions of safety among men and women.

Speaking to perceptions of safety relating to physical structures, Fletcher and Bryden (2007, 1153) cite lighting and signage on campus, and the availability of emergency phones as the top three physical safety features of concern on college campuses. This is very important when considering campus safety in terms of specific factors in safety perceptions or designing preventative measures, but more information is needed about the overall campus physical environment. Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink (2009, 555) explore the campus physical environment, stating that certain environmental factors in public settings and their immediate neighborhoods are generally associated with greater perceptions of fear. More specifically, Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink state that there is a strong correlation between a run-down physical environment and a perceived fear of that environment. They go on to say that factors such as darkness, desolation, lack of other people in surrounding areas, and poor maintenance can influence perceptions of
fear about the public setting. In addition, Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink describe the specific design characteristics of public space which can influence perceptions of fear, such as places where there are obstructions in one’s line of sight, where there are many spaces in which someone could hide, and where one would feel trapped, without possible escape routes.

The problem with looking at these physical structures or the design of a campus is that those data focus on the physical environment, ignoring the social environment. Johnson (2009, 452) defines the physical environment of a campus as the physical space in which campus violence occurs. This can be more broadly stated as the physical locations in which campus life or campus activities occur. Johnson lists space design, space use and circulation patterns, territorial features, and physical deterioration as the main elements of the campus physical environment. This contrasts with the social environment of campuses, which Johnson defines as the nature of interactions, or social norms, that occur among students and other members of the university, within the physical environment of the campus. Johnson concludes that the social environment of the campus impacts the behavior of students both at the individual and collective levels. At the individual level, it is the student’s individual beliefs, commitments, involvement, and attachment towards the social environment that impacts behavior. At the collective level, campuses with a cohesive, uniform set of social norms have a social environment which promotes collective action among students. Because the physical and social environments are invariably related to one another, it is important to consider both the campus physical and social environments when studying campus safety. Currie (1994, 25) explains that target hardening strategies, which reduce opportunities for crimes to occur, such as better lighting, become the primary means of alleviating concerns if only the physical environment of a campus is considered. Pain (2000, 370) even argues that the social environment operating within particular
spaces is more important to perceptions of safety and fear of crime than the physical environment. In any case, it is necessary to consider both the social and physical environment of a campus in order to completely address concerns for campus safety.

When thinking about specific incidents, student perceptions of safety vary widely between men and women. For example, Currie (1994, 33) found that a significantly higher number of women reported experiencing threatening incidents on campus than men. Currie believes that this higher incidence leads women to be more fearful on college campuses than men, and as a result, take more safety precautions than men. In their study, Fletcher and Bryden (2007, 1153) found that women perceive themselves as belonging to a group that they feel is more victimized than others. The same study also found that high numbers of women consciously avoid specific areas of campus during the night, avoid walking alone, and are vigilant for suspicious activity. This shows that women are aware of potential safety risks on campus, either through common knowledge or first hand experience, and act accordingly to protect themselves. According to Day (1994), women have an increased level of worry towards crime on campus, forcing them to adopt precautionary measures and restrict their activities and behaviors. This leads to limitations in educational, social, and leisure opportunities, which could effect the overall quality of life for women on college campuses.

Also relevant to student perceptions of safety is risk perception literature. Brown and Morley (2007, 575) explain that the majority of people believe “that their personal susceptibility to negative events is less than that of the average person.” This is an important implication for campus safety, where students may perceive their risk to be lower than it is in reality. Relevant risk perception literature consists of studies which examine specific aspects of campus safety, such as alcohol use or sexual assault. In one such study, Crawford et al. (2008) surveyed female
students about their perceptions of risks associated with sexual assault during and after social gatherings. The findings of this study show that most participants did not perceive the potential negative consequences of risky behavior, such as accepting a drink from an acquaintance or leaving a drink unattended. Crawford et al. conclude that programs aimed at both awareness and risk reduction could help to bridge the gap between perceived risk and actual risk related to campus safety.

Many studies report that most students, especially women, take some type of safety precaution to protect themselves on campus. These include avoidance strategies (not walking at night, staying away from specific areas of campus), walking with other students, carrying an object which could be used as a weapon, or carrying a weapon (Currie 1994, 33). Currie also found that men and women use safety precautions differently. Men are much more likely to carry a weapon than women, while women are much more likely to use avoidance strategies. Overall, men were much more likely than women to use no safety precautions at all. Starkweather (2007, 365) also found that students may utilize boldness strategies when managing campus safety concerns, saying, “People acting boldly do not limit their activities in response to perceptions of safety, because they feel that they are safe … individuals may deal with fear by rejecting or overcoming it.” A final way of coping with safety concerns on campus is seeking out campus resources (Kelly and Torres 2006, 32). This strategy, however, was used by very few of the students studied by Kelly and Torres, even though most students reported that they were aware that such resources existed. This could be due to a variety of reasons, including students believing that they did not need assistance or not having an established relationship with staff members at campus resources.
One of the most common problems explored in the literature relating to issues with campus security services and college administrations is the fact that many threatening incidents go unreported on college campuses. Currie (1994, 25) writes:

Given that the recorded assaults against women on my campus are historically infrequent, conventional wisdom encourages administrators to treat women’s fears of victimization as the problem, rather than to read their fears as symptomatic of victimization. The common understanding is … women over-estimate their risk of assault. This claim that women’s fear of crime is out of proportion to their actual rates of victimization can lead to the conclusion that women’s concerns are “irrational.”

Currie claims that because very few assaults have occurred on her campus, administrators believe that women’s concerns about campus safety are unfounded. Administrators consequently decide that the best way to deal with those concerns is to treat the perceptions, rather than the actual issues with campus safety, as the problem. In reality, many threatening incidents go unreported on college campuses. In fact, Copeland and Wolfe (1995, 68) report that less than five percent of college women report incidents of rape to the police, and more than half of college women who experience rape tell no one about their assaults. Copeland and Wolfe support these statistics with studies by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which show that only 10 percent of all rapes and sexual assaults are reported to the police. This is especially troublesome because many college administrators and campus safety services base their policies and programs on the types of crimes and threatening incidents that are reported. Currie’s claim, along with the findings of Copeland and Wolfe, support the fact that when administrators plan policies and programs, they should consider student perceptions of safety, rather than solely relying on crime statistics.

The issue of viewing women’s safety concerns as irrational is closely related to the problem of victim-blaming on college campuses. Kelly and Torres (2006, 33) report: “Women
students in this study reported that male students chided them when they shared stories of being
victimized or assisted in women feeling the only way to be safe was to be with a man.” This is
obviously problematic because it fosters a culture of victim-blaming, which creates an
uncomfortable, and often unhealthy, environment for victims of crime. Other studies, including
Currie (1994) and Fletcher and Bryden (2007), found that women will often avoid reporting
incidents either because they blame themselves or fear that others will blame them for the
incident. Again, this is problematic if campus administrators base campus safety initiatives solely
on crime statistics, which may not tell the complete story of campus security.

Bohmer and Parrot (1993) delve deeper into the issue of why victims of sexual assault on
college campuses rarely report incidents to the authorities. These victims often believe that they
are at fault, either because alcohol was involved or because they voluntarily went out with the
perpetrator. These victims also worry that if they were to report the incident, the authorities
would blame them for the assault for the same reasons. Other victims do not report sexual
assaults because they believe that the school does not take these incidents seriously, or are ill-
equipped to handle such incidents. They believe that it is not worth the trouble to go through the
reporting process when it is unlikely that anything will happen to the perpetrator. In any case, the
fact that many incidents, especially those as serious as sexual assaults, go unreported on college
campuses is disturbing. This is a fact which also must be taken into consideration when
administrators are considering campus security.

On another side of this issue, Gilchrist et al. (1998) explore the argument that women
have an irrational response to a low threat of crime. This could be attributed to the stereotypes
that women are more vulnerable to attack than men, less able to defend themselves, and less able
to cope with victimization. Other possible causes for women’s heightened fear of crime are that
women suffer more daily, low level victimization (such as sexual harassment) than men, women fear sexual assault, which is generally not perceived as a threat for men, and that women fear unusual, serious crimes, which often involve female victims and are exaggerated in the media. Gilchrist also suggests that women are socialized to fear public space, strangers, and men, and thus have a higher fear of crime in general. It is important to note that many of these claims concerning women’s high fear of crime have been challenged by other research, including research that shows many crimes against women go unreported (see Bohmer and Parrot 1993; Currie 1994; Fletcher and Bryden 2007; Copeland and Wolfe 1995). In particular, Gordon and Riger (1989, 118) argue that it would be irresponsible to advise women to completely stop being afraid, even if this heightened fear is irrational. Society must first take responsibility for this female fear, and address both actual crime and perceptions of crime against women. Until this occurs, fear, and the behaviors that come with fear (such as avoidance strategies), may actually protect some women.

Campus security services vary markedly among college campuses, but most studies report campus security providing some form of security patrol, safety escort service, emergency phone system (also known as “blue lights”), and emergency phone numbers. Fletcher and Bryden (2007, 1160) found that the majority of people in their study were aware of campus security and foot patrols, but fewer people had actually used either of these services. Students were much more likely to use avoidance strategies, walk with another person, or use some sort of weapon (including using keys in a defensive manner) than they were to contact campus security or use the foot patrol. According to Hall and Sandler (1984, 9), women rarely use campus security services, and, in some cases, campus safety personnel may even unintentionally
discourage women from using such services by diminishing women’s concerns when they report feeling threatened.

Some studies examine what campus security services could do to minimize safety risks to students. Franzosa (2009) states that the most effective way to do this is through encouraging communication between students and campus security services. Franzosa argues that by communicating that campus security is alert and knows how to react in any situation, students are more likely to be informed and participate in campus safety measures. Students also need to be informed of the risks that exist, without being unnecessarily fearful of the campus. “The key to fighting campus insecurity is not to create fear or diminish freedom, but rather to keep resources available, raise awareness that threats exist, and maintain open lines of communication” (Franzosa 2009, 21).

The literature on student perceptions of campus safety reveals that gender is an important dimension of this topic, and that there are marked differences in safety concerns between men and women. Several studies on college campuses, such as those of Currie (1994) and Fletcher and Bryden (2007), which present both quantitative and qualitative data, provide insight to perceptions of safety relating to physical structures (including lighting, buildings, and landscaping), perceptions of safety relating to specific types of incidents (including sexual assaults, harassment, physical violence, abuse, and theft), precautions taken by students relating to safety, and issues with campus security services and administrations. This project incorporated insights from the literature to develop a campus safety perceptions survey and provide questions for semi-structured interviews, and expands upon these studies by examining student perceptions of safety at the University of Mary Washington.
Methodology

Most of the existing studies on campus safety incorporate both survey and interview methods. This methodology is useful for the topic of campus safety because statistics from surveys tell only a partial story. In order to determine how students truly feel and perceive campus safety, some form of personal interviewing must also take place. Starkweather (2007) both used surveying and interviewing methodologies to explore student perceptions of campus safety. Starkweather distributed surveys in general education courses in order to obtain a random sampling of undergraduate students, then conducted semi-structured interviews with a small sample of students who, on the survey, indicated willingness to be interviewed. Other studies used a similar methodology, including Kelly and Torres (2006) and Currie (1994).

Like Starkweather’s, this study uses both surveying and interviewing methodologies in order to get a more complete picture of student perceptions of campus safety, with the first portion of the research being the surveying phase. In order to distribute surveys and interview students, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (Appendix A). The survey consists of four main sections, all of which aim to uncover the beliefs, attitudes, and opinions of students towards campus safety and security services (Appendix B). The first section contains several statements concerning personal beliefs towards campus safety, and respondents were asked to choose strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, or not applicable. The second section of the survey contains yes or no questions, asking whether or not respondents have ever utilized certain campus security services, including the Campus Police and the Blue Light system. The third section asks respondents to rate campus security services and physical features on campus, such as the presence of police officers and lighting on campus. Respondents could select extremely satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, or extremely dissatisfied. The
fourth section of the survey was an open ended question, asking respondents to identify as many as three places where they feel the least safe, using a campus map. Finally, there was also a section which asked the respondent to identify their sex, year at the university, and residential status.

The survey was distributed in a variety of classes, including introductory and upper level courses in several different departments. The goal was to get a random sampling of students, including both men and women, residential and commuter students, and students from different majors and class years. In order to minimize the amount of instructional time this survey took out of classes, the survey was distributed at the beginning of the class, and then respondents could complete it on their own time, and return it to the professor during the next class. The response rate for this survey was about 73 percent. This is a relatively high response rate, considering respondents had to complete the surveys on their own time, and then bring it back to the next class. In the end, 301 surveys were completed, returned, and compiled for the final results, meaning that about 7.5 percent of the undergraduate student body completed the survey.

After the development and distribution of the student survey, and compilation of the results, the next phase of this study was student interviews. Interview questions were developed based on the results of the surveys (Appendix C). For this study, the interview is simply a tool used to clarify and expand upon responses on the survey, as well as to investigate various trends found in the results of the survey. After both the surveying and interviewing phases of the study were finished, a final analysis was completed to tie together all of the findings. Together, the data from the surveys and the interview responses aim to provide a more complete depiction of student perceptions of campus safety.
Results

Of the 301 students surveyed, 67 percent were female and 32 percent were male (Table 1). For the most recent incoming classes at UMW, 65 percent were female and 35 percent were male, which shows that the survey captured a realistic population distribution in terms of sex. In terms of class year, 33 percent of students surveyed were first year students, 27 percent were second years, 22 percent were third years, 16 percent were fourth years, and 1 percent were fifth years. When examining the results of the survey, it is important to note that the distribution of class year among respondents is slightly uneven. This slightly uneven distribution is due to the fact that it was difficult to find professors who were willing to distribute surveys to their upper level classes, which would typically have more third and fourth year students. When asked to identify their residential status, 64 percent live on campus (56 percent in residence halls, eight percent in the UMW Apartments) and 34 percent live off campus (28 percent in the Fredericksburg area, six percent outside the Fredericksburg area). This is consistent with campus wide statistics, which show that 65 percent of students live on campus in residence halls or campus apartments, and 35 percent live off campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus – Residence Hall</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus – UMW Apartments</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus – Fredericksburg</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus - Outside Fredericksburg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining the personal beliefs of students concerning safety on campus, the overall results of the survey show that 86 percent of students surveyed believe that in general, UMW is a safe campus (Table 2). Nearly all students surveyed (99 percent) either agree or strongly agree that they feel safe being alone on campus during daylight hours, compared to only 54 percent of students surveyed who feel safe being alone on campus after dark. Very few students (6.6%) said that they avoid being alone in certain parts of campus during daylight hours, while 56 percent said that they avoid certain areas after dark. These overall results show that although most students believe this is a safe campus, time of day is an important factor in student perceptions of campus safety.

Table 2: Personal Beliefs on Campus Safety (as percentage of students surveyed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I believe that this campus is safe.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe being alone on campus during daylight hours.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe being alone on campus after dark.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns during daylight hours.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns after dark.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall results of the survey show the majority of students surveyed have not utilized most of the campus security services listed on the survey (Table 3). Campus police had the highest number of students who said they have utilized their services, at 26 percent, with much lower numbers for the other security services. When asked to rate certain campus security services, the majority of students were satisfied or neutral towards lighting on campus, blue lights, and the presence of police officers (Table 4). Lighting on campus had the highest
percentage of students either satisfied or extremely satisfied (57 percent), while presence of police officers had the lowest percentage of students either satisfied or extremely satisfied (41 percent).

Table 3: Use of Campus Security Services (as percentage of students surveyed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you utilized the following campus security services?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Light System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Phone Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety Escort</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Defense Classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Satisfaction with Campus Security Services (as percentage of students surveyed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting on campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of blue lights</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of blue lights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of blue lights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of police officers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the campus map portion of the survey show that most respondents feel unsafe in similar areas on campus. This portion of the survey asked respondents to circle up to three places on a campus map where they feel the least safe. The highest number of students indicated that they feel unsafe at the parking deck (22.3 percent), Campus Drive (17.3 percent), and Sunken Road (12.6 percent), with College Avenue, the Sunken Road parking lot, and Mercer path close behind (Figure 1).

When looking at the breakdown of results of the survey by sex, class year, and residential status, the greatest disparity in responses is between female and male responses (Table 5). The responses of females and males differ the most for personal perceptions of campus safety during daylight hours versus after dark. For example, 31 percent of females either disagree or strongly
Figure 1: This map visualizes the spatial pattern of student perceptions of campus safety based on the campus map portion of the survey.
disagree with the statement, “I feel safe being alone on campus after dark,” compared with only three percent of males who feel the same way. More females use avoidance strategies than males, with 72 percent of females responding that they avoid certain areas of campus due to safety concerns after dark, compared to only 18 percent of males. Male and female perceptions differ when it comes to satisfaction with campus security service. For example, 26 percent of females are either dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with the presence of police officers on campus, compared to only 12 percent of males. It is also important to note that male and female responses were similar for the campus map question, where respondents circled the top three places they felt least safe. The top 3 responses for both men and women were the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road. Although there were significant differences in the responses of females and males, there were very few differences in responses based on class year or residential status, other than a few important exceptions, which will be discussed later.

Table 5: Female vs. Male Responses (Female / Male, as percentage surveyed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I believe that this campus is safe.</td>
<td>11 / 36</td>
<td>73 / 57</td>
<td>13 / 5</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe being alone on campus during daylight hours.</td>
<td>59 / 81</td>
<td>40 / 18</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe being alone on campus after dark.</td>
<td>4 / 41</td>
<td>33 / 46</td>
<td>29 / 6</td>
<td>26 / 3</td>
<td>5 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns during daylight hours.</td>
<td>0.5 / 1</td>
<td>9 / 1</td>
<td>16 / 2</td>
<td>46 / 26</td>
<td>26 / 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns after dark.</td>
<td>25 / 2</td>
<td>47 / 16</td>
<td>12 / 12</td>
<td>10 / 27</td>
<td>4 / 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Feature</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting on campus</td>
<td>3 / 8</td>
<td>50 / 55</td>
<td>26 / 21</td>
<td>19 / 14</td>
<td>0.5 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of blue lights</td>
<td>8 / 21</td>
<td>46 / 41</td>
<td>25 / 32</td>
<td>20 / 5</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of blue lights</td>
<td>4 / 14</td>
<td>40 / 36</td>
<td>30 / 43</td>
<td>24 / 6</td>
<td>0.5 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of blue lights</td>
<td>2 / 13</td>
<td>40 / 40</td>
<td>39 / 37</td>
<td>16 / 8</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of police officers</td>
<td>5 / 14</td>
<td>32 / 36</td>
<td>36 / 36</td>
<td>21 / 11</td>
<td>6 / 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the survey portion of the study was completed, respondents were selected for interviews based on whether or not they indicated that they would be willing to participate in an interview on the survey. A total of 10 interviews were completed, with five female and five male respondents. All of the interview respondents were juniors or seniors, because these class years were underrepresented in the survey portion of the study. Overall, the findings from the interviews support the results of the survey. The majority of the interviews were quite brief, simply because the respondents did not have many safety incidents or experiences with campus security services to talk about. Respondents overwhelmingly expressed that they usually feel very safe on campus, and have never felt uncomfortable or threatened. Respondents also expressed feeling safer on campus during the day versus after dark, especially for females. One female respondent said that although she feels safe on campus at night, she is definitely more vigilant of her surroundings than during the day. Also similar to the results of the survey, nearly all of the interview respondents said that they have never used any of the campus security services listed in the survey, and that they are neutral towards these security services (rather than satisfied or dissatisfied).

Although the majority of the interview respondents were positive, and expressed opinions about a very safe campus, there were a few important exceptions where respondents expressed feeling uncomfortable or threatened at times on campus. One female respondent recounted an experience where she felt threatened inside a building on campus. When she reported the incident to an authority figure, her concern was wrongly dismissed. Eventually, the campus police were notified, but by this time, the student had already lost confidence in campus security services. Another male student reported feeling uncomfortable being alone at night in certain parts of campus, including areas near Sunken Road and along the path and steps behind Mercer.
The student said that he avoids these areas at night because they have poor lighting, low foot traffic, and are heavily wooded. These same concerns were echoed by several other respondents, both male and female.

The interviews were also able to expand upon students’ satisfaction with campus security services. Respondents agreed that overall, lighting on campus is acceptable, with the exception of certain areas, namely near Sunken Road, and behind Mercer, Monroe, and Trinkle. When talking about blue lights, respondents questioned the effectiveness of the system. One male respondent said that he has no confidence in the blue light system because he believes that the police respond too slowly to incidents on campus. Another male respondent reiterated this perception, saying that he would never use the blue light if he felt threatened because the campus police would never be able to respond quickly enough. Other respondents questioned the recent addition of more blue lights on campus (Figure 2). One female student said that these additional blue lights are unnecessary because the campus already has good blue light coverage. She also said that the locations of some of the new blue lights, such as at the corner of Sunken Road and Hanover Street, seem to be out of the way for the majority of students.

Figure 2: The university recently installed five new blue lights to fill gaps in high traffic areas along College Avenue. Some students believe that these new blue lights are unnecessary because the university already has good blue light coverage. With the addition of these new lights, the university has a total of 139 located on and around the campus.
When asked about the presence of campus police officers, respondents agreed that they rarely see officers at all on campus. Multiple respondents said that the only time they see the police is when they are issuing parking tickets or driving down College Avenue. One male respondent talked about how Brent House is a terrible location for the police, and that a more centralized location would make more sense. A female respondent echoed this complaint, saying that she only sees the police around Brent House, and they never go to the Goolrick side of campus. During the interviews, the respondents were also asked if they noticed any changes in campus safety, particularly in security services, during their time at UMW. All of the respondents agreed that they have noticed improvements in security services, including increased lighting, blue lights, and police presence. Most of the respondents noted that there is still room for improvement, particularly with police visibility.

In addition to general questions about perceptions of campus safety and expanding upon questions from the survey, there were a few specific questions addressed in the interviews. The first of these questions was about student awareness of campus security services. The results of the surveys show that very few students use campus security services (including campus police, the blue light system, emergency phone service, campus safety escorts, and self defense classes). The results of the surveys also show that most students are either neutral or satisfied with these services, but not extremely satisfied, nor dissatisfied. One possible explanation for both of these findings is that students are unaware of the existence of many of these campus security services, and thus they do not use them, nor do they have a strong opinion about these services. During the interviews, respondents were asked to identify the security services offered by UMW. All respondents were able to identify the campus police, the blue light system, and the campus safety escorts. Most of the male respondents did not identify the emergency phone service or the self
defense classes. This makes sense, given that the self defense classes are designed for females. Most of the female respondents were able to identify the self defense classes, but not the emergency phone service. Based on these interviews, it seems that students are aware of the existence of campus security services, with the exception of the emergency phone service.

**Discussion**

Based on the overall results of the completed surveys, four generalizations can be made. These generalizations are based on the four main sections of the survey: personal beliefs concerning campus safety, use of security services, satisfaction with security services, and the campus map. It is important to make these generalizations in order to get an overall sense of student perceptions of campus safety, but at the same time, it is important to remember that these are generalized interpretations of the overall results of the survey. There are important exceptions to these generalizations that will need to be analyzed further.

The first generalization from the survey results is that students believe UMW is a safe campus. The majority of students (86 percent) agree or strongly agree that in general, this campus is safe. Nearly all students surveyed (99 percent) agree or strongly agree that they feel safe being alone on campus during daylight hours, and more than half (54 percent) agree or strongly agree that they feel safe being alone on campus after dark. What these results show is that students feel safe on this campus, both in general, and even more specifically during daylight or after dark.

This general sense of safety among students on campus could be due to the low number of reported incidents that occur at UMW. According to the UMW 2009 Annual Security Report, in 2008, there were four forcible sex offenses, three aggravated assaults, four burglaries, and two arsons. The only other reported incidents that occurred were several incidents of larceny, liquor
law violations, drug violations, and public intoxication. There were no incidents of criminal
crimes such as homicide, non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, motor vehicle theft, or weapons possession. In
2008, the highest number of reported incidents were liquor law violations (152 incidents, 24
arrests), followed by public intoxication (25 arrests), followed by larceny (66 incidents). All of
these crime statistics are very low, and the serious offenses (homicide, sex offenses, robbery, and
assault) are all extremely low or nonexistent. In years past, UMW has had very low crime rates
as well, with the 2007 and 2008 Annual Security Reports being very similar to the 2009 report.
This continuing pattern of low crime rates probably contributes to the general perception of
students that UMW is a safe campus.

The second generalization from the survey results is that the majority of students never
utilize the campus security services included in the survey (campus police, blue light system,
emergency phone service, campus safety escorts, and self defense classes). In fact, 98 percent of
students have never used the blue light system, and 85 percent have never used a campus safety
escort. In addition, 94 percent of students surveyed have never used the emergency phone
services. Although more students (26 percent) have used the campus police than these other
services, this number is still relatively low. Very few students (3 percent) have taken a campus
self defense class, but this is likely due to the fact that the classes are very small, and are not able
to accommodate large numbers of students.

One possible explanation for low numbers of students using campus security services is
the fact that few incidents actually occur on campus, according to the 2007-2009 Annual
Security Reports. If few incidents are actually occurring, then there is no reason for very many
students to use these campus security services. Another possible explanation is that few students
are aware of the existence of these campus security services. This is probably not true in the case
of the blue lights and campus police because the majority of students have encountered these particular security services at some point during their time at UMW, either during freshmen orientation or while simply walking around campus. In addition, *The Bullet*, the UMW student newspaper, has a weekly column that is widely read by students that reports incidents handled by the campus police. *The Bullet* has also featured several articles about the blue light system, including “Five Emergency Lights Added” (Wilkerson 2010), so it is unlikely that many students are unaware of the existence of the blue light system. It is possible, however, that students are unaware of the existence of the emergency phone service and campus safety escorts. According to the interviews conducted, students are aware of the existence of safety escorts, but not the emergency phone service. This suggests that students are not using the safety escorts because they do not perceive a need to use them. The same could be true for the emergency phone service, or it could be that students are simply not aware of its existence.

The third generalization from the overall survey results is that students are either neutral or satisfied with the campus security services and features included in the survey (lighting on campus, visibility, number, and location of blue lights, and presence of police officers). On average, 74 percent of students surveyed are either neutral or satisfied with these services and features. Although these students are not dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied, they are not extremely satisfied either. This suggests that students may not know very much about these security services or have little experience with them. This makes sense, given that crime rates are low on campus, so students may not have the opportunity to use these services, and thus they would not have a strong opinion one way or another. Another possible explanation is that, again, students are unaware of the existence of these security services. Results from the interviews
show that students are aware of the existence of most security services, so this explanation is probably inaccurate.

The fourth generalization from the surveys is that students feel the least safe in similar locations on campus. This generalization is based on the section of the survey where students circle up to three places where they feel the least safe on a campus map. The results from this question show that there is great similarity in these responses, with the highest number of students indicating that they feel the least safe around the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road (see Figure 3). This generalization holds true for both female and male responses, but there is an important exception to this generalization for class year.

It is important to stress that these generalizations about the overall results of the survey do have some important exceptions. The most notable exception is the disparity in responses between females and males. This is not surprising, given that the difference in female and male perceptions of safety is an important theme raised in relevant safety literature (see Currie 1994; Day 1994; Fletcher and Bryden 2007; Kelly and Torres 2006). The responses of females and males differ the most when talking about perceptions of campus safety during daylight versus after dark, and when it comes to satisfactions with campus security services and features. Female students seem to feel much less safe being alone on campus after dark than male students. Females are also much more likely to use avoidance strategies due to safety concerns when alone on campus after dark. All of these findings conform to relevant safety literature. For example, Klodawsky and Lundy (1994, 134) found that women, unlike the majority of their male peers, often suffer anxiety and stress associated with fear of crime on campus. This directly affects the behavior of women, often leading to avoidance strategies, which limit participation in university
Figure 3: According to the campus map portion of the survey, students feel the least safe around the parking deck (upper and lower left), Campus Drive (upper right), and along Sunken Road (bottom right).

life. In addition, Currie (1994, 33) found that men are much more likely to carry a weapon or to use no safety precautions at all, while women are more likely to use avoidance strategies. The results of the survey, as well as further interviews, suggest that these claims hold true for students at UMW.

Female and male responses on the survey were similar for one important area, the campus map where respondents were asked to circle up to three places on campus where they feel the least safe. The top three responses for both men and women were the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road. It is interesting that female and male responses differ in so
many other categories of the survey, but are the same for this question concerning the spatial distribution of perceptions of campus safety. This suggests that the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road have very similar, prominent features that make students, men and women alike, feel unsafe. All of these places are relatively poorly lit and not well traveled, especially after dark. With the exception of the parking deck, the campus police presence at these places is also minimal. Within the last two years, the university has placed two security guards near the parking deck after dark. As the results of this survey show, however, students still feel unsafe at the parking deck, despite the presence of security guards. This suggests that lighting could be the top determinant in whether or not students feel safe in a particular place, more so than police presence or volume of foot traffic. Fletcher and Bryden (2007, 1153) support this claim, citing lighting and signage on campus, and the availability of emergency phones as the top three physical features of concern when it comes to campus safety. This is very important when considering campus safety in terms of specific locations and factors that create safety perceptions, as well as for designing preventative measures.

Although there were significant differences in the responses of females and males, there were very few differences in responses based on class year. This is probably because the majority of students surveyed indicated that they generally feel safe on campus, so there is no significant distinction among different class years. One exception to this is that freshmen reported a much greater range of locations where they felt the least safe on the campus map question. The majority of sophomores, juniors, and seniors reported the same locations as the overall results, with the highest numbers for the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road. A possible explanation for this difference in freshmen is that freshmen do not have cars on campus. Because of this, they do not regularly use the parking deck, Campus Drive, or Sunken
Road, and so they would not perceive these places as being unsafe. In addition, because freshmen do not have cars, it is likely that they walk to more places than upperclassmen. If they walk to more places, then they have more opportunities to come across places where they might feel unsafe. This would lead to a greater range of locations for freshmen on the campus map question. Differences in perceptions of safety among students of different class years has not been widely discussed in the relevant literature. Kelly and Torres (2006, 33) find that graduate students appear to be more aware of the potential risks of walking on campus alone at night than undergraduate students, but they do not report any findings based on undergraduate class year. This particular area of study could be the basis for further research.

There were also very few differences in responses based on residential status for both the surveys and interviews. One exception to this is that more students living on campus report using campus police services than students living off campus. This is not surprising, given that students living off campus do not spend as much time on campus as residential students, and so they would be less likely to need the services of the campus police. What is surprising is that such a high number of students living in the UMW Apartments report using the campus police. Nearly 43 percent of students living in the apartments report that they have used the campus police services, compared to only 25 percent of all students surveyed. This could be higher because students living in the apartments are juniors or seniors, so they have spent more time on campus, and have had more opportunities to use the campus police. Another more disturbing possibility is that something about living in the apartments makes students feel more unsafe, and this is why more students living in the apartments report using the services of the campus police.

Interviews with students living in the apartments were conducted to attempt to find out if this high rate of use of campus police is due to something about living in the apartments, or some
other outside factor. During the interviews, respondents were asked if they have ever used the
services of the campus police, and if so, whether or not the incident was in any way related to the
apartments. The interview respondents reported that they had never used the services of the
campus police for a safety issue. Upon further questioning, the respondents went on to say that
they had never felt threatened or uncomfortable in the vicinity of the apartments. In order to
determine the answer to this question from the survey results, interviewing would have to take
place on a larger scale at the UMW Apartments.

Looking at the map of these responses to the campus map portion of the survey (Figure
1), there other interesting patterns that emerge. This first pattern is that students seem to feel
more unsafe in buildings and structures along the edges of campus, including the Battlegrounds,
Sunken Road, College Avenue, the parking deck, and the Thornton Street parking lot. Students
seem to feel safer in buildings and structures located along the interior of campus, such as
Willard Hall, Simpson Library, Ball Circle, and Trinkle Hall. This could be due to a number of
different factors, such as poor lighting and decreased foot traffic along the outskirts of campus,
as compared with the interior of campus. Another pattern seen on the map is that students seem
to feel safe in all of the academic buildings and most of the residence halls. Students seem to feel
the least safe in student services and athletic buildings, including the Fitness Center, Goolrick
Hall, Seacobeck Hall, and Woodard Campus Center. Again, there are a number of factors that
could contribute to this pattern. A likely possibility is that students feel safe in residence halls
because they are always locked, and they feel safe in academic buildings because they are
usually there during the day with several other students. Students might feel less safe in student
services and athletic buildings because they are often there after dark, or when there are few
other students around.
Looking back at the overall study there are some problems with the structure of the study, particularly with the survey, and areas for improvement. With the survey itself, it is apparent after careful review that some questions could be misinterpreted. In the second section of the survey, which asks: *Have you utilized the following campus security services?*, respondents could be confused or have different ideas about what is meant by *utilized*. This is especially true for the first item in the section, the campus police. What does it mean to *utilize* the campus police? A better way of structuring this section might be to make each item (campus police, blue light system, emergency phone service, campus safety escort, and self defense classes) a separate question. For example, the restructured questions would read: *Have you ever called the campus police due to a safety concern? Have you ever requested a campus safety escort? Have you ever taken a self defense class on campus?* These questions are more specific, and would likely reduce any confusion for respondents.

Another problem with this study was the distribution of the survey. Ideally, the survey would have been distributed to more students, resulting in closer to 400 completed surveys (or about 10 percent of the undergraduate student body). However, some faculty members were not willing to have the surveys distributed in their classes. This was especially problematic among upper level courses, many for which professors said they could not spare any class time for the distribution of a survey. It was easier to survey introductory level courses, where professors said they could spare a few minutes of class time to distribute the survey. This led to a slightly uneven distribution in class year among survey respondents, as most introductory level courses have more freshmen and sophomores than juniors and seniors. Starkweather (2007, 360), who administered surveys in general education courses, reports this same problem of over-representation of freshmen and sophomores and under-representation of seniors. Ideally, there
would have been a more even distribution of class year among survey respondents. In order to try to overcome this, the interview portion of the study focused on the opinions and responses of juniors and seniors.

Finally, the campus map portion of the survey proved to be difficult both for the respondents and for interpretation purposes. Several respondents (20 percent) did not complete this portion of the survey. This could be because these students do not feel unsafe anywhere on campus, and some students wrote this on the map. It is also possible that these students either forgot to fill out the campus map, or did not want to take the time to complete this portion of the survey. In any case, the fact that 20 percent of respondents did not complete this section is something that must be taken into consideration when examining the results. For this reason, it was difficult to interpret the results of the campus map question. Another difficulty was that some respondents circled very large areas on the map, encompassing several buildings and other structures. This made it difficult to produce an accurate map displaying the overall results from this portion of the survey. In order to try to overcome this, locations were simplified into more concise, defined areas. For example, if a respondent circled one entrance to Seacobeck on the map, this response was mapped as if the respondent had circled the entire building. Similarly, if a respondent drew one circle around Alvey, Arrington, and Goolrick, this response was mapped as if the respondent had circled each building separately. This method was used so that the resulting map would be easier to read, and so that the map would be more meaningful.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the results of this study indicate that in general, students believe that UMW is a safe campus. Both student surveys and interviews confirm this notion: 86 percent of students surveyed agree that this is a safe campus, and all ten students interviewed report that they feel
safe on campus. These findings show a level of perceived safety that is consistent with actual crime reports on campus. Very few crimes actually occur on campus, according to Annual Security Reports, so in other words, students are not overestimating or underestimating their risk pertaining to campus safety. One important caveat to this conclusion is that many scholars argue that the majority of crimes on college campuses, especially sexual assaults, do not get reported to the authorities (see Bohmer and Parrot 1993; Currie 1994; Fletcher and Bryden 2007). For example, Copeland and Wolfe (1995, 68) report that less than five percent of college women report incidents of rape to the police, and more than half of college women who experience rape tell no one about their assaults. If campus crime rates are much higher in reality then what the Annual Crime Reports show, then it is possible that student perceptions of safety actually underestimate the risk associated with college campuses.

The results of the surveys and interviews also indicate that few students use campus security services, such as campus police, blue lights, or campus safety escorts. The interview portion of the study revealed that students are aware of these services, they simply choose not to use them, or do not feel the need to use them. This is consistent with findings in relevant literature, such as Fletcher and Bryden (2007, 1160) who found that the majority of people in their study were aware of campus security and foot patrols, but much fewer people had actually used either of these services.

The findings from this study also indicate where further investigation, and in some cases improvements in campus safety, should be directed. One area that needs to be addressed is the disparity between female and male perceptions of campus safety. Further research must be conducted in this area in order to discover ways in which college campuses, and UMW in particular, can close the gap between female and male perceptions of campus safety. The lack of
overall satisfaction with campus security services is also an area of campus safety that needs to be improved. Although many respondents indicated that these services are making progress, there is still room for improvement. Finally, further research needs to be done to determine exactly why so many students feel unsafe around the parking deck, Campus Drive, and Sunken Road. The results of this study point to poor lighting and low police visibility. If these results are confirmed, then something can be done to alleviate student concerns about these areas.
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Appendix B

Survey of Student Safety Perceptions

The purpose of this survey is to study University of Mary Washington students’ perceptions of campus safety. The results of this research will be used as part of an individual study. All results will remain anonymous for this study.

Questions 1-5 ask about your personal beliefs concerning safety on campus at the University of Mary Washington. Please fill in the circle which corresponds with your response.

1. In general, I believe that this campus is safe.  
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2. I feel safe being alone on campus during daylight hours.  
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3. I feel safe being alone on campus after dark.  
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4. I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns during daylight hours.  
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. I avoid being alone in certain areas of campus due to safety concerns after dark.  
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Questions 6 asks about your experiences concerning campus security services. Please fill in the circle which corresponds with your response.

6. Which of the following campus security services have you utilized?  
   - Yes
   - No
   - Campus Police
   - Blue Light System
   - Emergency Phone Service
   - Campus Safety Escort
   - Self Defense Classes

For questions 7-9, please rate the following security services by circling the letter which corresponds with your response.

7. Lighting on campus  
   - Extremely Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Dissatisfied
   - Extremely Dissatisfied

8. Visibility of blue lights  
   - Extremely Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Dissatisfied
   - Extremely Dissatisfied

9. Number of blue lights  
   - Extremely Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Dissatisfied
   - Extremely Dissatisfied

10. Location of blue lights  
    - Extremely Satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Neutral
    - Dissatisfied
    - Extremely Dissatisfied

11. Presence of police officers  
    - Extremely Satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Neutral
    - Dissatisfied
    - Extremely Dissatisfied

12. Using the campus map on the reverse, please circle up to three places where you feel the least safe.

Please circle the appropriate response:

Sex:  F  M  
Number of years (including current year) at UMW:  1  2  3  4  5

What is your residential status?  
- On campus – Residence Hall
- Off campus – Fredericksburg
- On campus – UMW Apartments
- Off campus – Outside of Fredericksburg

Thank you for your participation. This research also includes an interviewing portion in order to gain further insight into student perceptions of campus safety. If you would be willing to be contacted for an interview, please write your name and e-mail address below.

Name: _______________________________  Email Address: _______________________________
Appendix C

Interview Questions

1. Have you ever had an experience on campus in which you felt unsafe?
   When? Where? What happened?
   What about the experience made you feel unsafe?

2. Are there specific locations on campus where you feel unsafe or uncomfortable?
   What factors contribute to you feeling unsafe? Physical features?

3. Have you ever used any campus security services?
   Are you aware of the services offered?
   Did you find the service to be effective?
   Did you feel safer or more comfortable after using the service?
   Do you believe that the service offered meets the needs of students? Why?
   How could these be improved?

4. Do you feel a difference in your level of safety during daylight hours versus after dark?
   Do you behave differently during daylight hours versus after dark?
   Do you avoid areas of campus or travel differently after dark?

5. Do you believe that this is a safe campus?

6. Have you noticed any changes or trends in campus safety or security services throughout your time here?

7. Are you a UMW Apartments or commuter student?

   Commuters:
   Do you believe commuting to campus poses any additional safety concerns?
   Have you always lived off campus?
   Have your perceptions of safety changed at all since moving off campus?

   Residential – UMW Apartments:
   Have you ever used the services of the campus police?
   Did this incident occur at or in the vicinity of the UMW Apartments?
   Have you ever noticed any strange activity around the UMW Apartments?
   Has anything about living in the UMW Apartments ever made you feel unsafe?