1999

Women's fear of crime and the evening guide program at San Jose State University

Rizwana Mahmood
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Mahmood, Rizwana, "Women's fear of crime and the evening guide program at San Jose State University" (1999). *Master's Theses*. 1883.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.73zk-2afj>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1883

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI[®]

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

**WOMEN'S FEAR OF CRIME AND THE EVENING GUIDE PROGRAM AT
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Administration of Justice

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Rizwana Mahmood

August 1999

UMI Number: 1396184

UMI Microform 1396184

Copyright 1999, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI

**300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

© 1999

Rizwana Mahmood

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Dr. Louis M. Holscher

Dr. Charlotte S. Yang

Jackye McClure, Administration of Justice Bureau

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Abstract

Women's Fear of Crime and the Evening Guide Program at San Jose State University

by

Rizwana Mahmood

Due to an increase in crimes on campuses universities have been implementing programs to ensure safety. One such program established by San Jose State University is the escort program known as the Evening Guide Program. This thesis investigates the relationship between the Evening Guide Program and fear of crime among female students at San Jose State University. The main purpose of this research is to measure the level of fear among female students and to observe if the level of fear is reduced with the awareness and/or usage of the Evening Guide Program.

The total of 440 female students were surveyed at various locations on campus. Research on this study revealed that although fear of crime exists on campus no relationship existed between the awareness and usage of the Evening Guide Program and fear of crime. It was also found that the majority of the respondents were aware of the program but only a small number of respondents ever used the program. Comments and policy implications are presented in detail to improve the Evening Guide Program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This thesis is dedicated to my parents Aisha and Ismail Mahmood and my brother Sultan Mahmood. Without their support and encouragement I would have never completed this thesis and all other achievements in my life. Also a very special thank you to all friends and family especially my brothers Tariq Mahmood and Nasir Mahmood for always being there for me.

My sincerest appreciation and thanks to Dr. Louis M. Holscher, who as my thesis advisor gave an abundance of guidance and support. I would also like to thank Dr. Charlotte S. Yang and Jackye McClure from the Justice Bureau for their valuable comments and suggestions. I would also like to express my appreciation to Sergeant Dan Accardo supervisor of the Evening Guide Program at University Police Department, San Jose State University, for providing information about the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose	3
	San Jose State University's Evening Guide Program.....	4
Chapter II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
	Campus Crime	7
	Women and Fear of Crime	13
	Women and Existence of Fear of Crime on Campus	15
	Crime Prevention Strategies	18
	Unpublished Studies at San Jose State University	23
Chapter III.	METHODOLOGY.....	26
	Setting.....	26
	Reported Crimes at San Jose State University	27
	Sample	28
	Design and Procedure	28
	Survey Questionnaire	29
	Independent Variables	30
	Dependent Variables	30
	Hypotheses	31
	Reliability and Validity	32

Chapter IV. RESULTS.....	32
Descriptive Statistics: Demographic and Related Variables.....	32
Descriptive Statistics: Measurement of Fear.....	35
Testing of Hypotheses.....	37
Chapter V. DISCUSSION.....	44
Analysis and Discussion.....	44
Limitations.....	46
Policy Implications.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Tables.....	52
Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Age Breakdown of the Population	52
Table 2	Number of Evenings on Campus.....	53
Table 3	Awareness of the Evening Guide Program.....	54
Table 4	Usage of the Evening Guide Program.....	55
Table 5	Number of Times the Evening Guide Program.....	56
Table 6	Fear on Campus	57
Table 7	Fear in Parking Lots.....	58
Table 8	Fear in Surrounding Neighborhood.....	59
Table 9	Relationship Between Fear on Campus and Awareness.....	60
Table 10	Relationship Between Fear in Parking Lots and Awareness.....	61
Table 11	Relationship Between Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods and Awarenes	62
Table 12	Relationship Between Fear on Campus and Usage	63
Table 13	Relationship Between Fear in Parking Lots and Usage.....	64
Table 14	Relationship Between Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods And Usage.....	65
Table A	The Strongly Disagree Category and Awareness Variables with Three Measures of Fear.....	66
Table B	The Strongly Disagree Category and Usage Variables with Three Measures of Fear.....	67

Women's' Fear of Crime and the Evening Guide Program at

San Jose State University

Introduction

Campus crime has become a matter of great concern for students, parents, faculty, and administration at post secondary institutions due to increases in the crime rate on campuses. Siegal and Raymond (1992) found that close to 40% of students reported being a victim of crime at least once during their college tenure. When campus crime and violence strikes, the toll on the institution may be immediately devastating and have long-term impacts on recruiting, financial support, and public image. Students who become victims of crime or even perceive a threat of harm may not remain in school and/or may also become an institution's worst public relation ambassadors. (Nichols, 1997).

Although both male and female students in general express some fear on campus, fear is greater for female students. Over the past two decades women have been attending college in increasing numbers. The feeling of vulnerability has followed women to campuses. Studies have indicated that many students feel unsafe or fearful while on campus (Fisher, 1995). For example, Klodawsky and Lundy (1994) found that because of fear for their safety almost two thirds of women restricted their movement on the university campus in their study.

Fear of crime can have a negative effect on a students performance and learning experience at school. Due to the existence and perceived risk of crime, students in general

and especially female students are continuously on guard. This can directly effect the quality of campus life for women and limit their participation in college activities. A number of solutions have been suggested to increase campus security and reduce the level of fear, such as maintenance of campus grounds, regularly patrolled campus routes, increased lighted surroundings, and the establishment of escort services (Mowery, 1997; Beeler, 1991). San Jose State University (SJSU) established an escort service known as the "Evening Guide Program" in the Spring of 1977 as a response to the safety concerns expressed by the campus community.

Purpose

This research project attempts to establish a connection between the awareness and / or usage of the Evening Guide Program and female students' level of fear on campus. The main research problem is whether the awareness and/or usage of the Evening Guide Program provided by the University Police Department (UPD) is successful in reducing the fear of crime and increasing the feeling of safety for women on campus. It is hypothesized that awareness or/and usage of the Evening Guide Program will result in reduced level of fear. There is also an important policy rationale for studying the Evening Guide Program. Because it is funded out of the general UPD budget, and is not a volunteer program, it is important to see whether it is achieving its goals.

To research this project, 415 female students were surveyed at various locations on the SJSU campus. The study was restricted to female students because only women use the Evening Guide Program, and also women have a greater fear of crime than men do. The survey consisted of 14 questions relating to safety, fear of crime, and the Evening Guide Program (see Appendix B).

San Jose State University's Evening Guide Program

SJSU's Evening Guide Program, established by the UPD, primarily serves as an escort service. It was established to assist students, faculty, staff, and any visitors on campus and the immediate surrounding area. The program operates within the boundaries of Santa Clara Street to the north, Reed Street to the south, Second Street the west, 12th Street to the east. Escort services are also provided to Spartan Village Apartments (about one mile south of campus) based on special circumstances. Other than the regular escort duties, the evening guides also provide visible observation of the campus and report any serious incidents or other public safety hazards. The primary hours of operation are every night from 6:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m., although it is available 24 hours a day seven days a week. The Evening Guide Program is not in operation during summer or winter breaks.

Trained evening guides, one type of the broader Community Service Officer (CSO) category, and sometimes police officers, provide service to individuals going from building to building on campus, and to their cars or other nearby destinations. Evening guides are equipped with radios so they may communicate immediately with UPD officers and dispatchers. They are identifiable by their light blue jackets or yellow vests with the words "Student Assistant" on the back, and a photo ID they must wear around their neck. Student, staff, faculty, and campus visitors may request an escort by calling the UPD business line, or from any of the "blue light" or elevator phones on campus. "Blue light" phones are found at many convenient locations throughout the SJSU campus.

The formal goal of the Evening Guide Program is to provide a safe and secure environment by reducing the level of fear and thus increasing the feeling of safety for everyone on campus. The objective is that through knowledge and use of the program by individuals on campus crime victimization will be reduced to a minimum. UPD wants to provide a safe atmosphere that also includes a psychological component for the campus community. They believe that if people work or study in a safe environment, one will feel more comfortable and perform more effectively.

During the 1997-1998 school year the Evening Guide Program had eight trained CSOs who were all male SJSU students. In the 1998-1999 school year, five female CSOs were hired. Additionally, sworn officers and one police cadet provide escort assistance when needed. Evening guide qualifications include:

- Have no criminal record
- Be a registered student at SJSU
- Speak English fluently and clearly
- Familiarity with campus buildings and street surroundings
- A California drivers license
- 18 years or older

Evening guides are trained a minimum of four hours, covering payroll, radio procedures, and guidelines for working at UPD. In addition, they are required to train a minimum of four to eight hours in the field with an experienced guide or the student supervisor. Evening guides are paid seven to eight dollars an hour and work a maximum

of twenty hours a week. The Evening Guide Program does not have a fixed budget because the number of evening guides and the number of hours worked varies. In the 1996/97 school year, the UPD responded to 1,925 requests for escorts. In 1997/98 this increased to 2,097 requests (University Police Department, 1998).

Chapter II

Literature Review

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents literature that discusses, in general, crime and fear on campus. It starts with evidence that crime and fear of crime exists on campuses. Next, five realities about campus crime are presented with incidents of crimes on campus. In the last part, the causes of campus crimes are discussed. The second section consists of two parts: Part A discusses women and crime at the societal level, including women's fear of crime, crime statistics and factors responsible for fear of crime and theories of victimization. Part B focuses on women and fear of crime on campus, and examines women and campus crime in detail. The final section presents various crime prevention strategies, including a detailed section on escort services and the importance and justification for escort services.

Campus Crime

Existence of Campus Crime and Fear

No one knows exactly when incidents of campus crime began. There were, of course, incidents of crime, violence, antisocial and deviant behaviors from the beginnings of higher education, but no records were kept. Since 1990, all colleges have been required by federal law to compile annual statistics about crime on their campuses (Lederman, 1995).

In a survey conducted right after the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 (discussed below) was passed, it was found that during the 1991-92 school year on 2,400 college campuses there were 30 murders and approximately 7,500 violent crimes (Lederman, 1995).

Data indicate that incidents of crime on campus are increasing, and that many students feel unsafe or fearful while on campus (Fisher, 1995). For example, at a campus in Ohio over 30% of the students reported they felt fear walking around the campus at night (Fisher & Nasar, 1992). Not only do many students feel fear on campus, but they also experience fear in the surrounding areas. Studies indicate that this fear is justified, considering one in three students will be a victim of some kind of campus crime during his or her college experience (Fisher, 1995).

Realities about Campus Crime

The first reality is that crime exists on campuses. Close to 40% of students in one study reported that they have at least once been a victim of crime during their college tenure (Siegal & Raymond, 1992). Recent data on campus crime indicate that in a typical year more than 36,000 violent assaults, 7,500 sexual assaults, dozens of homicides, and some 200,000 thefts will occur on American college campuses (Nicholas, 1997).

The second reality is that the rate of campus crime is unclear and thus it is difficult to make accurate comparisons between institutions. Currently only 15% of our nation's 3,600 institutions report crimes to the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) (Nicholas, 1997). Although the UCR basis for determining the crime rate is based on the population of a

campus, several other demographic and physical characteristics are not taken into account. Such as: the location of the campus (urban or rural), surrounding areas around the campus, the physical setup of the campus, and the make-up of the campus community. All of these factors can effect crime on campus. Thus, with different campus characteristics, crime patterns will be different. For example, in the last two decades, colleges have become more open to women and minorities. This has brought both diversity and increased tension to campuses. Minorities include not only women and racial or ethnic groups but also sexual orientations. For example, in a study of fear among gay and lesbian undergraduate students it was found that 75% of the respondents reported verbal abuse on campus and over 25% had been threatened with violence (D'Augelli, 1992). After surveying 121 students between the ages of 19 and 22, it was found that fear for one's safety on campus was related to the frequency of personal harassment (D'Augelli, 1992). Brantingham, Brantingham and Seagrave (1997) in a Canadian study found that fear appeared related to the physical characteristic of particular locations, their lighting levels and boundaries. They also found that students felt safe on campus during the daytime and crime often occurred at places where the student felt the safest. Furthermore, not only did women express more fear then men, but women felt different level of fear then men at different locations.

The third reality is that ~~serious crime~~, such as murder, rape, robbery and ~~aggravated~~ assaults are infrequent. In fact, most reported campus crime is comprised of larceny/theft, other property crimes, and public order offenses (Nicholas, 1997).

The fourth reality is that most crimes are perpetrated by students against other students. The National Campus Violence Surveys, presented in the findings of the Campus Security Act (discussed further below) state that 80% of campus crime is committed by students against other students (Nichols, 1997).

The fifth reality is that the occurrence of campus crime reflects the large amount of crime in the rest of society. Violence in America is a continuing problem. According to the 1993 UCR crime increased by 17% from 1989 to 1993. Likewise, reported crimes on campus have dramatically increased within the last decade. The 1990 UCR reported more than 2600 violent crimes and approximately 120,000 property crimes occurred on campuses (Nichols, 1997).

Why Crime Exists on Campus

Certain factors play an important role in campus crime. As discussed above, crime has always existed on campus but in the past two decades there has been an increase in campus crime. One possible reason is the changing demographic nature of the campus population. Because of available financial assistance and equal opportunities campuses have become more diversified. For example, students from the inner cities, with differing values and other cultural and racial backgrounds are attending colleges. Thus, the campus community now comprises individuals with a wide range of norms, societal habits, customs, and family backgrounds (Nichols, 1997). In addition, colleges have become open to women and minorities, plus many gay and lesbians have come out of the closet.

This tension, resulting from differences within different groups can sometimes lead to violence and assaults on campuses.

Other threats faced by campuses are guns, alcohol and drug abuse. According to Nichols (1997) reports of gun violence on campuses across the nation are increasing. In a report conducted by The Chronicle of Higher Education, campus officials reported a 7.2% increase in drug law violations, 3.6% increase in liquor law violation and 4.4% increase in the number of weapons violation arrests from 1995 to 1996 (Nicklin, 1999). A 1989 survey conducted by the Campus Violation Prevention Center at Towson State University entitled, "Linking the Use of Drugs/Alcohol and Student Crime", found that student perpetrators of crime tend to be more frequent drug and alcohol users than either victims or students who have not been associated with any sort of crime. Also, students who commit multiple offenses tended to use drugs and alcohol even more frequently than students who committed a single crime (Nichols, 1997).

The last possible threat to the campus environment is the fear from the surrounding communities and outsiders. College and university officials, as well as parents of college students, tend to perceive outsiders as the greatest threat to students (Nicholas, 1997). Problems caused by outsiders are often significant because campus boundaries are not always firm and college and university officials have no control over outsiders' actions. A campus is relatively open and free, physically as well as academically. It can rarely be closed to the public. Surprisingly not much difference in fear is expressed between students on urban and rural campuses. On average, urban campus students are scared of crime at the same level as rural campus students (Grayson, 1993). For most students,

though, the impact of urban violence has more subtle effects. While students in cities often lead relatively normal college lives, they do learn to be on guard and to protect both themselves and their property.

Women and Fear of Crime

Why Fear Exists

Consistently documented by crime surveys and crime statistics, fear of crime is a major concern for women. A poll in Ottawa, Canada found that a third of women are afraid to walk alone at night in their own neighborhood, and approximately 90% of them restrict their activities for self-protection (Klodawsky & Lundy, 1994). For most women, concerns for safety are a major part of their everyday life experiences. Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski (1987) reported a high incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of 6159 (3187 female and 2972 male students) enrolled in 32 higher education institutions. Women's reports of experiencing and men's reports of perpetrating rape, attempted rape, sexual coercion and sexual contact were obtained. The most important conclusion drawn from this research was that rape is much more prevalent than previously believed. Findings showed that since the age of 14, 27.5% of college women reported experiencing and 7.7% of college men reported perpetrating an act that met the legal definitions of rape or attempted rape. This supports the comment made by Stanko (1995) that women are fearful of men and learn to negotiate their safety whether the men are colleagues at work, acquaintances in social situations, strangers on the street, or intimate companions. In sum, many studies have found that crime and violence against women are an evident reality (Dekerserdy, Schwartz & Tait, 1993; Klodawsky & Lundy, 1994).

Theories of Victimization

Two major victimization theories are useful in explaining when and why women are victimized. Proponents of the Life Style Theory argue that certain life styles increase exposure to criminal victimization. Risk of victimization increases by such behavior as staying single, associating with young men and going out in public places at night (Siegal, 1998). All these factors are common for women on college campuses who are often at social gatherings and associate with men alone at night.

The second theory of victimization is Routine Activity Theory. There are three variables that play a role in Routine Activity Theory and can be applied to the existence of crime against women. They are: suitable targets (women in this case), absence of capable guardians (away from family or friends) and presence of motivated offenders (single young men on college campuses or isolated high crime areas). In short, the lifestyles and routine activities of many female college students can put them at an especially high risk of criminal victimization.

Factors Responsible for Fear of Crime

There are other factors responsible for women's fear of crime, including crime and violence statistics against women, the media image of women as being vulnerable, and portrayals of sexist attitudes towards women. According to Hayden (1984) women's fears are not just based on sexist beliefs, rather these sexist attitudes achieve concrete expressions. Some examples would be the fear felt in parks, construction sites, abandoned buildings and other isolated areas. Such spaces and contemporary symbols send clear

signals to women of the dangers of public exposure. Women get the message to stay away from these places because they run the risk of being raped or even killed. As a result of such dangers, women adopt the strategy of avoidance and end up staying home or avoid going out alone at night.

Although fear is widespread among women, it is not evenly distributed in the general population. According to Gorden and Riger (1989) fear follows existing social cleavages delineated by age, gender, social class and race. In extensive interviews with 299 women and 68 men concerning reactions to crime they concluded that women who are elderly, poor, disabled or members of an identifiable racial or ethnic minority feel most vulnerable.

Women and Existence of Fear of Crime on Campus

The fear and feelings of vulnerability follows women when they enter college campuses. Fisher and Nasar (1992) found that female students had more fear than male students on campus. High levels of anxiety and stress associated with the need to continually be on guard directly affect the quality of campus life for women and set limits on their participation in university activities. Klodawsky and Lundy (1994) found that almost two thirds of female academic and student women restricted their movements on campus due to the fear of crime. They also discovered that a greater percentage of women on campus were concerned about personal safety than urban women in their neighborhood at night. In general, they concluded that a majority of women experience fear of assault and concern for personal safety, a much higher percentage than men. Their

study reported safety concerns of 1500 men and women (including students, staff and faculty) at a midsize university campus. An interesting finding was that age rather than academic status explained different levels of fear among women on campus. Older female students (above 20 years) and younger female faculty members (under 40) expressed more fear than younger students and older faculty members. They also found that students living on campus were more fearful than students living off-campus. Klodawsky and Lundy (1994) also mention the importance of measures, such as emergency telephones, enhanced lightning, student initiated foot patrol and an escort service. In addition, modification of structural design and land use to enhance safety on campus were also discussed.

In a similar study concerning the fear of crime on college campuses, Brantingham et al. (1997) found that there was a noticeable difference between males and females depending on where they said they felt most fear. Thus, location on campus can make a difference in the level of fear.

Increased Fear of Crime After Dark

Brantingham et al. (1997) found that on college campuses females were much more fearful at night than males. When women alter their behavior and fail to participate in academic or social activities in the evening, this changes social interaction patterns and the university climate for those women who stay late or live on campus. They feel outnumbered by men and become more fearful. Many women avoid taking evening classes, staying late in the library and/or participating in evening activities on campus.

Women students might not realize how much better they would perform in class if they could freely go the library at night, participate in study groups which often meet at nights, and choose from the entire schedule of classes. (Scanlon,1997). In addition the fear of the “strangers”, can push women further into dependent and controlled realtionships with men from whom they are at most risk (Radford,1987).

Prevalent Crimes Against Women

Women have been and continue to be direct victims of such violent acts as stranger rape, date rape, and sexual harassment. Certainly men on campus are also subject violence but women are more commonly the victims, especially for sexual offenses (Cerio, 1989). It is apparent that many women are victimized by men, and researchers have found a significant amount of sexual aggression on college campuses (Dekeseredy, et al. 1993; Koss et al. 1987)). Several studies have found that college women, in particular first year students, are more vulnerable to rape than any other age group (Scanlon, 1997). The fall semester has been referred to as the “hunting season”, since the threat of rape is the greatest in the first week of school.

Similar trends have been found in Canada (Dekeserdy et al.1993). They found that while Canada has lower crime rates in general, the rate of sexual assault against Canadian women on college campuses is at least as high as it in the United States. An overwhelming majority of college women in the sample (84%) had suffered at least one form of stranger aggression in public places (Dekeserdy, et al. 1993).

Crime Prevention Strategies

Campus Security Act

As a response to the existence and increase in crimes on campus, the United States Congress, state legislators, and university administrators have enacted reporting legislation and policies. In addition, a number of safety programs, and security procedures were implemented to fight crime, and reduce the risk, and fear of crime. For example, in 1990 Congress enacted the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act (Public Law 101-542) commonly known as Campus Security Act (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). The act applies exclusively to colleges and universities participating in Title IV student financial aid programs. Among other mandates, it states that by September 1 of each year, schools must prepare, publish, and distribute information concerning:

- Crime prevention policies and programs.
- Statistics on crimes, such as murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary which cover the three calendar years preceding the publication of the report.
- Statistics concerning forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, which also covers the three proceeding years to the publication.

Fisher (1995) criticizes the Campus Security Act for not requiring enough information from the universities. She contends that the Act only requires numbers without an actual crime rate. Raw numbers can give someone a false indication of security (Fisher, 1995). She also criticizes the Act because it fails to give schools proper guidelines for the distribution of the information.

Several individual states have also responded to the fear of crime by requiring more than simply reporting the number of crimes on campus (Fisher, 1995). They have also required that the information be properly disseminated to its students and anyone else who wants to know. Some states, including California, have policies regarding security measures that schools must take to insure the proper safety of its students. State courts have also held universities economically liable for damages suffered by students as a result of crime that could have been prevented if proper security had been enforced (Fisher, 1995).

Safety Measures on Campus

Safety on campus is just not the responsibility of the campus security or university police departments. Administrators, faculty members, counselors, housing officials and students can play an important part and help in creating a safe campus.

As mentioned earlier, most violence against students is caused by other students. Many variables, such as home environment, negative peer influences, inadequate parenting, low self-esteem, drug and alcohol abuse, inappropriate solutions to stress situations can all play a role in student misconduct. In order to stop violent acts committed by students, college administration and faculty can use various strategies. For example, educating students to respect other cultures, races and different sexual orientations. This will help reduce tensions and misunderstandings among students. Colleges and universities must also attempt to eliminate negative student behaviors by helping with problem solving solutions (Bennett-Johnson, 1996). Providing time

management training, stress management workshops and counseling sessions would also help in reducing frustration and tension for students.

Community policing is a growing strategy utilized by university police departments (Nichols, 1997). Community oriented policing intensively involves the same officers over time in the same community setting. It is a proactive, decentralized approach designed to reduce crime, disorder and by extension fear of crime. University police are in an excellent position to take advantage of community policing because of their proximity to mostly educated individuals with similar goals. Other reasons for utilizing community policing include: concerns with increased fear of crime and its impact on students, disorder on campus, and development of community cohesion (Nicholas, 1997). One of the largest and oldest campus community policing programs can be found at Michigan State University. Some other campuses that have established community policing are University of Florida, University of Washington, University of Cincinnati and Virginia Commonwealth University (Lanier, 1997).

Escort Services

Due to the increase in campus crime, universities have adopted several measures to ensure a safe campus. Blue Light Emergency Telephones, self defense classes, regular campus patrol routes, and escort services are among the most prevalent programs established by campus administrators (Beeler, 1991; Fisher, 1995). There are a few types of escort services on campuses. Other than foot patrols, many campuses also have bike

escorts or escort services that use vans to take students from campus buildings to residence halls or to their cars or bus stops (Grayson, 1993; Klodawsky & Lundy, 1994).

In 1990, a national study was conducted that addressed campus safety issues and university responses to crime (Beeler, 1991). It revealed that most campuses had implemented various forms of security measures, including escort programs. For those schools that had not implemented an escort service, Beeler (1991) strongly recommended that they do so, although he did not detail reasons for his recommendation.

After the brutal murder of five students one of the safety precautions taken by the administration at the University of Florida was to greatly expand the student escort service (Archer, 1992). They increased the hours and staff of the escort service and extended the service area to off-campus housing. Another university that expanded its escort service was Jackson State University in Mississippi. They responded to the increasing rate of crime on their campus by greatly extending their nighttime escort service, especially for female students (Nichols, 1995). Scanlon (1997) found women needed an escort service more than men. She argued that, among other things, the existence of an escort service gives women on campus a comfortable realization that the university is aware of the dangers that women face on campus.

A statewide study in Minnesota also expressed similar recommendations (Mowery, 1997). This study took a closer look at the types of programs and policies universities implemented as security measures. Fifty-two percent of the universities participating in this study indicated that they had an escort service in place. After finding that there was a significant increase in the number of reported aggravated assaults during the study time

period, Mowery (1997) strongly recommended the implementation of escort programs in those universities that did not have one already.

These studies recommend the implementation of escort programs as a safety precaution. Congress has enacted federal legislation and universities have established programs and policies for the protection of the campus community. However, researchers have not taken a closer look at whether these programs have been productive in the reduction of fear of crime (Fisher, 1995). Without policy and program evaluations, combined with knowledge about what kinds of crimes actually happen on campuses, administrators will not be able to fully understand the effectiveness of such programs in reducing fear or crime on campus. In sum, this thesis attempts to fill the gap and determine if a program like an escort service helps reduce level of fear and enhances a feeling of safety on campus.

Unpublished Studies at San Jose State University

At SJSU, a study conducted by McDonald and Garcia, Department of Sociology, in 1996 revealed that students are fearful of crime particularly at night (Boer, 1998a).

Goals of this research were to study SJSU student's perceptions of and experiences with the UPD and crime on campus. With a sample of 339 students, a 58-question survey covered subjects including UPD's quality of service and student's perceptions of crime and safety. Among the overall findings, were that students generally felt the police department was doing a good job, but they also needed to make women feel safer (Boer, 1998a).

Twenty-three percent of the women surveyed indicated that they did not feel sufficiently protected by the police, and a large number of them stated concern for their safety "especially at night" (Boer, 1998a, p. 1). When asked if they felt "very" worried about going out on their own after dark, twenty-eight percent of the females replied affirmatively (Boer, 1998a). Overall, sixty-five percent of the women said they had felt "unsafe at times on campus" (Boer, 1998a, p. 1). Their study also revealed that most respondents were concerned with the transients in the surrounding streets.

McDonald and Garcia further found that seventy-eight percent of the respondents were aware of the escort service available on campus. However, the respondents expressed many complaints regarding the response time for escort requests. When asked how they (the students) would improve the escort service, "over twenty-six percent, by far the number one response, stated that they would make police more visible" (Boer, 1998a, p. 8).

Another survey, conducted in 1997 by the Office of the University President at SJSU, revealed that safety was among the top 10 concerns of students (Shaw, 1998). The goals of the survey were to determine student concerns on campus. Other findings were that the university parking lots, specifically the 10th street garage, were areas where students felt the most fear. As with the previous study, respondents expressed concern with neighborhood streets.

Furthermore, the Spartan Daily, the SJSU student newspaper, published information stating that the rape statistics at San Jose State may be misleading (Boer, 1998b). The UPD reported seven rapes in the last three school years (Boer, 1998b). After interviewing rape center counselors in the area it was discovered by the Spartan Daily staff that the statistics compiled by the UPD may not be accurate. Crisis counselors estimated that the official number could be multiplied by 10, because rape is still one of the most unreported crimes.

The above studies and reports at SJSU examined closely fear and crime issues on campus. The statistics on rape at SJSU illustrate the problem that Fisher (1995) found regarding raw numbers. Other factors have to be taken into consideration when examining crime and fear on campus. The small number of rapes on campus may imply a safe campus but as stated above, however the crime statistics from the UPD do not take into account the unknown number of unreported rapes. The two studies that looked at fear on campus also fall short because they did not address the impact of safety programs, (like the escort service) on the level of fear.

Without a study on the effectiveness of an escort program, the money allotted for them goes unjustified. It is not known if the services provided actually help in the reduction of fear and enhance a feeling of safety on campus. This paper addresses this issue, the connection between the Evening Guide Program and fear on campus.

Chapter III

Methodology

The Setting

The study was conducted at San Jose State University. Located adjacent to downtown San Jose, SJSU is an urban campus surrounded by middle class and lower income housing, including both apartment buildings and single family houses. It is a fairly compact campus that is roughly 18 city blocks square. There are eight residence halls right on one side of campus, and many fraternities and sororities in the surrounding community. There are three major parking lots on campus, and students can also park at the football stadium, which is approximately one mile away, and take a shuttle bus. Approximately 15% of the 27,000 students live within walking distance of the campus. Many students also use public transportation, including a public bus service and a light rail system, which stops two and three blocks from campus. Thus, in the evening many students are walking from classrooms and the library, and returning either to their residences, cars, or public transportation. Because of the downtown and low socioeconomic area around the campus, the crime rate of the area is fairly high (Nicklin, 1999). Women comprise about 54% of the student body, and 81% of the students are enrolled in undergraduate and 19% in graduate studies. There is a great deal of diversity on campus. The ethnic breakdown is: 35% white, 29% Asian, 10% Mexican American, 5% African American, 4% other Latino, 6% Filipino, and less than 1% Alaskan and

Pacific Islander (San Jose State University, 1998). Ten percent of the student body did not state ethnicity.

Reported Crimes at SJSU

Between 1994 and 1999 the crime rate at SJSU has been constant. For example, the number of thefts on campus has stayed the same in the last few years with 336 thefts reported in 1995, 330 in 1996, and 335 thefts in 1997. For robberies the following statistics were reported: 1995 - 7, 1996 - 2, and 1997 - 6. The number of reported rapes have gone down - from 4 rapes in 1995, to 3 in 1996, and 1 in 1997. Aggravated assault is also going down, from 8 in 1995, to 7 in 1996, and 6 in 1997 (University Police Department, 1996, 1997, & 1998). There were no murders reported in either 1996 or 1997, plus 31 and 40 burglaries in those two years (Nicklin, 1999). A major continuing problem is alcohol and drug offenses, with 160 drug offenses reported in 1996 and 162 in 1997. This is the second highest number reported in 1997 for all universities in the United States (Nicklin, 1999).

In the 1997-98 academic year there were 822 arrests by the UPD; 733 were misdemeanors and 89 felonies. There were 335 thefts, 14 motor vehicles thefts, 40 burglaries, 6 aggravated assaults and 1 rape during this school year (University Police Department, 1998). In sum, crime is a problem at SJSU, and is reflective of problems on other urban campuses.

Sample

The unit of analysis was individual students. The population for this research consisted of female SJSU students. Surveys were administrated at various classrooms and various busy locations on campus, such as the Clark Library and Joe West Resident Hall. Surveys in the classes were conducted at various times (morning, afternoon and evening). Classes included Administration of Justice, Women's Studies, Social Sciences, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Religious Studies and Counseling departments. The sampling method utilized was a combination of purposive and convenient sampling (Hagan, 1997). The intent was to survey a cross-section of women on campus at various locales. Although the age range for the sample was from 18 to 46+, most of the respondents (75%) were between the ages of 18 to 25. This approximates the percentages and range found among women in the general student body.

Design and Procedure

Design

Surveys of the student population and interviews of officials from the UPD were conducted to study the effects of the Evening Guide Program on fear of crime and feelings of safety.

A questionnaire was developed to measure the level of fear, and students' knowledge and usage of the Evening Guide Program. The questionnaire was constructed in such a way that it measured students' level of fear and knowledge of the Evening Guide

Program (see Appendix B). The reason for this distinction was to see if awareness of the Evening Guide Program reduces the fear of crime on campus.

Verbal consent was received from respondents by informing them that by filling out the survey they would be providing useful information on the Evening Guide Program and campus safety, plus help the UPD secure a safer environment on campus. Eight-hundred surveys were distributed and 440 returned. Twenty-Five surveys were omitted because they were incomplete. Thus, 415 completed questionnaires were used for the study.

An ideal design would have been to utilize a before and after research design to compare the number of crimes with the level of fear, both before and after the program started. As mentioned earlier, we were unable to do this since the Evening Guide Program was established in 1977, and the UPD did not keep complete records about the escort service or crime statistics until recently. Thus, the length of time that has passed since the Evening Guide Program was implemented makes it impossible to use a before and after design.

Survey Questionnaire

The first question in the survey asked respondents how many evenings per week they are on campus. The next three questions inquired about levels of fear on and around the campus at three different settings: after dark, in the parking lots and in the surrounding neighborhoods. The next eight questions were about the Evening Guide Program itself. Respondents were asked if they are aware of and used the Evening Guide Program, and, if

yes, how many times. Respondents were also asked if they would wait 10 or 20 minutes for an evening guide to arrive. Two additional questions inquired about feelings of safety and use of the Evening Guide Program. The last question was open-ended, and asked for comments and suggestions about the Evening Guide Program (see Appendix B).

Independent Variables

The independent variables are the awareness and usage of the Evening Guide Program. Awareness was measured by asking the respondents whether they were aware of the Evening Guide Program; responses were “yes” or “no”. Use of the program was measured using a similar question, also with “yes” or “no” as possible answers. When the answer to the question on use was “yes”, an additional question asked how many times per week the individual used the program.

Dependent Variable: Measurements of Fear

The dependent variable was fear of crime on campus. This variable was measured using three questions that asked if the respondent felt safe to walk alone on campus after dark, in the university parking lots, and in the surrounding neighborhoods near SJSU in the evenings. Each of these three questions could be answered with “strongly agree”, “agree”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”.

Hypotheses

Each of the two independent variables was analyzed with the three questions that measured fear of crime on campus. Thus, knowledge and use of the Evening Guide Program was compared with whether students felt safe on campus, in the parking lots, and in the surrounding neighborhoods after dark. Chi-square was calculated to compare the responses between those who were aware of the Evening Guide Program and those who were not. The two hypotheses studied were:

1. Awareness of the Evening Guide Program will result in reduced fear of crime on campus.
2. Usage of the Evening Guide Program will result in reduced fear of crime on campus.

Reliability and Validity

Measures in the form of simple, straightforward questions were designed based on the similar questions used in the Macdonald and Garcia study at SJSU (Boer, 1998a). Reliability and validity of the survey were measured with a pretest using 100 participants. The main difference between this study and the pilot study is gender. In the pilot study both males and females were used as survey respondents, but for this study the survey was restricted to females only since men were found not to use the Evening Guide Program.

Chapter V

Results

Descriptive Statistics: Demographic and Related Variables

In the following section, descriptive findings are presented for demographic and other related variables such as awareness and usage of the Evening Guide Program. The two demographic variables presented here are the age of respondents and number of evenings on campus. For every question, the total number of respondents who answered that question or left it blank are also presented.

Age

Among the 415 respondents, 402 answered the question on age, and 13 respondents left the question blank (the missing category). The four categories of age were: 18-22, 23-27, 28-32 and 33+ (see Appendix B). The majority (182,43.9%) of respondents was from the 18-22 category. The second largest category was 23-27, and had 133 respondents (32.0%). The third category was 28-32, and had 48 (11.6%). The least number of respondents, 39 (9.4%), were in the fourth category of 33+ (see Table 1). The sample was roughly representative of the age breakdown of female students on campus. The average age for students on campus is 24 (San Jose State University, 1998).

Number of Evenings on Campus

The next demographic question was the number of evenings a respondent spent on campus (see Appendix B). From the 415 respondents, only one respondent left the answer blank and appears in the missing category. Thus, the number of completed surveys for this question was 414. There were four categories in this question. Starting with a zero, which meant never on campus in the evening. There were 107 (25.8%) respondents in this category. The second category of one to two evenings on campus had the majority of the respondents, 170 (41.0%). The third category of three to five evenings had 95 respondents (22.9%). The last category consisted of respondents who were on campus for six and seven evenings, and had 42 respondents (10.1%) (see Table 2). Although surveys were conducted at various times, including day and evenings, not many students are on campus at night. This is because SJSU is a commuter school, and students only stay on campus if they are taking an evening class or have to use the library. The majority of the students take classes during the day and leave.

Awareness of the Program

Question five asked about one of the independent variables in the study. Respondents had to answer “yes” or “no” to the question on awareness of the Evening Guide Program. All of the respondents in the study (415) answered this question. A large majority of the respondents, 304 (73.3%), were aware of the program. The reminder of

the respondents, 111 (26.7%), were not aware of the Evening Guide Program (see Table 3).

Usage of the Program

Those respondents who were aware of the program were then asked to answer whether or not they have used the Evening Guide Program. The total number of respondents who answered this question was 298. This question measured the other independent variable (usage). Forty-seven of the respondents (15.8% of 298) reported that they have used the program, whereas 251 respondents (84.2% of 298) said that they have never used the program. There is a difference between those who said “yes” to being aware of the program in the previous question (304) and those who (298) answered with “yes” or “no” for the usage question (298). The reason for this difference is that 6 of the respondents who were aware of the Evening Guide Program mistakenly left the usage question blank and appeared in the missing category. This decreased the total from 304 to 298. The rest of the respondents (111) fell into the category of “not applicable” which consisted of the respondents who were not aware of the program (see Table 4).

Number of Times Used

Those respondents who replied “yes” about using the program were then asked to choose the number of times they use the program per week. There were three response categories: one to two times, three to five times and six or more times. The total number of respondents who answered this question was 42. Of these respondents, 41 (97.6%),

chose the category of one to two times, and only one (2%) respondent choose the category of three to five times. None of the respondents fell into the third category of six or more times. The difference between the number of respondents who answered “yes” to the question on usage (47), and on the question for number of times the program is used (41) is because 5 of the respondents left the question blank. These 5 respondents were place in the missing category. For 368 of the respondents (87.7%) this question was “not applicable” since they were not aware of the Evening Guide Program (Table 5).

Descriptive Statistics: Measurement of Fear

There were three questions that measured level of fear on campus. The reason questions on feeling of safety and level of fear were asked about certain locations is because these locations are utilized by the majority of the students and each provide a different experience. The locations included parking lots, surrounding neighborhoods and campus grounds. Level of fear was measured with four categories of responses in each of the three questions. Response categories are mentioned below, along with the total number of respondents that answered each question and the number of respondents who left the question blank.

Feel Safe After Dark on Campus

The first question that measured level of fear after dark had four separate categories: strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. The question simply asked the respondent to what extent they feel it is safe to walk on campus after dark

(Appendix B). As presented in table 6, the total number of respondents that answered the question was 411. Four of the respondents did not choose any category and left the response category blank. Among the 411 that answered 13 (3.1%) of the respondents belonged to the “strongly agree”, and 88 respondents (21.2%) were from the “agree” category. Whereas, a majority of the respondents 225 (54.4%) were from the “disagree” category. Eighty-Five respondents (20.5%) chose the “strongly disagree” category. It is evident that a majority of the respondents disagreed with the question on feeling safe on campus after dark, since 74.7% of respondents fell into the “disagree” and “strongly disagree” categories.

Feel Safe in Parking Lots

The second measurement of fear asked respondents if they feel safe in the university parking lots. Respondents had to choose from four different categories: "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" (see Appendix B). The total number of respondents that answered this question was 400; thus 15 respondents left the question blank. A majority of the respondents, 228 (54.9%), were from the “disagree” category. The second highest category was “strongly disagree” with 90 respondents (21.7%). The “strongly agree” category had 13 (3.1%), and the “agree” category had 69 (16.6%) respondents (see Table 7).

Feel Safe in Surrounding Neighborhoods

The last measurement of level of fear inquired about the surrounding community. The question asked if it is safe to walk alone in the evenings in the neighborhoods surrounding the SJSJ campus (Appendix B). As presented in table 8, the number of respondents that answered this question was 411. Four respondents were placed in the missing category. Among those who chose a category, the smallest number, five (1.2%), was from the “strongly agree” category. Twenty-six (6.3%) were from the “agree” category. A majority of respondents were from both of the disagree categories. One hundred ninety-one (46.0%) were from the “strongly disagree”, and 189 (45.5%) were from the “disagree” category.

Testing of Hypothesis

As mentioned earlier the hypotheses for this study are that both awareness and usage of the Evening Guide Program will result in a reduced fear of crime. The independent variables in the study are awareness and usage of the Evening Guide Program, and the dependent variable is the fear of crime. To establish a connection between the Evening Guide Program and fear of crime, the responses of those who were aware were compared against those who were not aware of the program for each measure of fear. Next, the responses of those who have used the program were compared against those who have never used the program for the same questions.

To determine if there is a relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable two separate types of analyses are conducted. First, a descriptive

analysis was done where the percentages and numbers are examined for each relationship. Second, the category of “strongly disagree” for each question measuring the fear of crime was analyzed. This allows one to isolate those individuals who strongly disagreed with the statement of feeling safe on campus and thus expressed strong fear on campus. These responses were then compared first on the awareness question, i.e., comparing those who are aware of the program and show fear with those who are not aware and show fear. The responses were also compared between those who used the program and those who did not use the program. Finally, cross tabulation tables were compiled and chi-square was calculated for each comparison to see if a significant relationship exists.

Relationship Between Awareness of the Program and Fear of Crime on Campus

As presented in Table 9, four cases were missing from the total sample size of 415. Thus, the total number of respondents for this comparison was 411. From the 411 respondents, 302 were aware and 109 were not aware of the Evening Guide Program. Among those 302 who were aware of the program, the majority, 158 (52.3%), were from the “disagree” category. The “strongly disagree” and “agree” almost had the same number of respondents, 65 (21.5%) and, 66 (21.9%), consecutively. The least number of respondents, 13 (9.6%), were in the “strongly agree” category. Among those who were not aware of the program, 109 the majority, 67 (61.5%), of the respondents were from the disagree category, 67. There were 20 respondents (18.3%) in the strongly disagree and 22 (20.2%) in agree categories. No respondents fell into the “strongly agree” category.

As mentioned above, to test the hypotheses and to see if awareness or usage of the program reduced level of fear the responses from “strongly disagree” categories were compared among those who were aware to those who were not aware of the program (see Table A). The total percentage of respondents who were aware of the program and disagreed to feeling safe on campus after dark is 21.5%; whereas, 18.3% of the respondents who were not aware of the program expressed fear on campus. This shows that those who were aware of the program were a little more scared than those who were not aware. The chi-square of 6.412 ($df=3$) was not significant at .05 level (see Table 9). It appears then that the two variables are not related and awareness of the Evening Guide Program had no effect on level of fear on campus. Thus, this test fails to reject the null hypothesis that awareness of the Evening Guide Program is not related to fear of crime on campus.

Relationship Between Awareness and Fear in Parking Lots

Out of the total sample of 415, 400 were valid cases and 15 were missing. From the 400 respondents in this category, 292 were aware of the program and 108 were not aware of the program. Among those who were aware of the program, 11 (3.8%) were from the “strongly agree” category and 55 (18.8%) were from the “agree” category. The “strongly disagree” category had 65 respondents (22.3%). The majority of respondents were from the “disagree” category with a total of 161 (55.1%) (Table 10). Among those who were not aware of the program, 2 (1.9%) were from “strongly agree”, 14 from

(13.0%) “agree”, and 25 (23.1%) were from the “strongly disagree” categories. Thus the majority (67=62.0%) were from the “disagree” category.

By looking at the “strongly disagree” category, it shows that those aware of the program were slightly less fearful (22.3%) than those who were not aware of the program (23.1%) (see Table A). The chi-square value of 3.152 with degree of freedom of 3 was not significant at the .05 level. This implies that, although fear is greater among those who are not aware of the program, there is no statistical relationship between awareness and fear of crime on campus.

Relationship Between Awareness and Fear in Surrounding Neighborhood

The total number of respondents for the cross tabulation between awareness and level of fear of crime in neighborhood is 411. Thus, only four cases were missing. Among those who were aware of the Evening Guide Program, the majority fell into “disagree” and “strongly disagree” categories: 139 (45.7%) and 144 (47.4%) respectively. There were only two (.7%) respondents in the “strongly agree” category and 19 respondents (6.3%) in the “agree” category. Among those who were not aware once again the majority were from the “disagree”, 50 (46.8%), and “strongly disagree”, 47 (43.9%) categories. There were only, 3 (2.8%) in the “strongly agree” and 7 (6.5%) in the “agree” categories (see Table 11).

The difference between the fear level for those who are aware and not aware of the program is minute in this comparison. Of those aware 47.4% and of those not aware 43.9% strongly disagreed with feeling safe in the surrounding neighborhood. This shows

that those aware were slightly more fearful (see Table A). The chi-square value of 3.226, (df= 3) was not significant which means there is no statistical relationship between awareness and level of fear on campus (see Table 11).

Relationship Between Usage and Fear of Crime on Campus After Dark

As presented in Table 12, the independent variable of usage of the Evening Guide Program and the dependent variable of fear after dark had the chi-square value of 1.109 with 3 degrees of freedom. There were 296 respondents in the cross tabulation, with 119 cases (respondents) missing. Among those who have used the program, 2 were from the “strongly agree” (4.3%) and 8 (17.4%) from the “agree” category. The majority were from the “disagree” category, 24 (52.2%), and the second largest category was the “strongly disagree” category with 12 (26.1%) respondents. There were 250 respondents who never used the Evening Guide Program. The majority 131 (52.4%) were from the “disagree” category. The “agree” and “strongly disagree” had more or less the same respondents 57 (22.8%) and 51 (20.4%) respectively. The lowest number of respondents 11 (4.4%) was from the “strongly agree” category (see Table 12).

By comparing the “strongly disagree” responses it shows that those who have used the program (26.1%) are more fearful than those who have never used the Evening Guide Program (20.4%). Although there is a small difference between the fear of those who have used and those who have never used the program the chi-square value of 1.108 (df=3) is not significant at .05 level (see Table A). This means there is no statistical relationship between the usage of the program and fear on campus after dark.

Relationship Between Usage and Fear of crime in Parking Lots

There were 286 respondents in the cross tabulation between usage and level of fear of crime in the parking lots. Cases missing were 129, which meant 129 respondents left one of the two questions (on usage or fear in parking lots) blank on the survey (Table 13). Forty-four respondents had used the Evening Guide program and 242 respondents have never used the Evening Guide Program. From the 44 who had used the program, one (2.3%) answered “strongly agree”, and seven (15.9%) answered “agree.” Most of the respondents answered “disagree”, 24 (54.5%), and “strongly disagree”, 12 (27.3%). Among the 242 who have never used the Evening Guide Program, 10 (4.1%) answered “strongly agree”, and 46 (19.0%) answered “agree.” Similar to the usage and fear of crime after dark, the majority of the respondents, 135 (55.8%), were from the “disagree category.” The strongly disagree category had, 51 (21.1%), respondents (see Table 13).

When comparing the “strongly disagree” responses of those who used with those who never used the program it is evident that fear is higher among those who have used the Evening Guide Program (27.3%) compared to those who have not used the program (21.1%) (see Table A). At the same time the chi-square of 1.187 with 3 degrees of freedom was not significant at the .05 level (see Table 13). This means usage of the Evening Guide Program does not have a statistical relationship with fear of crime on campus.

Relationship Between Usage and Fear in Neighborhoods

There were 298 respondents in the cross tabulation between the variables of usage and fear of crime in the SJSU neighborhood. There were 117 missing cases. Out of the 47 respondents who have used the program, only one (2.1%) fell in to the “strongly agree” category, two (4.3%) into the “agree” category, 20 (42.6%) fell into the “disagree” and 24 (51.0%) in the “strongly disagree categories.” There were 251 respondents who have never used the program. Out of these 251, the majority were from the “disagree”, 118 (47.0%), and “strongly disagree”, 117 (46.6%), categories. “Strongly agree” had one respondent (.4%) and “agree” had 15 (6.0%) respondents (see Table 14).

By comparing the “strongly disagree” responses of those who have used the program with those who have not, it was found that fear was higher among those who used the program: 51.1% compared to 46.6% for those who never used the program (see Table A). The chi-square value of 2.305 (df=3) is not significant at the .05 level (see Table 14). This means that, although level of fear is the same between those who have used the program and those who have never used the program, there is no relationship between usage and fear of crime in the neighborhood around campus.

Chapter V

Discussion

Analysis and Discussion

Overall, no relationship existed between the variables for both hypotheses. For awareness and the three measures of fear and then the usage of the program and the same three measures of fear: on campus, parking lots, surrounding neighborhood. However, there were some interesting findings. Level of fear was higher on campus and in surrounding neighborhoods for those who were not aware of the program compared to those who were aware of the program. But, level of fear in the parking lots was almost the same (1.1 % difference only) for both who were aware and not aware of the program.

Expected findings were discovered for the usage hypothesis. Those who have used the program expressed greater fear at all three locations: on campus, parking lots and surrounding neighborhoods. At least two explanations justify this finding. First, those afraid of crime were already using the program and secondly, knowledge and usage of the program possibly increases to the impression that crime exists on campus, and thus increases level of fear.

Although not significant when correlated with independent variables of awareness and usage, when the strongly disagree and disagree categories were combined it was discovered that fear existed for all three measures: on campus (74.9%), in parking lots (76.7%) and neighborhood (91.5%), which was the greatest level of fear expressed. This finding is very similar to the studies conducted at SJSU by the Department of Sociology

and the Office of the President. Both studies found that students felt the most fear in the surrounding communities (Boer, 1998a). To some extent, this finding was expected not only because of the results in previous studies but also because the university campus is located in the downtown metropolitan area with homeless people and a low income community around it.

Moreover, the majority of the respondents, 73.3%, knew about the Evening Guide Program on campus. This result is similar to the study conducted in 1996 by the Department of Sociology where 78% of the students indicated they knew about the program. However, of the 73.3% in the present study who were aware of the program, only 11.3% reported ever using the services (see Table 4). It is important to note that the actual number of students who use the program, is quite low. Out of the 11.3% who used the program a vast majority (97.6%) reported using it only once or twice a week. No one stated using it on a daily basis (see Table 5).

For future research, it will be important to study in detail the causes of low usage of the Evening Guide Program. It could be that students who most frequently use the program are those who need an escort in the surrounding community and not on campus. The locations where the service is most often requested should be an integral part of future research.

Other qualitative findings that may explain the low usage of the program are as follows. Many respondents complained that the waiting period for an evening guide is too long. Few respondents mentioned that they waited close to 20 minutes for an evening guide and after that experience never called again. Others expressed concerns about the

unfriendly attitude of the guides and lack of female guides. Lack of publicity also played a role in the low usage of the Evening Guide Program. Many respondents also commented that they do not know where or how to request an evening guide. Several of the respondents had concerns about trusting an evening guide and walking alone at night with a strange man.

During the research it was discovered that certain safety aspects are missing from the program. The first problem is the identification of an evening guide. When an evening guide meets the person who made the request for service, they only ask, "are you the student/person who requested the guide?" The individual then walks with the evening guide. Everyone who makes a request is not aware of the fact that an evening guide should be wearing a blue jacket or that they can ask to see the official identification. This means that anyone could pretend to be an evening guide and can be harmful.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is the method of sampling. Quota and purposive sampling was used, which could mean that the sample was not representative of the student population.

Another major limitation of the study was fear of crime on campus was studied, and not actual incidents or reports of incidents. As mentioned earlier, this was because the Evening Guide Program began in the 1970s, and thus it was not possible to compare reports of crime or incidents before and after the escort service.

Certain intervening variables were not analyzed, such as a person's location on campus, or prior knowledge of or personal experience as victims of assault and rape. It is likely that one's response to fear is influenced by one or more of these variables.

Policy Implications

A number of policy implications can be derived from this study and previous research. These are:

1. Additional publicity about the Evening Guide Program by using items such items as: key chains, book marks, writing pens, and safety whistles with the UPD logo and program contact number on them. Information about the program could also be placed in every course outline and announced in class especially those in the evening.
2. Reducing the waiting period for an evening guide after it has been requested.
3. Improving staff training for customer/client service. For example, one respondent mentioned that her guide's behavior and body language depicted annoyance at having been requested to escort her.
4. Hire more females. There is a need to send a female guide with a male guide when a female requests the service at night. A few of the female respondents mentioned their comfort level was low when walking with a male guide alone at night.
5. Everyone who requests a guide is not aware of the fact that the escort should be wearing a blue jacket or that they can ask to see the identification of an escort. To avoid any potential problem, people who request a guide should be given a code (which could be a number or a word) when they call for an escort. Upon arrival, the guide must say both

- the person's first name and the code. This way the person using the service will know that this individual definitely works for the UPD and it is safe to walk with him or her. Guides should also radio the dispatcher both when they arrive and when they drop off the student.
6. A good record keeping system should be established before conducting any future research on the Evening Guide Program. This should include detailed information on the both budget and staffing procedure.
 7. To increase student interest and participation as measurement of the Evening Guide Program staff the university could earn credit toward their tuition.
 8. Rather than having the Evening Guide Program staffed only at the UPD office, they could be dispersed at a number of locations on the SJSU campus, for example at the library and at the Student Union. This would decrease the waiting period for participants, and increase satisfaction and use of the program.
 9. Guides should be equipped with two-way radios so that the dispatcher at the UPD can more quickly send them to where students are waiting to be escorted.
 10. To ensure that unauthorized an authorized individuals do not use the blue jackets/vests they should be closely be kept at UPD and signed out and back in for every shift.

Conclusion

Although no statistical relationship existed between awareness and use of the Evening Guide Program and fear of crime it was found that fear does exist for women both on campus, and especially in the surrounding neighborhoods.

RERERENCES

- Archer, J. J. (1992). Campus in crisis: Coping with fear and panic related to serial murders. Journal of Counseling and Development, 71, 96-100.
- Beeler, K. J. (1991). Campus safety: A survey of administrative perceptions and strategies. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 001).
- Bennett-Johnson, E. (1996). The emergence of American crime and violence on the college and university campus. College Student Journal, 31 (3), 24-32.
- Boer, N. (1998a, February). UPD passes test: Police lessen student fears of urban campus. Spartan Daily, pp.1, 8.
- Boer, N. (1998b, April 20). Low SJSU rape statistics misleading. Spartan Daily, pp.1, 6.
- Brantingham, P., Brantingham, P., & Seagrave, J. (1997). Crime and fear of crime at a Canadian university. In Campus crime: Legal, social and policy perspectives. pp. 123-155. Chicago, IL: Locke Science Publishing Company, Inc.
- Cerio, N.G. (1989). Counseling victims and perpetrators of campus violence. In J. M. Shreill & D.G. Seigal (Eds.), Responding to violence on campus: New directions for students services, no. 47, pp. 53-63. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Augelli, A. (1992.). Lesbian and Gay male undergraduate experience of harassment and fear on campus. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 92 (7), 383-395.
- Dekeseredy, W.S., Schwartz, M.D. & Tait, K. (1993). Sexual assault and stranger aggression on a Canadian university campus. Sex Roles, 28 (5), 263-277.
- Fisher, B. S. (1995). Crime and fear on campus. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 539 85-101.
- Fisher, B. S. & Nasar, J. L. (1992). Students' fear of crime and it's relation to physical features of the campus. Journal of Security Administration, 15 (2), 65-75.
- Gordon M. & Riger, S. (1989). The female fear. New York: The Free Press.
- Grayson, P. (1993). Keeping their antennas up: violence and urban college student. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 8 (72), 139-150.

Hagan, F. E. (1997) Research methods in criminal justice and criminology (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: A Viacom Company Publication.

Hayden, D. (1984). Redesigning the American dream. New York: WW Norton and Company.

Klodawsky, F. & Lundy, C. (1994). Womens' safety in the university environment. Journal of Architectural and Planning Research, 11 (2), 128-136.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C.A. & Wisniewski, N (1987). The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55 (2), 162-170.

Lederman, D. (1995, Feb. 3). Colleges report rise in violent crimes. The Chronicle of Higher Education 3, pp. A31-42.

Lanier, M. M. (1997). Community policing on university campus. In Campus crime: Legal social and policy perspectives, pp. 246-263. Chicago, IL: Locke Sceience Publishing Comapany, Inc.

Mowery, A. (1997). Safe schools survey: Post secondary survey results. St.Paul, Minnesota: State Office of the Attorney General. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 766).

National Center for Education Statistics (1997). Campus crime and security at post secondary education institutions [On-line], Available <http://www.ed.gov/NCES/Pubs/97402.html>.

Nicklin, J. (1999, May 28). College report increases arrests for drug and alcohol violations. The Chronicle of Higher Education 28 p. A 39.

Nichols, D. (1995). Violence on campus: The intruded sanctuary. Law Enforcement Bulletin, 64 (6), 29-34.

Nichols, D. (1997). Creating a safe campus: A guide for college and university administrators. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publication.

Radford, J. (1987). Policing male violence- policing women. In J.J.Hammar & M. Maynards (eds.) Women violence and social control, pp. 83-119. Altantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanties Press International.

San Jose State University (1998). San Jose State University 1998-2000 Catalog.

Scanlon, J. (1997). The truly well-lit path: Efforts toward a rape-free college campus. Initiatives, 56 (3), 31-40.

Shaw, S. (1998, February 12). Students illuminated on nighttime tour. Spartan Daily, p.1.

Siegal, D.G. & Raymond, C. (1992). An ecological approach to violent crimes on campus. Journal of Security Administration, 15 (2), 19-29.

Siegal, L. J. (1998). Criminology (6th ed.) Belmont, CA: West/Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Sloan, J.J. (1994). The correlates of campus crime: An analysis of reported crimes on college and university campuses. Journal of Criminal Justice, 22 (1), 51-61.

Stanko, E. A. (1995). Women, crime and fear. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 539, 46-58.

Univesity Police Department, San Jose State University. (1996) University police department annual report 1995-1996.

University Police Department, San Jose State University (1997). University police department annual report 1996-1997.

University Police Department, San Jose State University (1998). University police department annual report 1997-1998.

APPENDIX A

Table 1

Age Breakdown of the Population

Age Categories	Percentages of Respondents
18-22	43.9%
23-27	32.0%
28-32	11.6%
33+	9.4%

96.9%
(402)

Note: 13 respondents (3.1%) left the answer blank and did not choose an age category.

Table 2

Number of Evenings on Campus

<u>Number of Evenings</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents on Campus</u>
0	25.8%
1-2	41.0%
3-5	22.9%
6-7	10.1%
	98.9%
	(414)

Note: 1 respondent (.1%) left the answer blank.

Table 3

Awareness of the Evening Guide Program

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
Aware	73.3%
Not Aware	26.7%
Missing	0%
	100% (415)

Note. Missing category includes percentages of respondents who left the answer blank.

Table 4
Usage of the Evening Guide Program

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
Yes	11.3%
No	60.5%
Missing	1.0%
Not Applicable	27.2%
	100%
	(415)

Note. Missing category includes percentages of respondents who left the answer blank.
 Not Applicable category includes percentages of respondents who were not aware of the program.

Table 5

Number of Times the Evening Guide Program Used

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
1-2	9.9%
3-5	0.2%
Missing	87.7%
Not Applicable	2.2%
	100%
	(415)

Note. Missing category includes percentages of respondents who left the answer blank. Not Applicable category includes percentages of respondents who never used the program.

Table 6

Fear on Campus After Dark

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
Strongly Agree	3.1%
Agree	21.2%
Disagree	54.2%
Strongly Disagree	20.5%
Missing	1.0%
	100%
	(415)

Note. Missing category includes respondents who left the answer blank.

Table 7

Fear in parking Lots

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
Strongly Disagree	3.1%
Agree	16.6%
Disagree	54.9%
Strongly Disagree	21.7%
Missing	3.7%
	100%
	(415)

Note. Missing category includes percentages of respondents who left the answer blank.

Table 8

Fear in Surrounding Neighborhood

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Percentages of Respondents</u>
Strongly Agree	1.2%
Agree	6.3%
Disagree	45.5%
Strongly Disagree	46.0%
Missing	1.0%
	100%
	(415)

Note. Missing category includes percentages of respondents who left the answer blank..

Table 9

Relationship Between Fear on Campus and Awareness

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Aware</u>	<u>Not Aware</u>
Strongly Agree	4.3%	0%
Agree	21.9%	20.2%
Disagree	52.3%	61.5%
Strongly Disagree	21.5%	18.3%
	100% (302)	100% (109)

Note. This table does not include 4 missing cases

Table 10

Relationship Between Fear in Parking Lots and Awareness

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Aware</u>	<u>Not Aware</u>
Strongly Agree	3.8%	1.9%
Agree	18.8%	13.0%
Disagree	55.1%	62.0%
Strongly Disagree	22.3%	23.1%
	100%	100%
	(292)	(108)

Note. This table does not include 15 missing cases.

Table 11

Relationship Between Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods and Awareness

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Aware</u>	<u>Not Aware</u>
Strongly Agree	0.7%	2.8%
Agree	6.3%	6.5%
Disagree	45.7%	46.8%
Strongly Disagree	47.4%	43.9%
	100%	100%
	(304)	(107)

Note. This table does not contain 4 missing cases.

Table 12

Relationship Between Fear on Campus and Usage

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Aware</u>	<u>Not Aware</u>
Strongly Agree	4.3%	4.4%
Agree	17.4%	22.8%
Disagree	52.2%	52.4%
Strongly Disagree	26.1%	20.4%
	100%	100%
	(46)	(250)

Note. This table does not contain 119 missing cases

Table 13

Relationship Between Fear in Parking Lots and Usage

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Used</u>	<u>Not Used</u>
Strongly Agree	2.3%	4.1%
Agree	15.9%	19.0%
Disagree	54.5%	55.8%
Strongly Disagree	27.3%	21.1%
	100%	100%
	(44)	(242)

Note. This table does not contain 129 missing cases.

Table 14

Relationship Between Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods and Usage

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Used</u>	<u>Not Used</u>
Strongly Agree	2.1%	0.4%
Agree	4.3%	6.0%
Disagree	42.6%	47.0%
Strongly Disagree	51.0%	46.6%
	100%	100%
	(47)	(251)

Note. This table does not contain 117 missing cases.

Table A

The Strongly Disagree Category and Awareness Variable With Three Measures of Fear

Questions	Aware	Not Aware
Fear on Campus	21.1%	18.3%
Fear in Parking Lots	22.3%	23.1%
Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods	47.4%	43.9%

Note. This table indicates Percentages of Respondents who Strongly Disagreed on each question.

Table B

The Strongly Disagree Category and Usage Variable with Three Measures of Fear

Questions	Used	Not Used
Fear on Campus	26.1%	20.4%
Fear in Parking Lots	27.3%	21.1%
Fear in Surrounding Neighborhoods	51.1%	46.6%

Note. This table indicates Percentages of Respondents who Strongly Disagreed on each question

APPENDIX B

Survey of Campus Safety

For my thesis I am studying student's feelings of safety on campus. By doing this survey you will not only assist with my thesis but will also help the University Police Department to secure a safer campus. Some questions require simple yes or no answers and some questions require you to express your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement. Thank you so much for your cooperation.

1. How many evenings (after 5:00 pm) per week you are on campus?

0	_____	1-2	_____
3-5	_____	6-7	_____

2. I believe that it is safe to walk alone on campus after dark.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

3. I feel safe in the university parking lots in the evenings.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

4. I believe it is safe to walk alone in the neighborhoods surrounding the SJSU campus in the evenings.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

5. Are you aware of the Evening Guides/Escort service on campus?

Yes _____ * No _____

* (If NO go to question 8)

6. Have you used the Evening Guides service on campus?

Yes _____ *No _____

*(If NO go to question 8)

7. How many times per week do use the Evening Guides service?

1-2 _____ 3-5 _____ 6 or more _____

8. I feel safer knowing that we have an Evening Guides service on campus.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

9. I would wait 10 minutes for an Evening Guide as opposed to walking alone at night.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

10. I would wait 20 minutes for an Evening Guide as opposed to walking alone at night.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

11. I believe that using the Evening Guides service is safer than walking alone at night.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

12. If a friend was recently attacked on or near campus I would start using the Evening Guides service.

Strongly agree _____ Strongly disagree _____

Somewhat agree _____ Somewhat disagree _____

13. Your age category is 18-22 _____ 23-27 _____

28-32 _____ 33+ _____

14. Do you have any comments or suggestions about the Evening Guides service or the survey.