



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works


5-2013

A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights

Jesse T. Kittle Mr.

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kittle, Jesse T. Mr., "A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1170.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1170>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology

by

Jesse Thomas Kittle

May 2013

Larry Miller, Ph.D., Chair

John Whitehead, Ph.D.

Gregory Rocheleau, Ph.D.

Keywords: Surveillance, Security, Crime

ABSTRACT

A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights

by

Jesse Kittle

The purpose of this study is to research the role and public perception of security surveillance on a university campus. The research measured variables such as age, gender, class standing, political affiliation, and one's residence whether on campus or off campus. This study is focused on how students view security surveillance, and whether they see security surveillance as an important tool for the safety of the public or a threat to privacy. A student survey was administered to undergraduate students asking how they felt about crime on campus and whether crime was a problem that could be solved by security cameras. The research indicates that the majority of students do not view security surveillance as a threat to their privacy, and that security cameras are an important tool in combating crime.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This would not be possible without the help and support of so many people. They encouraged me, motivated me, and kept me focused, not just with my thesis, but with the entire graduate school experience. To my precious girlfriend, Elizabeth Huntley, I am so fortunate to have you in my life, and without your support I would never have made it passed the first semester. Our little talks every night kept and continue to keep me going. To my father and mother, Kim and Trudy Kittle, without your prayers and support I would not have survived to earn my bachelor's degree let alone my master's degree. To my committee, Dr. Miller, Dr. Rocheleau and Dr. Whitehead, I greatly appreciate your help and wisdom in guiding me through the thesis process. Ryan, thanks for listen to me bemoan the graduate school. Thanks to Allen Morton who periodically provided a swift kick-in-the-pants to keep me motivated. To Christine Ketelaar, a special thank you for allowing me to come in your office, panic and then calming me back down. Brad Edwards, for being a mentor for me through graduate school. To Ashley Bowser, I am very fortunate to know someone like you who challenged and fostered my critical thinking skills and kept me centered on academic work. I'll never forget the time you texted me and asked if we were "going to be ok." It was at that moment that I realized just how fortunate I was to have another student to work through the process of writing a thesis. A special thank you to all my fellow graduate students: Phillip, Schyler, Prentice, Ford, Jessica, George, and Daphne. Without Daphne I would have flunked out the first semester. Finally, to all my friends and family that have prayed for me and supported my through this entire process of graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	3
LIST OF TABLES.....	7
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
Theoretical Perspectives	12
Purpose of Study.....	12
Hypotheses.....	14
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
3. METHODOLOGY.....	39
Sample.....	39
Demographics.....	40
Survey Questions.....	40
Bivariate Statistics.....	40
Independent Variable.....	41
Dependent Variables.....	41

Expected Results.....	41
4. RESULTS.....	47
Tests of Significance: Chi-square.....	48
Test 1.....	49
Test 2.....	50
Test 3.....	51
Test 4.....	52
Test 5.....	53
Test 6.....	54
Linear Regression.....	55
Test 7.....	56
Test 8.....	58
Limitations.....	59
5. DISCUSSION.....	62
ETSU Public Safety	66
Student Comments.....	69
Conclusion.....	70

REFERENCES.....71

APPENDIX: Data Collection Instrument.....74

VITA.....81

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Percentages for Test 1.....	49
2. Chi-Square for Test 1.....	50
3. Percentages for Test 2.....	50
4. Chi-Square for Test 2.....	51
5. Percentages for Test 3.....	51
6. Chi-Square for Test 3.....	52
7. Percentages for Test 4.....	52
8. Chi-Square for Test 4.....	53
9. Percentages for Test 5.....	53
10. Chi-Square for Test 5.....	54
11. Percentages for Test 6.....	54
12. Chi-Square for Test 6.....	55
13. Descriptive Statistics for Test 7.....	57
14. ANOVA for Test 7.....	57
15. Coefficients for Test 7.....	57

16. Descriptive Statistics for Test 8.....	58
17. ANOVA for Test 8.....	58
18. Coefficients for Test 8.....	59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Surveillance has been increasing over the last 10 years (Goold, 2001). Surveillance offers promise of protection with a constant and unbiased record of events. However, does security surveillance violate the civil liberties? Crime and terrorism have created a unprecedented demand for security. This increase in security has resulted in more surveillance activity. In the wake of the September 11th attacks, the Patriot Act increased the surveillance powers of the federal government. The British government has also vastly increased surveillance activities since the 1990s. Surveillance has allowed crimes to be tracked as they have taken place. Surveillance has played a critical role in law enforcement. Surveillance practices have gradually broadened with technology, from simple phone taps in the 1930s, to closed circuit television and cell phone wiretaps conducted today. Surveillance is critical in addressing crime. School systems have adopted cameras and metal detectors. Federal, state, and local officials have increased surveillance in public venues and locations. Clearly, surveillance has promise to provide more safety with lower cost. It is argued that surveillance is unblinking with an unbiased eye. There are clear advantages to surveillance, lower costs to law enforcement and security professionals. Surveillance offers protection for all types of security scenarios, from large sporting events to the small workplace and school campuses. Much of the research pertaining to school crime is focused on secondary school shootings and much of the research with surveillance has been done in Great Britain.

There are undeniable consequences to surveillance. Security surveillance is only as safe and trustworthy as the persons employed to operate the system, a hidden world with little access

to the general public and limited oversight. Abuse of power is a real and frightening possibility. Do the advantages of surveillance allow for greater security? There are disconcerting challenges that surveillance poses to society and civil liberties. In Great Britain, security surveillance has grown substantially since the 1990s. There are approximately 200,000 closed circuit television cameras operating in the public spaces (Fay, 1998). Security surveillance is perhaps the greatest method to address crime when one is considering situational crime prevention. Thus surveillance has been seen as a relatively cost effective tool for crime prevention and places only minimal demands on manpower, with the majority of the cost resulting from the installation. However, security surveillance can only watch a perpetrator, not intervene in a situation for a victim or stop the criminal.

Much of the concern with campus security has focused on high school shootings. High school students are traditionally seen as being more likely to commit a mass shooting or be victims of a mass school shooting. Juvenile students appear not to be concerned with victimization (Wilcox, May, & Roberts, 2006). Schools have adopted zero tolerance policies with weapons (Wilcox et al., 2006). Surveillance cameras have been added to schools, but there is limited research focused on the effectiveness of these cameras. With secondary schools, metal detectors and police officers are added in conjunction with security surveillance.

College campuses present different challenges. The campuses are large and cover acres with multiple buildings. The larger environment creates a larger challenge. There are more locations and more criminals to hide and commit crimes. The costs of more surveillance and security is much larger. The addition of metal detectors and personnel to operate them would not only add more cost but would slow the process of students and staff entering buildings, along with generating greater alarm for students. Secondary schools students also present different

challenges. With juveniles, schools have more freedom in controlling student movements and creating policies restricting what students are able to bring to school. However, it is important to note that much of this is due to violence in inner city schools and a much more punitive public view of teens and crime. The college and university campus presents unique security issues, but centers of higher learning also seek to attract students, thus safety is a concern for school administration. Punitive and intrusive security would potentially hinder student recruitment. It is also a formidable task to prevent mass shootings such as the Virginia Tech shooting. Such events, although very rare, are a concern on a college campus. Mass shootings are not addressed in the theoretical research.

On a speculative note, the majority of respondents in this study are likely to view security measures as having little to no impact on campus crime. Students at ETSU are likely to perceive the majority of crimes taking place off campus and the risk of their victimization being relatively low. The survey in this study was given in criminal justice classes. Criminal justice majors are likely to be more conservative, thus more likely to focus on individual responsibility than on threats to civil liberties. However, this study is not limited to criminal justice majors. Students from other majors and students who are criminal justice minors are also likely to participate. Their perception of security surveillance is unknown, and thus their responses are difficult to predict.

Theoretical Perspectives

In surveillance, it should be articulated that surveillance is merely a tool; it is neither good nor bad. The role of surveillance depends on the role and the power of the persons employing this tool. Much of the fear that surrounds the expanding powers of surveillance

centers on the fears of an Orwellian big brother and an all powerfully intrusive government. The theory that closely aligns relates to the use of security surveillance in routine activities and opportunity theory (Felson, 2002). The critical precepts of routine activities are that certain variables or combination of variables must be in place in order for a crime to take place (Felson, 2002). There must be a lack of guardianship, a suitable target, and a motivated offender (Felson, 2002). Surveillance is a method that feeds into the concept of routine activities theory. The majority of crimes committed on a college campus are theft (Fisher et al., 1998). The majority of college students fall into the age demographic for the high risk crime (Fisher et al., 1998). College students who live off campus often live in lower income locations. Many college students are unmarried, and some engage in high risk behaviors such as drug use. (Fisher et al., 1998). Security cameras offer the possibility of greater safety for college students. They also provide colleges and universities with a greater marketing tool in advertising of campus drug use when compared with other schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate fear of crime and whether students at East Tennessee State University are concerned to such a degree with crime to allow greater surveillance on campus. Would more and clearer surveillance make students feel safer, or would students feel that this would be an intrusion into their private lives? Greater and more detailed video and audio security surveillance could offer a safer living and learning environment for college students. With campus shootings a major concern, colleges and universities are obligated to protect. There must be a clear distinction between victimization and the perceived risk of victimization. Research indicates that there is a perceived greater risk for female college students (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). This study investigates how students feel about surveillance. The

anticipated results should indicate that women are more concerned about security and safety than male students (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). Further research done by Woolnough (2009) indicated that female students are more likely to engage in "self-protection behaviors." The variables of interest in this study are gender, race, class standing, and victimization. Previous (Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Woolnough, 2009) studies have indicated that although campus safety is a concern, the majority of college students who are victims of crimes are victimized off campus. Although females are more concerned with victimization, male students are more likely to become victims of a crime. Research (Fisher & Sloan, 2003) also indicates that the majority of campus crimes are minor incidents of theft. This study was intended to measure multiple variables. Previous studies have indicated that women are more concerned about personal security than men (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). It is possible that women are more concerned because they have been taught that they are the weaker sex and, therefore, fear sexual assault. Studies (Fisher & Sloan, 2003) and (Woolnough, 2009) have shown that male students are less concerned with being victimized. Research appears to indicate that males are more likely to be victims of crimes (Bromley, 1999). Research also indicates that theft is the most common crime on a college campus (Bromley, 1999). The number of violent crimes committed against college students is much lower than the national average (Bromley, 1999). The concerns surrounding surveillance could likely be correlated with one's political affiliation as well as age.

A critical question is how does the public perceive surveillance and is surveillance worth the risk of public alienation? This study relies on literature and research from the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has seen a large expansion of security surveillance (Fay, 1998). Although different with different dynamics, the issues of surveillance in Britain provide a case study of such cameras for the United States. The British CCTV system was a direct result of a

national increase in crime (Fay, 1998). The British cameras were thought to have been an effective and technologically advanced method to combat crime (Fay, 1998). However, this study, and the literature reviewed, indicate that there are issues with the British system, and that the vast security surveillance cameras have not provided a clear advantage and have presented concerns for personal privacy. The survey conducted with this study is intended to measure age, sex, class standing, race, and commuter statuses.

Security surveillance is the crux of this study. This study is not intended to argue for or against surveillance or CCTV cameras. It is simply a need to understand what the perception of surveillance is among students. The measurements and variables are intended to understand the students' views of security surveillance. A question of interest is whether a person's perception of surveillance is based on exposure to police and crime. There have been celebrated cases in the United Kingdom in which innocent persons have had their identities compromised (Fay, 1998). There have been other legal issues in addition that have been challenged in British courts (Fay, 1998). Media has been one challenge. Media reports on public surveillance have been negative and alarmist (Brooks, 2003). In addition to the media creating misconceptions, there are concerns that because private companies often own and operate the equipment, there could be concerns with employees' lack of professionalism (Brooks, 2003). Although in all fairness, issues with professionalism could arise in either private or public jobs, and Brooks writes that any lack of professionalism could be attributed to security being an "emerging industry" (Brooks, 2003).

Hypotheses

This study is intended to look at variables of age, gender, class standing, commuter status, major and minor, religiosity, and political affiliation. These independent variables are measured against the dependent variables. Examples of questions include "do you feel safe on

campus," "is crime a problem on campus" and "do security cameras on campus make you feel safer." Using the Chi-square statistic, measures of significances were addressed. The variables of greatest significance are likely to be gender and political affiliation. In addition, linear regression was used to measure the relationship between the dependent variables, measuring the views of security surveillance and the independent demographics variables. From previous studies (Fisher et al, 1998) women are more afraid of crime, therefore, more likely to favor security surveillance. Security surveillance is a controversial issue that appears to divide between liberals and conservatives. It is an emerging trend that liberals are concerned with possible threats to civil liberties. Conservatives are less concerned with security surveillance, in that conservative doctrine focuses on individual responsibility; therefore, if one is a law abiding citizen, they have nothing to fear from surveillance. Therefore, one hypothesizes: liberal students will be more concerned with security surveillance than conservative students. Female students will be more concerned with crime, therefore, more likely to favor security surveillance than male students. The specific hypotheses that to be answered are do cameras make students feel safer, and does security surveillance have an effect on decreasing crime on campus? A 5 point Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5 will be used. These questions are measured against the variables of gender, political views, and class standing.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Surveillance and crime prevention are major concerns in any public location. Recent studies (Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Fox & Harding, 2005) have focused on the causes of crime and school shootings in public schools. Following the Virginia Tech shootings in April of 2007, college campuses had to focus on increased security. This study is to research into whether students feel safe on campus and what measures, if any, they take to protect themselves. In addition to this, the study is research about what types of security measures are taken by colleges and universities and are such measures effective.

A critical aspect of crime on college campuses is victimization and perceived victimization. Authors Wilcox et al. (2006) researched the link between fear of victimization and college-age women. This study was conducted across 113 schools in Kentucky. Although not addressed by the researchers, this sample could have resulted in bias because the study was conducted in the rural south, a section of the nation with higher rates of gun ownership than the rest of the country. The hypothesis of the researchers suggested that victimization or fear of victimization would result in students carrying weapons, specifically guns, to school. The authors theorized that with greater victimization comes greater numbers of guns in schools. The results of their study did not support this hypothesis. The results indicated that there was an increase in risk taking and crime oriented behavior. High school students appeared not to be concerned with fear of crime on campus, and one might argue, typical delinquent juvenile behaviors such as carrying guns when in schools.

This should not be a surprise, although high schools across the nation having adopted zero tolerance policies on weapons (Snell, Bailey, Carona, & Mebene, 2002). It is important to note that some students are still carrying weapons to school, a matter that should be of some concern to teachers, administrators, parents, and law enforcement. Surveillance on high school campuses was not addressed in this article; however, it does provide insight into the fear of victimization of high school students. It appears from the data in this study that most high school students have little perceived risk of being victimized.

It was because of victimization that the federal government passed the Clery Act in 1990, named for Jeanne Clery, a coed student sexually assaulted and murdered in her dorm room. Clery's parents were unaware of the number of violent crimes committed on their daughter's campus (Brinkley & Laster, 2003). The Clery Act required that all universities and colleges that receive federal funding report for public record the number and types of crimes committed on their campuses. It is important to note that this reporting is separate from the FBI's UCR data (Brinkley & Laster, 2003). The reporting is required to be very specific, stating when and where a crime has been committed: residence halls, campus buildings, or in any public property connected to the university. The Clery Act also required that colleges and universities publish their policies regarding public safety on campus. The total impact of the Clery Act is difficult to judge. Although universities and colleges provide information to parents and students, it is quite possible that it is infrequently used by the public. There is some evidence that the Clery Act has "had a positive influence in reporting on crimes on campuses and the publication of information concerning these crimes"(Brinkley & Laster, 2003, 205). Statistics indicate police are responding to more student reported crimes (Brinkley & Laster, 2003). The Clery Act may truly serve to create and foster fear in students rather than placate those fears.

Not only is the effectiveness of the Clery Act questionable, and also questionable is how universities and colleges report crimes and how easy is this information accessed. Dameron, DeTardo-Bora, and Bora, (2009) researched the methods of how centers of higher learning reported crimes and how they presented public safety information. According to the Dameron and colleagues as of 2009 there were 6,400 public and private and postsecondary institutions that received federal funding. They stated that 15 million students and staff study and work in these schools. "Such schools are a microcosms of our larger society" (Dameron et al., 2009, 106). The authors wanted to specifically research how easy it was to find campus crime reports on the school's web page and did the web page provide information of safety precautions for students. Of the 323 schools that were surveyed, 72.4% had information on the schools crime rate and it was also found that 56% percent of the school's web page made reference to the Clery Act (Dameron et al, 2009, 106). Dameron and colleagues also found a significant difference between how the information was presented by public and private schools. Public universities and colleges generally had safety information on many web pages, private schools tended to have a link to a separate web page, with safety and crime information. The authors stated that the campus crime statistics and emergency contracts were very easy to locate in the vast majority (85%) of school web sites. Only half the schools studied had information about the school's sexual assault policy available on the web, the authors did not publish some of the security measures such as the number of cameras or security officers on duty on such web pages. It is important to note that most of the safety information was found on the school's web page. The authors wrote that it would be better to have a separate web page dedicated to security.

Security surveillance appears to be an ever-increasing presence in American society (Lewis, 2004). Increasing surveillance is one aspect in situational crime prevention that is

relatively cheap and places minimal demands on manpower (Lewis, 2004). However, surveillance can only observe a perpetrator, not intervene in the situation. Surveillance can only aid police in arresting a criminal after a crime has been committed. This is the greatest shortfall of surveillance when used in a security setting.

Research focused on high school students carrying guns to school motivated by fear (Wilcox et al., 2006). The objective of the study was to examine whether high school students carried weapons because of the fear of being victimized. They surveyed high school students in the south and asked whether they carried weapons out of fear of being victimized at school. The results indicated that the vast majority of students did not carry weapons, and students who did admit to carrying weapons indicated that it was not out of fear of becoming a victim. One is able to extrapolate that fear of crime on high school campuses is not significant for many high students, but that this did not appear to result in more weapons in schools.

Woolnough researched the prevalence of college students' fear of being victimized and any self-protection behaviors (Woolnough, 2009). Following the Virginia Tech shooting on April 2007, the deadliest school shooting in American history, colleges and universities had to reexamine campus security. No longer were school shootings a secondary school issue. The Campus Security Act required that all colleges and universities make their crime reports public record and available to students and prospective students. (Woolnough, 2009). This has added an unexpected dimension to the marketing of schools to prospective students, with many colleges and universities promoting their campuses as being safe. The focus of Woolnough's research, however, was to measure the fear or perceived fear of campus crime of women on college campus.

Female students are particularly concerned about the risk of a sexual assault. This increased risk of sexual victimization was first reported by Ferraro in 1995. Ferraro coined the term shadow of sexual assault, implying that this fear is ever present, particularly in college-age woman. Further research (Fisher & Sloan, 2003) not only supported this theory, but data revealed that college age women were actually being sexually assaulted. The United States Crime Victimization Survey indicated that college-age women were five to seven times higher than other age demographics for being victimized. (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). Research by Fisher and Sloan in their article *Unraveling The Fear of Victimization Among College Age Women: Is the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis supported* was to examine what college-age women feared. The object of this study was to repeat the original Ferraro study but in addition was also to examine what they feared. The results indicated that female college students did indeed fear a sexual assault. Surveillance and campus security measures were not directly addressed in these studies. Fisher and Sloan (2003) stated that colleges and universities would be well advised to add additional security in coed dormitories. It is conceivable that women are conditioned to fear rape from childhood (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). This combined with being less capable of defending themselves leads to produce greater fear in females than in males. The authors conducted this study by sending email requests for survey participation and asked questions relating to fear and perceived risk of victimization of a variety of crimes. The results of this study indicated that female college students have a greater perceived fear of victimization, and thus females are more likely to adopt defensive behaviors and actions. Examples of these behaviors were staying in well-lit locations at night and avoidance of being alone when walking on campus. The data showed that fear of sexual assault was significant for females. Only in the combined model, the significance of sexual assault was avoided. The data also indicated that a significant number of

males also engaged in protective behaviors but at a lower rate than the females. However, it is important to note that in both males and females the percent of the variance accounted for was still relatively low, thus the majority of college students do not fear victimization on campus (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). Both male and female indicators for nonviolent crimes were the most significant.

Further data from a further study (Bromley, 1999) indicated that thefts are crimes of opportunity. Previous studies have shown that violent crimes accounted for 2% of the total compared to 18% for the rate in the cities in which these colleges were located (Bromley, 1999). Campus surveillance was not directly measured in this study nor were the levels of police presence on campus. It is important to note that fear of crime and perceived risk were found to be correlated; however, fear of victimization is often much higher than the actual risk of being victimized. It is important to note that fear of crime does vary across different demographics. Research done by Carmen, Polk, Segal and Bing focused on fear of victimization of not only CRCJ majors and nonmajors but across race and gender lines as well. The results indicated that CRCJ students feared victimization a 28.1% of the time, compared to rates of 41.5 % for nonmajors (Carmen et al., 2000). The authors also found that there was greater fear in students who attended night classes compared with students who did not have night classes. The authors speculated that if security concerns were directly addressed by colleges or universities, schools could potentially increase the number of students taking night classes, and thus allow students more flexibility with schedules and decrease over-crowding in day classes. However, it should be noted that there is a difference between high school security and college campus security. Fear of crime is not only taught but learned. The media has exacerbated the level of fear of school violence, especially when concerning high school and middle school violence. Authors, Snell et

al. (2002) explored the relationship between the media and fear of campus violence. The media coverage of school shootings has been extensive. Prior to publication of this article, the largest school shooting was Columbine. The media is driven by ratings. Crime and fear of crime generates and fosters greater media coverage. Research (Snell et al., 2002) indicates that the closer the proximity to a highly publicized crime, the greater the fear or perceived fear of the residents, although there is disagreement if this holds true on more than a local level and across different modes of the media such as newspapers (Snell et al., 2002). A 1998 NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll conducted in 1998, reported that 71% of respondents felt that school violence was increasing (Snell et al., 2002). The fear of victimization stands in contrast to the statistical decrease in school crime since the early 1990s (Snell et al., 2002). This article also reiterates that there is a discrepancy in victimization and fear of victimization. The authors in this article addressed security measures adopted by school districts in response to school shootings. The authors indicated that although murders on school campuses have decreased, media coverage of such stories increased 473 times, although it was not reported how these measurements were taken or made in the study cited. The authors sought to determine whether security changes made by school systems actually made the schools safer or simply decreased the fear of crime. A survey sample was taken of 3,058 schools in Texas, both public and private schools. With 336 schools responding, the results indicated that the majority of schools had a zero-tolerance policy concerning drugs and weapons. The results also indicated that fear of crime was not statistically related to the reason for the sample schools' policy change. Metal detectors and security cameras were the most common responses. School resource officers were also a common security response. Although the authors did not research how this might be an encroachment on privacy, the cost and effectiveness of these surveillance tools were addressed. Many school districts

bought costly equipment in response to school shootings. For rural schools this presented a major financial burden. The most important finding is that there is little evidence that zero-tolerance policies and school security measures have had an impact in the current decrease in school violence. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that such security measures would not be effective in increasing the safety of larger colleges and universities. The research done by Snell et al. (2002) is further supported by authors Repenning, Powell, Doane, and Dunkle (2001) in their article *Demystifying School Violence: A Local, State, and National Perspective on the Phenomenon of School Violence*. Their research focused on the perceived increase in school violence and the true statistical decrease in this violence over the sample period. Their research indicated that 20% more media coverage is spent on crime related topics and many of these are sensationalized stories of violence. The authors asserted that surveillance has not been an effective tool for addressing school violence, citing evidence that Columbine High School had video surveillance. Jan Hughes argued that surveillance in schools could have the effect of making students feel like a targeted population, increasing alienation and violence among the students (Repenning et al., 2001). The authors also addressed the effectiveness of dress codes. The adoption of uniforms has been shown to decrease violence in elementary through high school students. Although unlikely to be implemented by centers of higher learning that promote free forms of thinking, it would be an interesting case study to see if uniforms would decrease violent crimes on college campuses. This is also less likely in that traditional college students will be living on campus in the majority of cases, thus also diminishing a sense of discipline.

There should be a distinction made between routine crime and mass campus shootings. Campus "street crimes" do not occur on college campuses with any greater frequency than the surrounding cities, and mass shootings are even more unlikely (Repenning et al., 2001).

However, despite this infrequency, law enforcement and schools should be prepared for all possible contingences. Some universities and colleges need to take steps to educate women on the dangers of sexual assault (Dameron et al., 2009). In the wake of the Virginia Tech shooting, colleges and universities educated students on what to do in the event of a campus shooting. Schools might also want to create a confidential web page, where educators counselors and law enforcement officials can discuss students and flag suspicious behavior as well as collaborate on any action that might need to be taken.

Routine activities theory and opportunity theory are the most effective method of explaining campus crime (Felson, 2002). Routine activities focuses on offenders finding opportunities to commit crime. Routine activities is a theory that addresses how crime is allowed to take place. In addressing this crime, Felson focused on how to limit crime by limiting the opportunities to commit crime. Routine activities is a theoretical framework that Felson argues is neither utopian nor fatalistic, rather it is an optimistically problematic approach to countering criminal activity (Felson, 2002). Felson states that the following three variables must be present in order for a crime to take place (Felson, 2002). "A likely offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a guardian" (Felson, 2002). All of these variables must be present for a crime to take place (Felson, 2002). The central element is that in order for a crime to take place, there must be a combination of factors (Felson, 2002). Certain factors increase the likelihood of a crime; others decrease the likelihood. (Felson, 2002). Routine activities supports this approach to address types of crime, from petty theft to sexual assault and murder (Felson, 2002). Felson argues that although there is a great diversity in crimes the motives, opportunity, target, and level of guardianship all contribute to crime and whether a crime is or is not committed (Felson, 2002).

Routine activities focus allows for limiting of the variables that contribute to crime (Felson, 2002).

Surveillance directly addresses the lack of adequate guardian (Felson, 2002). A critical issue, however, is that if a target is desirable, security surveillance is likely inadequate, thus is not a "capable guardian" (Felson, 2002). The presence or absence of security surveillance would act as a witness to a crime and can be thought of as a passive guardian (Felson, 2002).

Surveillance allows a guardianship to be extended and prolonged indefinitely. Felson argues that crime can be designed out of campuses and buildings (Felson, 2002). Natural surveillance is what Felson addresses as the most important for preventing crime (Felson, 2002). Natural surveillance creates an environment where possible offenders feel too exposed and thus are more likely not to avoid committing a crime at that location (Felson, 2002). Security surveillance can be used to monitor blind spots (Felson, 2002), because such surveillance is hidden and not the natural line of sight that Felson argues is so important (Felson, 2002). Security cameras might not be as important in preventing crime as maintaining a natural surveillance (Felson, 2002).

The majority of campus crimes are minor thefts (Felson, 2002). Much of the research done on campus crime centers around limiting student victimization (Felson, 2002). To reduce the risk of crime, Felson argues for concentrating parking and student movement during night time hours; allow students to park close to their dorms and create better line of sight for students (Felson, 2002). Campuses are not typically areas that are prone to high crime, not falling into the "broken windows" category, that is most college campuses do not suffer from a lack of guardianship (Felson, 2002). Theft is the most common crime on college campuses (Fisher et al., 1998). Research has indicated that many of these thefts have taken place with a lack of guardianship (Fisher et al., 1998). Much of campus crime can also be attributed to the age group

of college students. Nineteen to 24 year olds have the highest rates of theft victimization (Fisher et al., 1998). This same age demographic also has high rates of violent crime victimization, although it should be noted that 12 to 15 year olds are the most likely to be victims of violent crime (Fisher et al., 1998). College students are predominately unmarried and with lower incomes, also increasing their likelihood of being crime victims (Fisher et al., 1998). College years also have the added element of drinking and drug experimentation (Fisher et al., 1998). This also increases exposure to both committing and being the victim of crime. This aspect might be a possible explanation for why many of the crimes that take place on college campuses go unreported (Fisher et al., 1998). Students are unlikely to report being the victim of a crime if they were intoxicated or "high" when the crime was committed. Colleges and universities might want to research the possibility of encouraging students to report crimes by offering students some immunity from disciplinary action or retribution. This would be especially helpful when combating violent criminals such as rapists. Such a system might not have a drastic effect on the reporting of crimes, but district attorneys might still determine not to press charges against a suspect, especially rape suspects. However, it is possible that there would be at least some benefit. King (2009) proposes that community oriented policing also could be effective on a college campus. Colleges and dorms are relatively small communities that could potentially benefit from community policing programs. King also addressed the theories behind school violence in primary and secondary schools. However, Fisher et al. (1998) argued that school violence in these settings can be explained with a combination of learning theory, modeling theory, labeling theory (Fisher et al., 1998) and even the southern subculture of violence theory (Fisher et al., 1998).

Although these theories offer some explanations to public school violence, theories as to the causation of university and college violence are likely to be very similar, with the exception that Hirschi's self control theory (1991) which might offer greater explanations of university and college crime with criminals such as the Virginia Tech shooter. Such persons may be acting violent due to a lack of bonds with friends and society. There are minimal social and cognitive similarities between high school students and the majority of traditional college students between the ages of 18 and 21 (Fisher et al., 1998).

Most colleges and universities maintain email accounts for staff and students to communicate. Large corporations also maintain such accounts. On multiple occasions courts in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada have ruled on the expectation of privacy of employees (Etsebeth, 2007). The majority of these cases centered around the firing of employees over the content of emails they considered private. Courts in Canada and the United Kingdom ruled that employees have some expectation of privacy at the workplace (Etsebeth, 2007). American courts, thus far, have ruled that employees have no expectation of privacy under these circumstances (Etsebeth, 2007). This is an important precedent for any future court cases that could potentially involve students and any universities and colleges they attend. Although this might not directly be concerned for this topic of research, it is important to make note of any policy implications and conflicts arising from these work place rules and policies. Security and surveillance is also a concern in the workplace environment just as it is with school campuses. The increase of surveillance holds the promise of increased security. The larger question remains, would increasing surveillance create safer college campuses or just reduce the fear of crime?

The United Kingdom has seen an inordinate increase in the use of closed circuit television (Fay, 1998). British law enforcement has vastly increased the number of CCTVs in all of Britain's major cities (Fay, 1998). There are approximately 200,000 CCTVs operating in the public spaces according to Fay. The growth of CCTV began in the 1990s as a direct response to crime. There was an increase in crime beginning in the 1980s; the CCTVs were to give the public reassurance. It has been shown that since the installation of cameras, fear of crime has gone down. As a proponent of CCTVs, the conservative branch of the British government began implementing CCTV cameras for security purposes. The cameras were installed on existing buildings and other structures in order to avoid any conflicts with city ordinances or zoning laws. It was considered both being tough on crime and being tough on the causes of crime (Fay, 1998). CCTVs offered the promise of an unblinking eye and an unbiased opinion of events. CCTVs, like all methods of surveillance, offer the assurance of security. Because of the very large number of cameras, it was believed that British law enforcement was able to keep watch in a much more effective manner than using officers in standard patrol. Home Secretary Michael Howard argued that CCTVs add to police effectiveness, not replace officers, although police in the town of Bingley were cut from 24 officers, to just 3. (Fay, 1998). The loss of civil liberties was a major concern. Prime Minister John Major strongly argued that civil liberties would not be endangered.

However, several issues have arisen with British surveillance. Studies of surveillance operations have indicated that minorities and persons of interest (Fay, 1998), young people and blacks, were shown to be one and a half to two and a half times more likely to be watched closely by CCTV (Fay, 1998). There is also a higher concentration of cameras in transition areas between business districts and lower income neighborhoods. This higher concentration of

cameras in poorer regions has led some to argue that British law enforcement is effectively "fencing in" less desirable persons with this surveillance (Fay, 1998). Abuse of the CCTV video has also been an issue with the British CCTV system. CCTV cameras were secretly installed in public restrooms to capture illegal homosexual activity. This created a huge controversy when two of the men implicated committed suicide. The public had not been informed about the cameras. Law enforcement argued that the cameras were not angled into stalls, and the men were entering one stall (Fay, 1998). Law enforcement stated that the cameras were only temporary (Fay, 1998). CCTV cameras also came under fire when a British newspaper reported that CCTV operators had compiled videos of couples in "intimate clinches" (Fay, 1998) and distributed this video. It has also been reported that women were targeted by CCTV operators in a voyeuristic manner (Fay, 1998). CCTV come under further fire when CCTV footage was published in a compilation entitled *Caught in The Act*. Fay did not indicate how and why this film was released, but it outraged several members of the House of Commons, although the release of this film did not violate any laws at that time (Fay, 1998). Protocol on the operation of CCTVs discouraged the release of any film footage but did not prevent such a release. Although *Caught in the Act* footage blurred out the faces of the individuals, the case of Geoffrey Peck raised more controversy (Fay, 1998). Peck was suffering from depression and had cut his wrists. He was filmed by CCTV operators walking along a public street. He was arrested by police and taken to a mental health hospital. He was not charged with any crimes as police stated that he was only a danger to himself. The film of Geoffrey Peck was released in *Caught in the Act*; he was recognized by friends because of this distinctive hair style (Fay, 1998). Peck took the town council to court, arguing that they had exploited his situation to gain publicity for the CCTV cameras. Peck was only able to obtain an apology from the local television station. The single

biggest threat to the public is that there is no clear provision in British law to recognize one's right to privacy. There is the real danger that if one is caught in a compromising position, the subject is considered guilty until proven innocent. Surveillance has been viewed as the "silent witnesses" to crime (Lewis, 2004). Fay made it clear in this article that CCTV represented a major threat to British privacy and to the freedoms of the British people. The ambiguity of British law has led to the majority of these issues. The British CCTV footage has also experienced issues with poor quality, and thus it were not permissible in court. Fay states that the Association of Police chiefs reported in 1993 that facial recognition was only possible in 20% to 40% of cases. Although this is dated information, it is important to note.

Despite these controversial obstacles, as of 1997 the British government claimed that CCTVs had contributed to 1,800 arrests. (Fay, 1998). British CCTVs offer an interesting perspective into a massive expansion of surveillance. Although Fray strongly argues against the use of CCTVs, he does not emphasize the benefits of surveillance. Conceivably, there are issues with the British CCTV system, but there are also successes with the system. Crime rates rose dramatically during the first phase of the CCTV network (Taylor, 2010). This rise was simply due to law enforcement being able to make arrests with actionable intelligence from the CCTV system. The clearance rates for any criminal case has been a matter of debate. It is estimated that the average person in London is recorded over 300 times a day (Lewis, 2004). Research conducted by Keval and Sassa (2010) revealed some of the difficulties and shortcomings of the British CCTV system. As previously stated, poor quality footage has been a major issue with the CCTV footage; however, with the adoption of digital cameras, the quality of the footage has improved. This has been the only technological difficulty.

The implementation of CCTV operations into law enforcement has not been a smooth transition (Fay, 1998). There are three different types of strategies: proactive surveillance, reactive surveillance, and video review (Fay, 1998). There are simply too many cameras to have a human monitor keeping watch at all times. The issues of transition have arisen when CCTV operators have to move between these methods of operation. For example, if a robbery is committed, police on the scene can request any footage captured from the local CCTV center in real time; however, any footage has to be reviewed; this takes valuable time. The CCTV operators might have to transition from proactively searching for incidents to reviewing footage for a police investigation. Furthermore the CCTV surveillance is not totally centralized (Fay, 1998). There are cameras operated by government agencies and private companies (Fay, 1998). There are cameras that are operated by law enforcement and others that are operated by private security companies that focus on strictly protecting businesses. The key element in the system footage is quickly and easily shared between different agencies. It is important to note that if the CCTV network is staffed and operated by different agencies and companies, there will be differences in training and professional conduct (Keval & Sassas, 2010). One could surmise that a loosely centralized system could possibly allow permit abuses of power and the voyeuristic incidences that have been reported (Keval & Sassas, 2010). Having such a surveillance system operate under one central authority might allow for greater control and improved professionalism. Keval and Sassas's research found that many of the CCTV locations were understaffed, and the staff worked long hours. Keval and Sassas also emphasized that CCTV operations do much more than focus on crime. CCTV cameras have enhanced emergency response in critical car accidents, aided in fire incidents, as well as help locate individuals in other emergency situations. Keval and Sassa (2010) are much more positive in their opinion of

the British CCTV system. They do write on the failures of the system, but they also give a much more impartial view of the successes.

Campus security programs should have a program of cost and benefit analyses. Within criminal justice, there is often a reactionary response. Little time and effort is given as to how effective a policy or strategy truly is in reducing crime, and although fear of crime is often disregarded and marginalized by criminal justice professionals, one should not diminish the value of reducing a perceived risk (Keval & Sassas, 2010).

The legality of CCTV film has been an issue in particular cases. The admissibility in court of surveillance footage has also been questioned (Murphy, 1999). Traditionally, surveillance footage has been considered almost irrefutable. In the example of the United Kingdom, CCTV footage is legally considered a witness. Any persons who also view the footage in real time are considered witnesses (Murphy, 1999). The British archetype of surveillance has been shown to have critical flaws; conversely, it has also great successes. The failures in personal privacy protection were inevitable, although maintaining privacy and protecting a one's civil liberties is still unattainable (Murphy, 1999). Such reports of abuse and mismanagement in British surveillance hold great importance for American universities and colleges expanding campus security and surveillance. Schools should set forth and clearly state the security and expectation of privacy to students. CCTVs would do little to prevent mass shooting incidences such as Virginia Tech. The critical element in campus security is privacy. Increased demand for a secure environment has led to privacy concerns. Goold (2002) addresses the concerns of CCTV surveillance and privacy. Goold (2002) cites extensively the work of legal philosopher David Feldman and draws upon Feldman's work in explaining his arguments. The most critical legal issue has been and will continue to be, do citizens have an expectation of privacy in public?

The case of Geoffrey Peck set forth a legal precedent of no privacy expectations in public locations in the United Kingdom. Goold cites the Supreme Court as having moved in this direction. Police video has been ruled by the court as not requiring a search warrant, and the Fourth Amendment has protecting people not places (Goold, 2002). Goold argues that much of the difficulty in protecting privacy lies with the problem of defining privacy and the expectation of privacy. Goold quotes David Feldman, who states that "privacy rights are important because they provide individuals with the ability to determine and control the boundaries between different, interlocking social spheres" (Goold, 2002, 22). For example, one operates within certain boundaries and behaves in a certain manner at work, with public social events, and within their own home (Goold, 2002). Goold writes that privacy is how one will act and respond within these circles. Privacy allows for greater freedom of action and expression. Without a level of privacy, there is no true freedom. There is no level of what Goold calls "self-determination or self-fulfillment" (Goold, 2002, 22). The ultimate question is whether people have a right to privacy in a shared public space. It is often argued that if one is not committing a crime and has nothing to hide, then one should not be concerned. Is there a real difference between a police officer watching a person and a CCTV camera operator watching a person? It is clear that there should be a distinction between the two (Goold, 2002). The officer may observe a person, but if criminality is not obvious, it is little more than a passing glance. Also, one is able to observe the observer. One can see that he or she is being watched by the police. The police are an easily recognizable force. CCTV surveillance is not easily recognizable. They are often hidden, and one cannot see the face of the individual behind the camera. Goold (2002) writes that this ambiguity possesses a sinister element. One cannot see who is watching the CCTV footage. Goold (2002) also writes that the observed does not know if the observer is a trained professional or a leering

voyeur. People will react in a different manner if they see they are being observed. A child or even a police officer might not necessarily evoke a response out of a individual, but being watched by a man in dark clothing is likely to create a measure of discomfort. Does being watched by a camera truly infringe on these rights? As Goold writes, "I expect to be noticed (in public) by those around me. I do not expect to be stared at intently" (Goold, 2002, 26). Many Americans are recorded on footage every day and have little concern. Many businesses display signs stating that individuals in the store are being recorded, and the general public passes by with little concern or thought. However, there is an element of deceit in camera placement and is a dangerous precedent. Goold argued that there is a distinction between hidden cameras and cameras that are in public view. Goold calls these issues, the "unobservable observer." Although some may argue that hidden cameras will not detect persons involved in illegal activity, this seems unlikely. Though public surveillance may not appear to be a significant infringement on civil liberties, if only with small steps are liberties and freedoms taken away. Increased surveillance has been a reality, especially after September 11th. Goold argues that in any free society there has been some measure of public anonymity given to the citizens. He takes this one step further by stating that hidden surveillance threatens this anonymity, and thus any cameras in public locations should be accompanied by signage stating that the location is being monitored. These issues can conflict when addressing universities or college campuses. The campus is both a public location and the private home for students living on campus. A major source of positional conflict is where students have an expectation of privacy. In dorms some buildings have attached bathrooms; older buildings might have communal bathrooms where the residents walk down a hallway. The residents may have privacy in their rooms, but a university might place cameras in hallways. This scenario could lead to conflict over privacy. Theoretically,

universities and colleges could classify an interior hallway as a public space. Students could also view this same space as private. The lines between what is public and private could quite easily be blurred on a university or college campus. The author argues that in order to safeguard the interests of the public, there should be a separate watchdog agency to monitor law enforcement and private surveillance operations. This would ensure that professionalism and ethical guidelines are being followed. Goold (2002) writes that these agencies would be empowered to conduct inspections and oversee surveillance operations. The operators would also be professional, vetted, and well trained. The general public would also be able to go to a web page and view the personnel operating CCTV cameras. The authors primary concern is transparency with surveillance. With transparency would come greater autonomy and assurance for the public.

One issue that Goold (2002) fails to address adequately is fear. Much of the surveillance done today has been as a result of terror attacks and mass shootings on college campuses (Snell et al., 2002). Fear of crime has been a driving force in the adoption of mass surveillance in Great Britain (Fay, 1998). If there is a concerted grass roots effort to create a watchdog agency, there might be some level of protection provided. However, there is likely to be a level of indifference and complacency on the part of the general public. Many people are not likely not to care about any infringement on their liberty (Goold, 2002). College students are not likely to notice campus surveillance at all (Goold, 2002). Goold acknowledges that courts in the United States have thus far ruled against the argument that one has a right to privacy in a public location. If surveillance is legally considered little more than a witness to any crime, then it is unlikely that the position of the courts would change.

In order for the police and school authorities to prevent mass shootings, the sociological causes and warning signs must be examined. Fox and Harding (2005) researched the causes of

the middle and high school shootings in the 1990s and how these crimes differ from other forms of secondary and college violence. There are fundamental differences. Mass shootings target the entire institution or society. The authors refer to such a phenomenon as "organizational deviance." Crimes are a result of the anger and hate of certain individuals. The larger question is does surveillance provide protection against such attacks? According to the Fox and Harding, with a few exceptions, the majority of secondary school shootings were preceded by warning signs from the perpetrators. In the shootings at Heath High School in West Paducah, Kentucky, Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, Arkansas, and Columbine High School, all the shooters in these incidents exhibited signs of dangerous and sociopathic tendencies. Regrettably, it appears that these shootings took place because of a failure to intervene. The officials and teachers of these schools had sufficient information regarding troubling behaviors of these students. Most had been bullied, been in trouble in school, and had shown cruelty to animals. Despite these concerns, school counselors and officials failed to intervene. The authors write this was a result of "poor managerial oversight" (Fox & Harding, 2005).

Obviously, there are significant differences between high school and college students. College professors do not have the level of disciplinary control over their students as high school teachers have over their students. College students are adults, but they are likely to still exhibit the same antisocial behavior as high school students (Fox & Harding, 2005). Thus the causes of such shootings are very similar. However, professors often know their students quite well and are likely to have opportunities to see troubling behavior by any one of their students and may be in a position inform the proper authorities. Organizational deviance can be prevented with the proper intervention (Fox & Harding, 2005). Fox and Harding (2005) state that the key to combating school related shootings is information and intelligence. The authors differentiate

mass shootings with interpersonal disputes and murders on school campuses. Mass shootings, whether in the work place, or school, are very rare events. Unlike surveillance, preventing mass shootings would depend greatly on friends, family, and acquaintances reporting suspicious or troubling behavior. Colleges and universities must take a greater interest in their students lives as a matter of security. The authors state that students from middle school through high school should have any deviance issues reported and passed with them as they advance through school. Although not addressed by these authors, it is feasible that colleges and universities create a method for gaining information about new students who could have the potential for violence. Once again, there is the concern for security versus privacy. Fox and Harding (2005) write that there is a propensity to have "a clean slate" when students move from middle school to high school. The authors did not directly address security or privacy concerns. However this article provides valuable insight into addressing troubled students.

Haggerty and Samaras (2010) take a stronger position against surveillance. In their book, Surveillance and Democracy, they write that surveillance has been a critical tool of oppressive dictatorships throughout the 20th century (Haggerty & Samatas, 2010). They argue that simple CCTV surveillance can give way to much more intrusive surveillance. Computer data mining, warrantless wiretapping, and other forms of much more intrusive surveillance are likely to take place within a society that allows surveillance powers to go unchecked. Haggerty and Samatas make it undoubtedly clear that they did not support surveillance of citizens and indeed, citizens of any free nations should hold their governments accountable. Once again, they draw upon history as holding numerous examples of freedoms slowly trampled by governments when the citizens did not stand up against the tide of encroaching surveillance.

In contrast to the concerns with surveillance is Brooks's work with street surveillance. Brooks focused on risk of surveillance in public locations and if there is a risk for certain demographics. Brooks addressed what is known as "blind camera syndrome" (Brooks, 2003). This is the belief that there is a trained personnel watching the monitors at all times. This creates a false sense of safety (Brooks, 2003). This blind camera syndrome appears to be a product of the misconception that all security cameras are staffed and monitored. If blind camera syndrome is an issue and a danger, then that would signal a shift in public perception from one of suspicion of surveillance to an over reliance and trust in surveillance cameras. Brooks also addresses risk and the perception of being victimized. This feeling of being at risk appears to be tied to the level of unfamiliarity of a specific location. If a person is not familiar with a location, he or she appears to be more aware of an possible dangers. This in combination with possible "blind camera syndrome" allows for an even greater possible threat of victimization. The critical element of Books's research is that there appears to be a shift in the public perception and insight into security surveillance.

The literature cited has provided insight into security concerns on college campuses along with privacy issues that greater security entails. Campus security is a concern for faculty, staff, students, and parents of students. Security on college campuses address aspects of not only crimes of simple theft but also concerns about sexual assault and mass shooters. In addition to this, there are privacy concerns as more security cameras are adopted, especially when individuals are living on a campus and believe they have an expectation of privacy. The research conducted in this literature review demonstrates that campus security is a complicated situation.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study is focused on variables that are concerned with students' demographics. The specific variables researched are gender, age, class standing, political affiliation, and religiosity. These independent variables (gender, age, class standing, political affiliation, and religiosity) were measured in relation to variables concerning fear of crime and opinion on surveillance.

Sample

A sample of criminal justice classes was taken. The goal of this research was to explore and understand the fear of crime on campus and the perceptions of security surveillance in protecting against crime and threats to privacy, if any exist. For this study a convenience sample of ETSU criminal justice classes was taken. The survey was administered at the beginning of a class with the instructors' permission obtained before class. This could create bias, in that it is very difficult to achieve a large enough sample size. A target measure of 150 students was taken to help ensure a sample of 100 students could be achieved. Two months surveying were required to provide surveys of 100 students. A 100 student sample size should reduce Type II errors caused by low power. Homogeneity was difficult to prevent in that the classes sampled were criminal justice classes. However, some of the classes as introductory level classes had incoming students who were not fully educated in the criminal justice system. Some of the students were undoubtedly criminal justice minors and students taking the class as an elective. This provided variability among the sample. The large sample size used minimized threats to validity. The sample included both freshman to senior level classes.

Demographics

Randomization allowed for a sample that contained satisfactory levels of variables such as gender, race, class standing, and age. The survey consisted of 25 questions and a student comments section. The anonymity of the individual was preserved. Questions pertaining to their age, gender, race, and class standing was surveyed, along with whether or not they live on campus or are a commuter student.

Survey Questions

Questions asked in this study included: Do you feel that the ETSU campus is safe? Are crimes such as theft a problem? Do security cameras on campus make you feel safer? Does the presence of public safety officers make you feel safer? Do security cameras make you feel safer on campus? Have you ever been a victim of a crime on campus? In addition to these questions, respondents were asked if they would feel better with increases in the number of CCTV cameras on campus. The questions were worded carefully to prevent bias by leading the reader. The questions were placed into a loose block form so that the readers thoughts were directed to focus on answering truthfully but without creating undue stress and fatigue. The survey was set up in the form of a ratings scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questions were listed in such a manner as to limit the good subject effect and other threats to internal validity. This was critical in gaining truthful as well as valid responses from the subjects.

Bivariate Statistics

Results of this study were used to create a sample data set of variables. This data set allowed SPSS software to be used for regression analysis. The data allowed for analysis of the nominal and ordinal level variables. Gender was the independent variable. The dependent

variables were age, class standing, along with commuter/non-commuter students. Regression allowed for researching the correlation between a number of variables. The significances of the regression variables was measured the by Chi-square. The data set created allowed for testing multiple variables to be regressed and demonstrate that any relationship or lack of a relationship between the variables. The Chi-square was used to determine whether the variables were statistically significant.

Independent Variable

There are multiple independent variables in this current study. They focused on the demographics of the students. These included age, gender, class standing, political views, and religiosity. These variables are critical in determining how the students view crime and surveillance on campus. These variables were selected by the author and determined to be the most valid and critical in collecting data on how students view security surveillance.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in the current study were used determining the students' views of surveillance. Do the students feel safe on campus? Does the presence of police officers make students feel safer? What are the students' feelings on security surveillance? These variables have given insight into students' feelings on crime and surveillance.

Expected Results

Results of this study should indicate that female students are more concerned with crime on campus and more likely to favor greater security surveillance. Male students should be less concerned with crime; however, they should indicate greater incidences of victimization.

This data should indicate that the although college age men and women are most likely to be the victims of crime, the vast majority of these crimes take place off campus according to research. An area of further research outside the scope of this study would be the ETSU students and crime in the larger Johnson City urban area. The results of this study should indicate that females between the ages of 18 and 25 should be the most concerned about victimization. If the results of this study follow similar results found, females will be more concerned with victimization than males, although males are more likely to be victims of crime. Previous research also indicated that victimization was greater for those who live on campus, with even further increase in risk if one lives in a coed dormitory and greater still for males living in an all male dorm. A key variable to be addressed is which gender would state that they would feel safer with an increase in the number of surveillance cameras. It is likely females would feel safer than males due to their already increased fears of victimization. Living location of students will also lead to enlightening responses. Based on the previous research, (Fisher et al., 1998) theft should be the most common crime. Further variables to be addressed are the ethnicity of the respondents. Would African American students feel more likely to be a victim of a crime, or would Caucasian students be more afraid of crime on campus?

Much of the literature reviewed for this study focused on the effectiveness of security surveillance or the ethical concerns. This study differs in that participants were asked whether they feel concerned with crime in conjunction with their thoughts on privacy concerns. There is often a discrepancy between fear of crime and the likelihood of victimization (Fisher et al., 1998). This study differs in that it compared both information from East Tennessee State Universities security measures and procedures and information from the survey of students, an element that has not been present in previous studies.

The scope of this study is very limited. The issues with this research are that with N=100 there is danger in the lack of variability. The convenience sample of criminal justice classes will likely produce uniformity in the responses. In addition, the variables of interest, gender, age, class standing, and resident location are being measured along with religious views and political views. Because the research was done at a regional university in the south, the respondents are likely to be more conservative than students at other universities. As students who are studying criminal justice are likely to have discussed security surveillance and privacy issues, this inside knowledge of surveillance may have created bias in that they have already formulated a theory and opinion of surveillance. This study is intended to help the researcher understand more of the average person's views of surveillance and crime.

Risk is another factor that is possibly limited or bias in this research. In a study conducted by Bromley's (2003), the comparison between the perceived risk of victimization between CRCJ majors and non-CRCJ majors, the results indicated who non-CJCR majors were significantly more likely to fear crime than CJCR majors by a margin of 41.5% to 28.1% respectively. This indicates that students who study crime, and the criminal justice system are less concerned with crime, and because the students surveyed in this study are in CJCR classes, they too are likely to be less concerned with victimization than students in other classes. Thus risk is not perceived as being the same for all students in Bromley's research (2003). This could possibly be limited with surveys of other students in other classes .Unfortunately, this shortcoming could not be remedied in the limited amount of time.

The results should also indicate that more politically liberal students would be concerned with greater security surveillance and possible threats to personal rights and liberties. Politically conservative students should be less concerned with the civil liberties. Research indicates that

conservatives tend to believe that if one is not committing a crime, the individual, law-abiding citizen has nothing to fear, therefore should not be concerned with surveillance. Those students who identify themselves as being more politically liberal should appear to be more concerned with privacy rights and security surveillance. The division of views is striking. Traditionally, conservatives favor small government and individual rights. Liberals favor creating a society that has collective responsibility, shared wealth, and security. One would be led to believe that conservatives would be more concerned with surveillance, but it appears from research that the conservative principle of individual responsibility appears to cancel fears of government intrusion. The differences of opinion should lead to interesting results. There appears to be little scholarly research focusing on the impact of political affiliation on crime, surveillance, and privacy concerns. The sources cited for this study did not address this concern. The variability of political affiliation is only partially addressed in the sources pertaining to CCTV systems in the United Kingdom (Taylor, 2010). There appeared to be a political divide over the legality and ethical issues surrounding CCTV systems. From the arguments with these systems, it appears that conservatives and the liberal labor party favor the CCTV system (Taylor, 2010); arguing that if one is personally responsible and law-abiding, and that a law-abiding person has nothing to fear from CCTV cameras (Fay, 1998). The conservatives used the CCTV system to counter public fear of crime (Fay, 1998). The CCTV expansion in Britain is an example of how fear of crime is a powerful political tool. The impact of political affiliation on student's opinions will be interesting to document.

An issue that was not addressed in the literature source is that of religious beliefs. The beliefs of the persons in this study are purely speculative, but it is possible that persons who identify as being more conservative will also report less concern with surveillance than

liberals. As a conservatives, such persons are less likely to be concerned with security surveillance, as they feel they have nothing to hide.

A possible dimension of that could be seen in the results is many students are simply unaware of campus security surveillance. Security surveillance is often hidden from view and silent (Goold, 2002). Many people are unaware that they are being monitored through cameras (Goold, 2002). This is an increasing reality, and it is possible that many student taking the survey will be introduced for the first time to capacity, safety concerns, and privacy issues of security surveillance.

The students living off of campus are likely to be more concerned with crime and surveillance. The older, more mature students should also indicate that they are more aware of crime and the possibility of being victimized and that female students are more afraid of being victimized the males (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). Female students should also be more aware of their surroundings (Woolnough, 2009). The most common crime that is expected to be reported is theft (Fisher et al., 1998). Research has indicated that a majority of college students perceive campuses as crime free (Carmen et al., 2000). Of those students who do fear victimization, fear of property crime appears to be most prevalent (Carmen et al., 2000). Fear of violent crime was also reported, but students stated that they felt much safer on campus than off campus (Carmen et al., 2000). Only a minority of students (22.5%) surveyed indicated that they have been a victim of a crime and an even smaller number, 1.2% of the 22.5% total, indicated that they had been victims of a serious crime such as aggravated robbery or rape (Carmen et al., 2000). The fear of crime it a very powerful phenomenon, and it is documented that fear of victimization is much higher than the true risk of victimization (Carmen et al., 2000).

The possibility exists that the data indicate that there are no significant levels of fear for surveillance or of the fear of crime. Security surveillance has become an integral part of modern life over the past 20 to 25 years (Brooks, 2003). People adapt to technology quickly; it is likely that most individuals do not notice security surveillance and are not troubled with an possible privacy issues.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The data collected were analyzed using bivariate statistics. The Chi-square were used to measure the significances of the data. There were a total of 23 variables measured, the independent variables of age, gender, class standing, political views, and religiosity. The dependent variables addressed fear of crime, views of security cameras, crime on campus, and the effectiveness of police officers. The statistical tests were intended to see if there was any statistical significance between the independent and dependent variables.

The final data collection yielded N=115 surveys. The data were entered into SPSS 20 to create a data set. There was a 61 males and 54 females. The racial data did not yield much variability: 86.1% reported as white, with 8.7% black, and 2.6% for Asians and Hispanics. The age demographics indicated the largest age groups was 20 year olds with 19.1% and 21 year olds with 18.3%. The demographics for class standing reflected these ages, with juniors and seniors being the two largest groups with 32.2% and 31.3% of respondents respectively. The majority of the students lived off campus, 71.3% with only 28.7% living on campus. The students were asked to indicate their major and minor and these variables were coded to indicate whether they had exposure to criminal justice either as a major or minor. Only 11.3% were not a CJCR major or minor, thus the vast majority had some CRJR education. The political affiliation had a more uniform spread of data with 45.2% moderate and only 7.8% and 8.7% very conservative and liberal respectively.

It has been indicated in a previous study (Carmen et al., 2000) that CJCR majors would be less concerned with crime than nonmajors. A percentage of 39.1% stated that they felt that

crime was not problematic on campus, and 57.4% stated they felt safe on campus. The concern with the data being that a the majority of students surveyed responded that they were either CJCR majors or minors, thus the responses likely suffered from being too homogenous. Of the students (39.1%) stated that they felt safer with cameras. A majority reported that they felt safe with police officers, indicating that students felt that both police and cameras increased their safety. Other variables indicated that the majority of students favored surveillance cameras, but the majority also agreed that security surveillance would have no effect on decreasing crime on campus.

Tests of Significance: Chi-square

The variables were entered into a series of tests to measure the significance levels with Chi-square. The first test measured the significance of whether gender affected whether or not they felt safer with the presence of security cameras. In order to decrease the degrees of freedom, two of the variables, originally coded as camera and effect, were recoded. These two variables asked whether "security cameras on campus make you feel safer" and " would surveillance cameras have an effect on decreasing campus crime." These questions were asked against the variables of gender, political views, and class standing. The hypotheses being that gender, political affiliation, and class standing would have an effect on whether one viewed security surveillance in a positive manner and its effectiveness or lack of effectiveness in decreasing crime on campus. The Chi-squares data are the SPSS data outputs (Note that Chi-squares is labeled as Pearson Chi-square in SPSS). These are the values for critical values. The df column is the degrees of freedom in each case. There are columns marked "asyp. sig" for both one and two sided models, these are assumption of significance in the test and are not exact values. The tests regarding gender have columns with the exact values for models that are both 1 and 2 sided.

The cell marked likelihood ratio is the likelihood of the expected values and linear-by-linear association are merely permutations of possible values. N is the total number of cases in the test.

Test 1: Measured the statistical significance of gender and whether security surveillance would have any effect on decreasing crime on campus. Table 1 shows a percentage of students answers split by gender. Table 2 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of .019. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between gender and if surveillance would have an effect on decreasing crime on campus. The degrees of freedom $X^2=1$. Assumption of significance $p=.89$. $N=85$.

Table 1.

Table one is the percentages of males and females in test 1 and perception on whether security surveillance would decrease crime.

Males	Females	Gender
55.7%	51.8%	Agree
21.3%	18.5%	Neither agree or disagree
22.9%	29.6%	Disagree
Total 61	Total 54	Total 155 students

Table 2.

Chi-Square data output for percentages of males and females in test 1 and the perception on whether security surveillance would decrease crime.

Chi-Square Tests					
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.019 ^a	1	.890		
Likelihood Ratio	.019	1	.890		
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.890		
N of Valid Cases	85				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.28.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Test 2: Measures of statistical significance between gender and whether students feel safer with security cameras. Table 3 shows a percentage of students answers split by gender. Table 4 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of .415. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between gender and whether students feel safer with security cameras. The degrees of freedom $X^2=1$. Assumption of significance $p=.519$. $N=85$.

Table 3.

Percentages of male and female in test 2 and whether they feel safer with security cameras.

Male	Female	Gender
47.5%	48.1%	Agree
29.5%	19.6%	Neither agree nor disagree
22.9%	29.6	Disagree
Total 61	Total 54	Total 155

Table 4.

Chi-Square data output for the males and females test 2 and whether they feel safer with security cameras.

Chi-Square Tests					
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.415 ^a	1	.519		
Likelihood Ratio	.417	1	.518		
Linear-by-Linear Association	.410	1	.522		
N of Valid Cases	85				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.41.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Test 3: Political views or political affiliation and whether cameras on campus make one feel safer. Table 5 shows percentages of students responses on political views. Table 6 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of 3.265. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between political views and whether cameras make one feel safer. The degrees of freedom $X^2=4$. Assumption of significance $p=.514$. $N=84$.

Table 5.

Percentages of student's political views and whether the cameras on campus make them feel safer.

Very Liberal	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Very Conservative	Political Views
40%	45%	46%	56.5%	55.6%	Agree
40%	35%	23.1%	13%	33.3%	Neither agree nor disagrees
20%	25%	30.7%	30.4%	11.1%	Disagree
Total 10	Total 20	Total 52	Total 23	Total 9	Total 114

Table 6.

Chi-Square data output of students political views and whether cameras on campus make them feel safer.

Chi-Square Tests			
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.265 ^a	4	.514
Likelihood Ratio	3.390	4	.495
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.639	1	.200
N of Valid Cases	84		
a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.76.			

Test 4: Do political views effect whether one will think security cameras can decrease crime.

Table 7 shows percentages of students responses on political views. Table 8 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of 9.231. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between political views effect whether one will think security cameras can decrease crime. The degrees of freedom $X^2=4$. Assumption of significance $p=.056$. $N=85$.

Table 7.

Percentages of political views effect whether one will think security cameras can decrease crime.

Very Liberal	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Very Conservative	Political Views
30%	45%	46%	56.5%	55.6%	Agree
40%	35%	23.1%	13%	33.3%	Neither nor disagree
20%	25%	30.7%	30.4	11.1%	Disagree
Total 10	Total 20	Total 52	Total 23	Total 9	Total 114

Table 8.

Chi-Square output data on political views effect whether one will think security cameras can decrease crime.

Chi-Square Tests			
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.231 ^a	4	.056
Likelihood Ratio	8.296	4	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.336	1	.248
N of Valid Cases	85		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.16.

Test 5: Does class standing have a significant effect on students' views on whether security cameras affect crime. Table 9 shows the percentages of students by class standing with the total number of students in each class. Table 10 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of 2.973. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between class standing and whether security cameras affect crime. The degrees of freedom $X^2=3$. Assumption of significance $p=.396$. $N=85$.

Table 9.

Percentages by class standing of students in test 5 and whether security cameras affect crime.

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
42.8%	71.4%	51.4%	47.2%
6.8%	14.3%	16.2%	27.8%
35.7%	14.3%	32.4%	25%
Total 14	Total 28	Total 37	Total 36

Table 10.

Chi-Square data output for class standing in test 5 and whether security cameras affect crime.

Chi-Square Tests			
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.973 ^a	3	.396
Likelihood Ratio	3.021	3	.388
Linear-by-Linear Association	.978	1	.323
N of Valid Cases	85		
a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.44.			

Test 6: Is there statistical significance between class standing and whether students feel safer with security cameras. Table 11 shows the percentages of students by class standing with the total number of students in each class. Table 12 shows the SPSS data output with the Chi-square value of 1.110. The direction of the values indicate there was no association found between class standing and whether students feel safer with security cameras. The degrees of freedom $X^2=3$. Assumption of significance $p=.775$. $N=85$.

Table 11.

Percentages by class standing of students in test 6 and whether students feel safer with security cameras.

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
57.1%	46.4%	35.1%	58.3%
21.4%	25%	27%	27.8%
21.4%	28.6%	37.8%	13.9%
Total 14	Total 28	Total 37	Total 36

Table 12.

Chi-Square output data for class standing in test 6 and whether students feel safer with security cameras.

Chi-Square Tests			
Values	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.110 ^a	3	.775
Likelihood Ratio	1.105	3	.776
Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.850
N of Valid Cases	85		
a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.88.			

The above data indicates that tests were not significant concerning their respective hypothesis. Test 4 did indicate a movement toward significance with regards to political views and political affiliation and whether security cameras have an effect of decreasing crime. It should be noted that there were a total of 4 cells within this test that had a count of less than 5. This indicated possible issue with low power. The variable was coded using a 5 point Likert scale that ranged from very liberal, liberal, moderate, conservative, to very conservative. This scale likely could have been collapsed into just three variables, liberal, moderate and conservative. This may have addressed this issue, although at this time, it is unclear whether this would have moved the variable to a more significant level.

Linear Regression

The linear regression was also employed to measure the nature of the relationship between demographic variables and the same questions of whether security cameras make one feel safer and whether security cameras can decrease crime on campus. In addition to political views, gender, and class standing, the independent variables of race and age were added to the

model. The gender and race variables were recoded into dummy variables of 1 and 0 in order to function in the regression model. The dummy variables were coded as 1 male and 0 non male for gender and renamed sex2. Race was recorded 1 white and 0 non white and renamed race2. The political views were also recoded into three new variables of liberal, moderate, and conservative. These three variables were named viewliberal, viewmoderate, and viewconservative. This viewmoderate was left out of the model to measure the significance of the political views of just liberals and conservatives. In addition, in the regression model, the variables of "camera" and "effect" were used in their original form of a 5 point Likert scale and not the recoded compressed variables used in the chi-square model. There are three tables for each of the two test of linear regression. The tables with descriptive statistics are the variables with the mean, standard deviation and the N value or total number of students. The ANOVA tables are the data output with the critical values being the columns labeled Sig. for the statistical significance of the test. The coefficients tables detail information on beta values, standard error and significance. The critical values being the columns marked Sig. for the statistical significance. Any values ranging from .000 to .050 are statistically significance.

Test 7: Linear regression model with the variables do cameras make you feel safer. Table 13 shows the statistical data for regression with the variables measured with mean and standard deviation. Table 14 show the ANOVA data output with total significance of .729. This value indicates that there is no statistical significance with the variables measured. Table 15 shows the coefficients data with the statistical significance of each variable in the test.

Table 13

Descriptive statistics of age, sex2, viewliberal and viewconservative in test 7.

Values	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
camera	3.0000	1.36323	114
age	22.6491	5.33146	114
sex2	.5351	.50097	114
viewliberal	.2632	.44229	114
viewconservative	.2807	.45133	114
race2	.8596	.34888	114
class	2.8158	1.00939	114

Table 14

ANOVA values for test 7 data output.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.840	6	1.140	.600	.729 ^a
Residual	203.160	107	1.899		
Total	210.000	113			

a. Predictors: (Constant), class, viewliberal, sex2, race2, viewconservative, age

b. Dependent Variable: camera

Table 15

Coefficients^a data output for test 7.

Model	B	Std. Error	Bata	t	Sig.
Constant	3.363	.658		5.114	.000
Age	.026	.027	.103	.968	.335
Sex2	-.178	.269	-.066	-.662	.509
Viewliberal	-.297	.331	-.096	-.897	.371
Veiwconservative	-.313	.316	-.103	-.989	.325
Race2	-.478	.385	-.122	-1.242	.217
class	-.101	.141	-.075	-.718	.474

a. Dependent Variable: camera

Test 8: Linear regression with the variable do security cameras have an effect in decreasing crimes on campus. Table 16 shows the statistical data for regression with the variables measured, mean and standard deviation. Table 17 shows the ANOVA data output with the total significance of .645. This value indicates that there is no statistical significance with the variables measured. Table 18 shows the coefficients data with the statistical significance of each variable in the test.

Table 16

Descriptive statistics of age, sex2, viewliberal and viewconservative for test 8.

Values	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
effect	2.9474	1.34258	114
age	22.6491	5.33146	114
sex2	.5351	.50097	114
viewliberal	.2632	.44229	114
viewconservative	.2807	.45133	114
race2	.8596	.34888	114
class	2.8158	1.00939	114

Table 17

ANOVA^b values for test 8 data output.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	7.768	6	1.295	.707	.645 ^a
Residual	195.917	107	1.831		
Total	203.684	113			

a. Predictors: (Constant), class, viewliberal, sex2, race2, viewconservative, age

b. Dependent Variable: effect

Table 18Coefficients^a data output for test 8.

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	3.610	.646		5.590	.000
Age	-.004	.027	-.016	-.149	.882
Sex2	-.260	.264	-.097	-.982	.328
Viewliberal	-.568	.325	-.187	-1.747	.084
Viewconservative	-.197	.310	-.066	-.634	.527
Race2	-.391	.378	-.102	-1.034	.303
class	.038	.139	.028	.274	.785

a. Dependent Variable: effect

Tables 12 through 17 show the linear regression models of significance and the relation between the demographics variables and the dependent variables of whether cameras could decrease crime on campus or whether cameras make one feel safer on campus. The tests reveal that there is no significance difference between the variables and no relationship with the beta values and the variables measured. The regression model left out the moderate variable in the two tests in order to examine whether the extremes of political affiliation of either liberal or conservative would affect the model. However, this did not prove a relationship or significance.

Limitations

The data indicated that the Chi-squares were not significant. This was likely due to a small sample size and limited variability within the sample. To gain a better understanding of the perceptions of security surveillance, a larger more representative sample should be taken with more variation of classes and a more diverse selection of students. The data in the frequency distribution highlighted the uniformity of the sample with students reporting, by large margins the students being exposed to criminal justice classes on some level with their major or minor. The majority of students were also white between 20 and 21 year old juniors and seniors. This uniformity in the sample likely created the lack of significance in the data. The uniformity of the

sample likely resulted in the lack of significance with both the Chi-square and the regression model. The classes selected were all criminal justice undergraduate courses. If repeated, this study would include classes selected at random from a list of all classes offered at ETSU. The sample size would be increased substantially with graduate classes included in such a study. A target number of 300 to 500 hundred students would be sampled to have a more representative group from ETSU. The survey would have additional questions pertaining to exposure to criminal victimization and contact with law enforcement other than traffic stops. The questions in such a survey would include more questions concerning fear of crime. Fewer questions would be asked concerning demographics. The only variables that would likely be needed would be age and gender. Political affiliation would be included, but the wording would be changed. The principal investigator, after administering the survey and analyzing the data, felt that the question asking political affiliation was leading and that more of the students put "moderate" than was truly reflective of the sample. The large number of moderate students probably affected the linear regression in that moderates were left out of the regression, and only a small number of liberal or conservative students were tested in the regression. This was likely true of some of that other questions may have been leading in some manner. Thus more careful wording would be needed in further research. In addition, the hypotheses concerning class standing would not have been asked if the study were to be conducted again. It was thought that some significance would be found with older students, and that upper classmen might be more concerned with surveillance and possible crime on campus. However, after additional consideration, there is not enough spread in the ages of students to ask class standing. It was considered that race might be a significant variable in a student's view of security cameras, but with 86.1% of data respondents

being white the race data were not even considered for measure with Chi-square data with so few minorities.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Security surveillance is a tool for countering crime through providing a level of guardianship of a potential crime target, whether a woman walking to her car on a dark night or an unoccupied residence. One must remember that it is simply a tool and concerns over privacy, although not unfounded, do not appear to be as large a problem as many have stated (Brooks, 2003). There is support among the public for security surveillance (Brooks, 2003). It is likely that the public will simply adapt to security surveillance and CCTV systems. Although few would argue that one has a right to privacy, most would likely expect not to have that right for the same privacy in a public location (Goold, 2002). Studies in the UK found 96% of persons surveyed stated that CCTV cameras did not threaten civil liberties, but 67% claimed that they felt safer with the cameras in place (Brooks, 2003). The data in this study appear to indicate such support for security cameras. In addition, there is also the possibility that cameras can create a false sense of security. Blind camera syndrome (Brooks, 2003) is the "public perception of safety reinforced by the belief that there are trained operators behind every street camera ready to react to a situation they view in their control room" (Brooks, 2003). The majority of security cameras are not continuously monitored (Brooks, 2003). However, the possible danger of blind camera syndrome is impossible to measure with any level of certainty. The poor quality of the footage gathered was a concern for some of the sources cited (Lewis, 2004). The level in which people have become dependent on surveillance is interesting but unclear (Brooks, 2003). The data from the frequency table indicated that 39.1% stated that security cameras made them feel safer and only 20.9% reported that cameras did not make them feel safer. The numbers were much closer

when asked whether cameras would reduce crime with 30.4% stating it would and 27.0% indicating that it would not.

Risk of victimization has been documented as being higher than likely (Fisher & Sloan, 2003), but one must not discount any level of fear. Fear is a deeply rooted primeval psychological response to danger. The ETSU cameras record on a 14-day loop (Chief Cortel, personal communication February 19, 2013) The method of recording on a 14-day loop differs from some of the methods used by some of the sources. Keval and Sasse (2010) studied CCTV monitoring rooms in the United Kingdom. Unlike the security cameras at ETSU, the cameras in this study were monitored in real time by personnel. This was cited as a possible issue by the authors, who wrote that some of the stations had a very high number of monitors to watchful operators (Keval & Sasse 2010), and this could allow for crimes and accidents to be missed by the operators. Although the videos were all recorded, missing events in real time negated the purpose of having the operators there watching. Such security cameras monitored in real time by full time staff who work with police is vastly different from the security cameras employed by ETSU, which is monitored and staffed by Public Safety personnel. An interesting dimension of further study would be, does having a large full time, round the clock staff operate better than having a security cameras operate on only in a forensic roll helping to solve crimes after the fact.

Although security cameras do not appear to pose a threat to personal liberties and privacy, the perception that one is being watched is powerful and threatening. As Goold writes "privacy is a matter of being able to choose how I (Goold) respond to the demands and curiosity of those around me and of maintaining some degree of control over how I present myself to the world" (2010). Goold said that privacy is critical for "private autonomy" (Goold, 2010, 25). One has an expectation of being seen in public, but not being leered at by an unseen stranger through

a hidden camera (Goold, 2010). Goold's concern with civil liberties was reflected in a majority of students who agreed that civil liberties are important; however, this should not be surprising in that most students would be expected to believe that civil liberties should be protected. This was a question that, if repeated, the principal investigator felt was leading and misdirected the students to write a favorable response.

The issues of security at centers of learning have been of paramount concern. Colleges and universities have a critical and vested interest in the safety of students. Colleges and universities also have students living on campus, and this in conjunction with the freedoms and rebellion often associated with college students combine to create dangers on school campuses. The danger, in combination with the misconceptions and concern over security surveillance, has led to a disconnect. Authors such as Goold feel threatened by the "unobservable observer" (Goold, 2010), but there are a many surveillance systems that do not have people watching monitors 24 hours a day (Brooks, 2003), and there is the increasing false belief in "blind camera syndrome" which may leave persons vulnerable (Brooks, 2003).

Cameras have proven to be a popular method of catching criminals and preventing crime. However, criminals will adapt (Brooks, 2003). There is no research as to the exact number of crimes that have not been solved due to criminals counteracting the effectiveness of security cameras with various methods (Brooks, 2003); however, future systems could be biometric (Brooks, 2003). A biometric system could gather data and, based on body type, height, and various other markers, suggest possible suspects in real time to law enforcement (Brooks, 2003). The implications with the further advances of surveillance will have to be seen.

Information is critical for ensuring a safe environment, and it is not the information gathered from the cameras, but the information of the people present when a crime takes place or about to take place. The risk of victimization or the perceived risk of victimization will be a deciding factor in whether many of the respondents favor or dislike security surveillance. Research has shown that many people favor cameras because they feel safer (Brooks, 2003), and their personal privacy in a public location a concern. Another aspect of the risk is the level of familiarity of a public location. Research indicates that the more familiar with a certain location, the more likely to perceive security surveillance. From the interview with ETSU Public Safety, it is evident that ETSU departments want more cameras, so clearly there is not the concern with privacy. There is an element of self-regulation within the surveillance industry. Because the cameras on campus are not monitored by an individual, (Chief Cotrel , personal communication February 19, 2013) there is no intrusion or surveillance of persons on the ETSU campus. There is a disconnect in how people view surveillance and the actual employment of surveillance. People are exposed more and more to security surveillance, and it appears that they are not as sensitive as cited in some previous sources (Brooks, 2003). It appears that people have grown accustomed to cameras in public locations. Historically, security surveillance has been a sensitive issue, but this might be a paradigm shift in the perception of security surveillance. Student perceptions appear to reflect a tough position on security surveillance as the research reviewed would have indicated . It is important to note that although fear of crime was not a variable that was measured in this study, it still likely played a role in students' responses. It is understandable that one would be fearful of possible intrusion and threats to privacy with security surveillance; however, from a pragmatic perspective it is understandable that the campus cameras record, and the film is used only if needed. The cost of maintaining personnel to work security cameras

would be burdensome and depending on the time frame in which a crime takes place, might not allow for significant increase in the response time for emergency personnel.

ETSU Public Safety

An interview with the Chief of ETSU public safety was included in the study to provide insight into the security procedures of the university. This information was compared to the data gathered from the surveys.

In an interview with ETSU with Chief Jack R. Cotrel and Dispatcher Dewey Mullikin, the security cameras were discussed at length, along with the effectiveness of surveillance. ETSU cameras are only used as a forensic tool allowing law enforcement to investigate crimes that have already taken place (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The cameras do not have personnel monitoring them, rather they record on a 14-day cycle (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). ETSU public safety does not have the resources in either funds or manpower to monitor the cameras in real time (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). Chief Cotrel made it clear that the surveillance cameras on campus are not intended to watch people or intrude into their lives (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). This system of recording falls in line with the majority of security cameras in use (Brooks, 2003). There are approximately 170 (and more are likely to be added) cameras on the ETSU campus, (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013) and as with other security systems, the cameras are located at focus points of foot traffic at entrances, elevators, dorm key cards locations, certain high traffic hallways, and certain parking lots (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The cameras are not placed in dorm hallways, bathrooms, locker rooms, or any other sensitive location (Chief

Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013).The cameras also cannot be used to monitor employees by their supervisors. The cameras can only be used in a forensic investigational role (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 201). The focus on entrances and elevators negates such a need (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The placement of cameras is done with care. A risk assessment of the location must be done and the view of the proposed location measured to ensure a good view (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). In addition, the department of information technology (OIT) works in conjunction with Public Safety to allow for a camera to have the proper wiring installed The cameras themselves are capable of zooming in on a specific location and are equipped with low lux lenses (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The low lux lens allows for the illumination of a subject with local ambient light sources such as a distant street light (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013).In contrast to many concerns with privacy that security surveillance has sometimes created, Public Safety has had no complaints on the cameras but rather many department requests for more cameras. There would be more cameras on campus if allowed, but with a price of approximately \$4,000 for a single camera, the cost is a strong prohibiting factor (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). If a department requests cameras, the majority of the cost would have to be covered by that department (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013).

Public Safety is very aware of the potential for the perception of intrusion into students' privacy. The wording on the signage was carefully chosen to assure the public did not feel threatened but also to inform the public not to rely on the cameras to deliver aid in an emergency (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The effectiveness of the cameras is not disputed. They have helped solve crimes such as petty theft that might not have been solved

without the cameras (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). This finding is supported by other findings of other researchers (Fray, 1998). One issue, however, is that it is not clear if the cameras have reduced overall crime on campus (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). When asked if more cameras would be helpful, the answer was unequivocally yes. The cameras have been critical in solving crimes on campus. Public Safety would like to have more cameras in the campus parking lots (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013). The Buccaneer Ridge apartments has video footage of those lots but only marginal footage of the majority of the main campus lots (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013) More coverage of the parking lots would help solve hit and run accidents (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013) A possible issue in the security surveillance is the parking garage that is currently under construction (Chief Cotrel, personal communication, February 21, 2013) The garage will be a high traffic area with multiple blind spots that has the potential of creating new security issues. A college campus will never be entirely safe, but security cameras proved a powerful tool to solve crimes on campus.

The information from ETSU Public Safety is standard with the employment of surveillance. Surveillance is a tool to solve crimes after they have been committed, not as a proactive tool to prevent and fight crime. ETSU security cameras are operated independent of personnel monitoring them, thus fall into the majority of cameras in use (Brooks, 2003). There is a clear divide and misconception between the public and security officials on how surveillance is employed. This study is intended only to investigate how ETSU students perceive and view security surveillance on campus.

Student Comments

The comments from the students were mixed. Students appeared to be concerned with crime on campus but had an element of caution. He reported that although he felt that more police officers on campus would be more effective at combating crime on campus, he cited the Kansas City police experiment as an example of how increased police presence had no effect on crime. In this particular instance, a criminal justice student likely had more information on a subject than the general public. One student wrote that after reporting an incident to the police, the responding officer stated that next time such an event took place, the person in question should video the incident. One of the students stated that cameras can be helpful but only given that the cameras were installed properly and had the correct angle to show a suspect. This was repeated by several students, that cameras are beneficial only if the angle and the lighting are correct. Several of the students voiced discontent not with security cameras but with Public Safety, stating that they felt the officers were rude and unhelpful. Many of the students identified as conservative indicated that they felt they have the right to defend themselves was more important than the cameras on campus, although they did not specify if this meant carrying guns on campus (an illegal act on the campus of East Tennessee State University). Political affiliation was considered to be a strong predictor of one's views on security surveillance. Conservatives are less likely to be concerned with surveillance and liberals more likely to view surveillance as a threat to privacy, but this was not supported by the data. Although it is worth noting that it appeared to be supported in the student comments. One of the students, identified as very liberal, stated he or she preferred more officers to more cameras because the cameras were a threat to personal privacy. There does appear to be some disconnect between how security surveillance is employed and the public's view of these cameras. This is demonstrated by a

student commenting that cameras were important in that there was "always someone watching" not cognizant of the fact that the ETSU cameras record on a loop with no person monitoring them unless a crime takes place.

Conclusion

This study has provided insight into the role of surveillance. The research indicated that although students were predicted to view surveillance as a possible threat to privacy, this did not appear statistically significant. The research, even with limitations, did prove to be enlightening and important in the overall understanding of the role that cameras will have in providing public safety. Although limited in scale, there are variables and topics within this study that could be used for further investigation. The data did not indicate significances, but with more time and a larger, more random sample, some significance might be found and statistical regression used to further the data and test the variables in question.

Continued security threats such as terror attacks and high profile mass shootings substantiates a need for security and in the forefront of the public's attention. More research should be done with regards to the questions and hypotheses that have been investigated. With time and analysis, a better understanding of surveillance and its role in the protection of the public can be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Brinkly, W, J., & Laster, J.D., (June 2003.) Campus crime in Missouri: An analysis and comparison of crime in four-year colleges and universities.
Journal of Security Administration 26. 1-15.
- Bromley, M. L., (Dec. 1999.) Community college crime: An exploratory review.
Journal of Security Administration, 22 (2), 11-21.
- Brooks, D. J., (2003). Public street surveillance: A psychometric study on the perceived social Risk. Masters Degree in Science. University of Sidney, Australia, 2003.
- Carmen, A. D., Polk, E.O., Segel, C., & Bing, R. L., (June 2000.) Fear of crime on campus: Examining fear variables of CRCJ majors and non-majors in pre and post serious crime environments. *Journal of Security Administration*, 23, 22-47.
- Dameron, S. L., Bora-DeTard, K. A., & Bora, D., (2009.) An assessment of campus security and police information on college/university Websites. *Security Journal*, 22, 251-268.
- Etsebeth, V., (2007.) Monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: Lessons learnt? investigation the international legal position. *Journal of Digital Forensics*, 2 (2). 7-18.
- Fay, S. J., (1998.) Tough on crime, tough on civil liberties: Some negative aspects of Britain's wholesale adoption of CCTCV surveillance during the 1990s.
International Review of Law Computers & Technology, 12 315-347.

Felson, M., (2002). *Crime and everyday life. third edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Fisher, B. S., & Sloan, J. (Sep. 2003.) Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis" Supported? *Justice Quarterly*, 20 633-659.

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. S., Cullen, F. T. & Lu, C. (Aug, 1998.) Crime in the Ivory Tower: the level and sources of student victimization. *Journal of Criminology*. 36 671-710.

Fox, C., & Harding, D. J., (Jan. 2005.) School shootings as organizational deviance. *Sociology of Education*. 78 (1) 69-97.

Goold, B. J., (2002.) Privacy rights and public spaces: CCTV and the problem of the "unobservable observer". *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 21 (1) 21-27.

Haggerty, K. D., & Samatas, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Surveillance and democracy*. London. Routledge-Cavendish.

Hart, T. C., & Caolavito, V., (2011.) College student victims and reporting crime to the police: The influence of collective efficacy. *Western Criminology Review*, 12 (3) 1-19.

Keval, H., & Sasse, M. A., (April 2010.) "Not the usual suspects:" A study of factors reducing the effectiveness of CCTV. *Security Journal*, 23 (2) 134-154.

- King, R., (Feb. 2009.) Women's fear of crime on university campuses: new direction?
Security Journal, Suppl. Special Issue: 87-99. doi:10.1057/sj.2008.14
- Lewis, D. L. (2004.) Surveillance video in law enforcement.
Journal of Forensic Identification, 54 547-559.
- Murphy, T., (Dec. 1999.) The admissibility of CCTV evidence in criminal proceedings.
International Review of Law Computers & Technology, 13 (3) 383-404.
- Repenning, K., Powell, H., Doane, A., & Dunkle, H., (June, 2001.) Demystifying school violence: A local, state, and national perspective on the phenomenon of school violence. *Journal of Security Administration*, 24 (1) 45-97.
- Snell, C., Bailey, C., Carona, A., & Mebane, D., (2002.) School crime policy changes: The impact of recent highly-publicized school crimes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26 270-285.
- Taylor, E., (2012.) Evaluating CCTV: why the findings are inconsistent, inconclusive and ultimately irrelevant. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 12 209-232.
- Wilcox, P., May, D., & Roberts, S. D., (Dec. 2006.) Student weapon possession and the "fear and victimization hypothesis" unraveling the temporal order. *Justice Quarterly*, 23 (4) 502-529.
- Woolnough, A. D., (2009.) Fear of crime on campus: Gender differences in the use of self-protective behaviors at an urban university. *Security Journal*, 22 (1) 40-55.

APPENDIX

Data Collection Instrument

Date

Dear Participant

My name is Jesse Kittle, and I am a graduate student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my master's degree in criminal justice and criminology. In order to finish my studies, I need to complete a research project. The name of my research study is A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights.

Please note: You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. There is a cover page provided that will ensure that your answers will not be viewed once handed back to the researcher. In addition, please allow space between you and the other students so that the answers are kept confidential.

The purpose of this study is to research the relationship between fear of crime and surveillance practices on the ETSU campus. I would like to give a brief survey questionnaire to ETSU students. It should only take about 5 to 10 minutes to complete. You will be asked questions about students' feeling on security surveillance and crime on campus. Since this project deals with personal security and crime as well as possibly having been a victim of a crime, it might cause some minor stress. However, you may also feel better after you have had the opportunity to express yourselves about crimes and security surveillance. This study may provide benefit by providing more information about the impact of surveillance on a college campus.

This method is completely anonymous and confidential. In other words, there will be no way to connect your name with your responses. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the ETSU IRB and Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) will have access to the survey data. In addition, the thesis committee members have access to the study records. If you do not want to fill out the survey, it will not affect you in any way. There are no alternative procedures except to choose not to participate in the study. Participation in this survey is voluntary. You may refuse to participate. You can quit at any time. If you quit or refuse to participate, the benefits or treatment to which you are otherwise entitled will not be affected. If you have any research-related questions or problems, you may contact me or my research partner, Jesse Kittle, at (865) 712-1862. We are working on this project together under the supervision of Dr. Miller. You may reach him at (423) 439-5964. Also, the chairperson of the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University is available at (423) 439-6054 if you have questions about your rights as a research subject. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team or you can't reach the study staff, you may call an IRB Coordinator at 423/439-6055 or 423/439/6002.

Sincerely,

Jesse Kittle

Survey

Attention: All responses will be kept confidential DO NOT PUT NAME ON SURVEY

Directions: Circle/fill in the appropriate response OR mark the appropriate box.

1.

Age

2.

Sex

Male

Female

3.

Race

White

Black

Asian

Hispanic

Other, Please specify

4.

Class Standing

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

5.

Commuter Status

Live on Campus

Live off Campus

6.

Major:

Undecided Major

Minor:

Undecided Minor

7.

Please Describe your residence as a student

House Apartment Condominium Dorm

Other, Please specify

8.

I feel very safe on campus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

9.

Crime is a problem on the ETSU campus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

10.

Public safety officers make campus safer for students.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

11.

Security cameras on campus make you feel safer.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

12.

More public safety officers on campus would make campus a safer place.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

13.

More security cameras would help make campus safer.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

14.

Greater security surveillance lead to increased campus safety in place of more police officers.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

15.

Surveillance cameras would help in solving crimes on campus.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

16.

Surveillance cameras would have an effect on decreasing campus crime.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

17.
Surveillance cameras simply reduce fear of crime on campus, but have no effect on crime.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

18.
Does crime on campus make you more aware of safety?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

19.
Would you say that crime on campus is a major concern for you before you were a student?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

20.
Do you feel that protecting civil liberties is important?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

21.
Do you feel you have a right to privacy in a public location?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

22.
Would greater surveillance help with crime in off campus locations, for example, in the greater Johnson City area?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

23.

How religious do you consider yourself?

Religious Somewhat religious Somewhat not religious Not Religious

24.

What are your Political Views?

Very Liberal Liberal Moderate Conservative Very Conservative

25.

Comments?

Do you have any personal comments on this subject?

VITA

JESSE THOMAS KITTLE

Personal Data:

Date of Birth: September 3, 1984

Place of Birth: Boone, North Carolina

Marital Status: Single

Education

Homeschooled: High School degree Mountain City, Tennessee May 2003.

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN

B.S. History Major, Geography Minor; December 2008.

M.A. Criminal Justice and Criminology, May 2013.

Professional Experience:

Tuition Scholarship:

Department of Criminal Justice/Criminology, 2011-2013

Honors and Awards:

Deans List

Academic Performance Scholarship

Graduated Magna Cum Laude, East Tennessee State University

Member of Pi Gamma Mu and Phi Alpha Theta honor societies