

# **The Impact of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act on College Student Behavior**

By  
Steven M. Janosik  
Donald D. Gehring

Fall 2001

**epi**

*Educational Policy Institute of Virginia Tech Policy Paper – Number 10*

## Table of Contents

Preface	ii
About the Authors	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Purpose	1
Method	2
Participants	2
Procedures	3
Instruments	3
Results	3
Responses by Gender	4
Response by Victim Status	7
Responses by Institutional Type	7
Responses by Location of Institution	12
Responses by Institutional Size	12
Discussion	12
Awareness of the Act and Use of Mandated Reports	17
Use of Other Crime Prevention Information and Programs	17
Student Relationship with Campus Police	18
Conclusion	18
References	20

## PREFACE

This report is the tenth in a series of policy papers issued by the Educational Policy Institute (EPI) of Virginia Tech. The Institute is an interdisciplinary group of faculty with common interests in education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The mission of EPI is to: (a) establish an organization devoted to educational policy research and services in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation, (b) conduct research intended to inform educational policy makers, (c) focus research interests of the faculty and graduate students on educational policy issues, and (d) act as a service unit for educational policy groups such as the State Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

This report represents a slight deviation from the work of EPI, since it focuses on the implications of an important piece of federal legislation. While administrators and policy-makers continue to debate the intent and implementation requirements of the Jeanne Clery Campus Crime Disclosure and Reporting Act, Steve Janosik and Don Gehring have tried to ascertain the Act's effectiveness in increasing student awareness and changing student behavior in ways that will reduce their risk of becoming victims of campus crime. Drs. Gehring and Janosik have national reputations as legal scholars. This paper represents a continuation of their work on a very important statute that affects most colleges and universities in this country.

Several national organizations have helped make this research possible. I want to recognize the Association for Student Judicial Affairs, the NASPA Foundation, Donald D. Gehring Associates, Inc. and our own Institute for their financial support of this project.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained by contacting Dr. Steven M. Janosik at the Institute or they can be downloaded from EPI's web site. I hope you find the information to be of interest. URL: <http://fbox.vt.edu:10021/chre/elps/EPI>

Don G. Creamer  
Executive Director  
Educational Policy Institute of Virginia Tech  
308 East Eggleston Hall (0302)  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE  
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Steven M. Janosik** - is associate professor of higher education and student affairs in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies department of the College of Human Resources and Education at Virginia Tech and co-director of the Educational Policy Institute of Virginia Tech. Dr. Janosik has more than 20 years of experience in college administration. From 1994 to 1997, he served as the deputy secretary of education for the Commonwealth of Virginia. He has written more than 30 articles on the topics of campus crime, law in higher education, liability and risk management, residence life, student development and state higher education policy. His latest research includes papers entitled, *Trends in Community College Litigation: Implications for Policy and Practice* and *The Impact of the Campus Crime Awareness Act on Student Behavior*.

**Donald D. Gehring** is Professor Emeritus of Higher Education and the former Director of the Higher Education Administration Doctoral Program at Bowling Green State University. He has had extensive experience in student affairs administration and college teaching. His publications are found in *The Journal of College and University Student Housing*; *NASPA Journal*; *Personnel and Guidance Journal*; *The Dental Educator*; *Surgery*; *Programming*; and *The Journal of College Student Personnel*. He is the Co-Editor of *The College Student and the Courts*, Co-Author of *Alcohol on Campus* and has also contributed chapters on legal issues to a number of other books.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded in part by grants and in-kind contributions from Donald D. Gehring & Associates Inc., the Educational Policy Institute of Virginia Tech, the Association for Student Judicial Affairs, and the NASPA Foundation (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Steve Janosik, who is now at the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 306 East Eggleston Hall, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to [sjanosik@vt.edu].

# **THE IMPACT OF THE JEANNE CLERY DISCLOSURE OF CAMPUS SECURITY POLICY AND CAMPUS CRIME STATISTICS ACT ON COLLEGE STUDENT BEHAVIOR**

By

Steven M. Janosik and Donald D. Gehring

The Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (Public Law 101–542) was passed in 1990 and was signed into law by President George Bush. Title II of this Act is known as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990. Since then, it has been amended several times (National Center of Educational Statistics, 1997). The most recent version of this law was passed by Congress as part of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998. Its official title under this Act is the “Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act” (Public Law 105–244). This legislation grew out of a tragic incident at Lehigh University involving the rape and murder of a young woman living in university housing. Since their daughter’s death, the Clery’s have lobbied tirelessly to force colleges and universities to be more forthcoming about the criminal activity on their campuses.

Current regulations call for institutions to annually distribute the security report defined by the Act to all current students and employees and provide a summary of the report to any applicant for enrollment or employment upon request (*Federal Register*, 1992). The purpose of the legislation is largely two-fold. First, by requiring institutions to report specific crime statistics, open their criminal activity logs, and share information about their crime prevention programs with prospective students and their parents so that information about campus safety can be factored into the college choice decision. Second, by notifying students, faculty, staff, and others of criminal activity occurring on campus, individuals can be made aware of the potential risks and make active choices about their personal behavior.

In a three school study Janosik (2001) found that student knowledge of the Act and their use of the information contained in the mandated reports was low. On the other hand, students were reading the supplemental materials posted or printed in various other formats and a few students were changing the way they protected their property and themselves from harm based on this information.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to collect similar information on a national scale and to examine the differences by victim status, institutional type, size, and location as well as to reexamine differences by gender. This research was guided by the following research questions:

1. Are students aware of the Campus Crime Awareness Act?

2. Are students using the information mandated by the Act in making decisions about college choice?
3. Are students using other forms of crime information, programs and services to inform themselves about campus crime?
4. Does having access to other information change the way students protect themselves, their property, or move about the campus?
5. Does having other information increase the likelihood that students will report crimes?
6. Does student use of the information required under the Act vary by gender, victim status, institution type, institution location, or institution size?
7. Does student use of other information, programs, and services related to crime awareness and prevention to reduce safety risks vary by gender, victim status, institution type, institution location, or institution size?
8. Does this increased information sharing affect the relationship between students and the campus police by gender, victim status, institution type, institution location, or institution size?

## **Method**

To obtain the answers to these questions the following methods and procedures were used.

### Participants

To analyze the effect of this federal policy on student behavior, the researchers chose to contact the voting delegates of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). These individuals represent a wide range of institutions across the United States and are usually the senior most student affairs administrator at the institution.

The researchers received a set of mailing labels from NASPA that included 1024 voting delegates. Because the researchers were interested in examining the knowledge and behavior of undergraduates affected by the Act, voting delegates at professional schools, specialty proprietary schools, and institutions in other countries were eliminated from the population. A total of 998 voting delegates were left. These professionals were contacted by mail and asked if they would be willing to participate in the study. Those who did not respond immediately were sent a reminder card and encouraged to respond. Three hundred and five administrators (30.6%) agreed to participate. The sample included the following types of institutions: three two-year private institutions (.1%), 30

two-year public institutions (10%), 137 four-year private institutions (45%), and 135 four-year public institutions (44%).

### Procedures

Administrators at each of these institutions were asked draw a random sample of 30 students for inclusion in the study. They also were instructed to draw the sample so as to be representative by gender. No further sampling request was made. Thus, the student sample totaled 9,150. Data received from respondents were tabulated using the crosstab procedure. Chi-squares were calculated to test for significance differences between groups.

### Instruments

The researchers used the questionnaire developed by Janosik (2001). Thirteen questions addressed the student's knowledge of the Act's existence and asked if specific changes in behavior occurred as a result of attending crime prevention programs or reading about the information mandated in the institution's annual report. The reliability coefficient for these items was shown to be .73 in a study by Janosik (2001). The researchers added seven other questions to collect a variety of demographic data including gender, victim status, place of residence (on or off campus), institution type (public or private), institution location (urban or rural), and institution size (less than 5,000 undergraduate students or more than 5,000 undergraduate students). Two additional questions asked respondents to indicate how safe they felt on campus and in areas immediately adjacent to their respective campuses.

## **Results**

Of the 9,150 questionnaires, 3,866 (42%) were returned in useable condition. The respondents consisted of 2,286 (59%) women and 1,575 (41%) men. Five responses were missing. Five hundred sixty-two (15%) reported that they had been victims of crime while enrolled at their respective institutions. Thirty-three hundred (85%) students reported not being victims of crime while enrolled and four students did not respond to this question. Two thousand two hundred nineteen (58%) respondents lived on campus and 1,643 (42%) lived off campus. Four responses were missing. A total of 1285 (33%) respondents classified their campuses as metropolitan or a large city, while 2574 (67%) respondents classified their campuses as being located in a small town, city, or in a rural area. Seven responses were missing. At the time of the study, 2154 respondents (56%) reported that they were attending public colleges or universities and 1690 (44%) respondents were attending private institutions. Twenty-two responses were missing. Four hundred eighty-seven (13%) respondents attended public or private community colleges while the remaining 3357 (87%) attended four-year institutions. Finally, 3430 (89%) respondents reported feeling safe or very safe on their respective campuses. Seventy-nine percent of respondents reported feeling safe or very safe off-campus.

The reliability for the 13 items was calculated using the Cronbach Alpha model. The reliability coefficient for this set of responses was .72. The researchers analyzed responses by gender, victim status, institutional type, location of institution, and size of institution.

#### Are Students Aware of the Clery Disclosure Act?

As the data in Table 1 shows, only slightly more than one-fourth (27%) of the students responded that they were aware of the Act. Even fewer students (24%) recalled receiving the summary in their admissions materials. Only 22% of the students remembered receiving a copy of the annual Security Report and the same low percentage read the report.

#### Are Students Using Information Mandated by the Act in Making College Choices?

The data in Table 1 also shows that a very small proportion of students (8%) is actually influenced by the summary data mandated by the law in selecting the college or university attended.

#### Are Students Using Other Forms of Crime Information, Programs or Services?

Overall, students appear to more often use “other types of information” to inform themselves about crime on campus. A total of 60% of the respondents stated that they read other crime related reports, news articles, or flyers produced by their institutions (see Table 1), but only 27% attended crime prevention or awareness programs mandated by the Act. This “other information” did change the way students protected themselves (41%) and their property (37%), but had no major influence (25%) in changing the way students moved about the campus (see Table 1).

#### Does Having Access to Other Information Increase the Likelihood that Students Will Report Crimes?

More than half (51%) the students reported that access to “other information” increased the likelihood that they would report crimes (see Table 1).

#### Does Student Knowledge and Use of the Information Mandated by the Act or Other Information Vary by Gender, Victim Status, Institutional Type, Location or Size?

Responses by gender. As the data in Table 1 suggests, student awareness of the Act or having read the Security Report mandated by it remains low. Men were significantly more likely to be aware of the Act (Chi-square = 4.90, df = 1, p = 0.27) and to read an institution’s annual report (Chi-square = 7.49, df = 1, p = .006).

Table 1  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Gender*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
1. Were students aware of the Act?					
Women	589 (26%)	1694 (74%)	4.92	1	.027
Men	456 (29%)	1115 (71%)			
Total	1045 (27%)	2809 (73%)			
2. Did they remember receiving the summary in an admission packet?					
Women	527 (23%)	1756 (77%)	1.14	1	.285
Men	387 (25%)	1188 (75%)			
Total	914 (24%)	2944 (76%)			
3. Did students read the summary?					
Women	515 (23%)	1770 (77%)	.077	1	.781
Men	349 (22%)	1226 (77%)			
Total	864 (24%)	2996 (76%)			
4. Did the summary influence students' enrollment decisions?					
Women	200 ( 9%)	2080 (91%)	3.43	1	.064
Men	112 ( 7%)	1462 (93%)			
Total	312 ( 8%)	3542 (92%)			
5. Did students remember receiving the annual report?					
Women	487 (21%)	1799 (79%)	2.74	1	.098
Men	371 (23%)	1204 (77%)			
Total	858 (22%)	3003 (78%)			
6. Did students read the annual report?					
Women	464 (20%)	1822 (80%)	7.49	1	.006
Men	378 (24%)	1197 (76%)			
Total	842 (22%)	3019 (78%)			
7. Have students read any other crime related reports, news articles, or flyers?					
Women	1434 (63%)	851 (37%)	14.41	1	.001
Men	892 (57%)	682 (43%)			
Total	2326 (60%)	1533 (40%)			

Table 1 (con't)  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Gender*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
8. Have students attended a crime prevention or awareness program?					
Women	716 (31%)	1567 (69%)	44.79	1	.001
Men	340 (22%)	1235 (78%)			
Total	1056 (27%)	2802 (73%)			
9. Did the related information or programs change how students protect their personal property?					
Women	992 (44%)	1285 (56%)	31.21	1	.001
Men	438 (28%)	1135 (72%)			
Total	1430 (37%)	2420 (63%)			
10. Did the related information or programs change how students protect themselves from harm?					
Women	1176 (52%)	1102 (48%)	75.76	1	.001
Men	397 (25%)	1178 (75%)			
Total	1575 (41%)	2280 (60%)			
11. Did the related information or programs change how students move around campus?					
Women	757 (33%)	1524 (67%)	195.46	1	.001
Men	210 (13%)	1365 (87%)			
Total	967 (25%)	2889 (75%)			
12. Did the related information or programs increase students' level of confidence in campus police?					
Women	589 (26%)	1692 (74%)	1.167	1	.280
Men	382 (24%)	1191 (76%)			
Total	971 (25%)	2883 (75%)			
13. Did the related information or programs increase the likelihood that students would report crime?					
Women	1263 (56%)	1005 (44%)	58.13	1	.001
Men	675 (44%)	889 (56%)			
Total	1938 (51%)	1894 (49%)			

Women, on the other hand, were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to have read other campus material such as flyers or news paper articles relating to crime and safety (Chi-square = 14.41, df = 1, p = .001) or to have attended a crime prevention or crime awareness program (Chi-square = 44.79, df = 1, p = .001). As a result of engaging in these activities, when compared to male respondents, women were significantly more likely to change the way they protected their personal property (Chi-square = 98.48, df = 1, p = .001), change the way they protected themselves from harm (Chi-square = 269.91, df = 1, p = .001), and change how they moved around campus (Chi-square = 195.46, df = 1, p = .001).

Finally, as a result of reading these flyers or newspaper articles, women were significantly more likely to report criminal activity than male respondents. (Chi-square = 58.13, df = 1, p = .001).

Responses by victim status. Among the respondents, 562 (15%) indicated that they had become victims of some type of criminal activity while enrolled at their respective institutions. Twelve percent were women and 17 percent were men. Those who reported being victimized were more likely to know about the Act (Chi-square = 6.93, df = 1, p = .008), but victims were no more likely than their non-victim counterparts to remember receiving the federally mandated reports or using the information contained in those documents. Victims, however, were significantly more likely to have read other crime related reports, news articles, and flyers available on campus (Chi-square = 23.70, df = 1, p = 001), to have attended a crime prevention or awareness program (Chi-square = 45.93, df = 1, p = .001), to have changed the way they protected their personal property (Chi-square = 39.56, df = 1, p = .001), to have changed how they protected themselves from harm (Chi-square = 4.62, df = 1, p = .032), and changed the way they moved around their respective campuses (Chi-square = 5.34, df = 1, p = .021). These results are shown in Table 2.

Responses by institutional type. Respondents identified the institutions they were currently attending as being public or private. The data analyzed using this classification are shown in Table 3.

Again, while the total percentage of students being aware of the act, having read the Security Report or using that information to make their college choice is very low, when compared to their public institution counterparts, students attending private institutions were significantly more likely to have: remembered receiving the crime summary contained in an admissions packet (Chi-square = 16.94, df = 1, p = 001), read the crime summary contained in the admission's packet (Chi-square = 23.39, df = 1, p = .001), used this summary in their college choice decision (Chi-square = 20.15, df = 1, p = .001), remembered receiving the institution's annual crime report (Chi-square = 34.44, df = 1, p = .001), read the annual report (Chi-square = 16.18, df = 1, p = .001), read other types of awareness materials such as posters, flyers, and newspaper articles (Chi-square = 11.08 df = 1 p = .001), and attended crime awareness or crime prevention

Table 2  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Victim Status*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
1. Were students aware of the Act?					
Victim	178 (32%)	384 (68%)	6.93	1	.008
Non-victim	867 (26%)	2426 (74%)			
Total	1045 (27%)	2810 (73%)			
2. Did they remember receiving the summary in an admission packet?					
Victim	141 (25%)	421 (75%)	.717	1	.397
Non-victim	773 (23%)	2524 (77%)			
Total	914 (24%)	2945 (76%)			
3. Did students read the summary?					
Victim	134 (24%)	428 (76%)	.814	1	.367
Non-victim	730 (22%)	2569 (78%)			
Total	864 (24%)	2996 (77%)			
4. Did the summary influence students' enrollment decisions?					
Victim	52 ( 9%)	510 (91%)	1.18	1	.276
Non-victim	260 ( 8%)	3033 (92%)			
Total	312 ( 8%)	3293 (92%)			
5. Did students remember receiving the annual report?					
Victim	128 (23%)	434 (77%)	.119	1	.730
Non-victim	730 (21%)	2570 (79%)			
Total	858 (22%)	3004 (78%)			
6. Did students read the annual report?					
Victim	135 (24%)	427 (76%)	1.90	1	.168
Non-victim	707 (21%)	2593 (79%)			
Total	842 (22%)	3020 (78%)			
7. Have students read any other crime related reports, news articles, or flyers?					
Victim	391 (70%)	171 (30%)	23.70	1	.001
Non-victim	1936 (59%)	1362 (41%)			
Total	2327 (60%)	1533 (40%)			

Table 2 (con't)

*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Victim Status*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
8. Have students attended a crime prevention or awareness program?					
Victim	220 (39%)	342 (61%)	45.93	1	.001
Non-victim	836 (25%)	2461 (75%)			
Total	1056 (27%)	2803 (73%)			
9. Did the related information or programs change how students protect their personal property?					
Victim	275 (49%)	286 (51%)	39.56	1	.001
Non-victim	1156 (35%)	2134 (65%)			
Total	1431 (37%)	2420 (63%)			
10. Did the related information or programs change how students protect themselves from harm?					
Victim	252 (45%)	308 (55%)	4.62	1	.032
Non-victim	1324 (40%)	1972 (60%)			
Total	1576 (41%)	2280 (60%)			
11. Did the related information or programs change how students move around campus?					
Victim	163 (29%)	399 (71%)	5.34	1	.021
Non-victim	805 (24%)	2490 (86%)			
Total	968 (25%)	2889 (75%)			
12. Did the related information or programs increase students' level of confidence in campus police?					
Victim	133 (24%)	428 (76%)	.764	1	.382
Non-victim	838 (25%)	2456 (75%)			
Total	971 (25%)	2884 (75%)			
13. Did the related information or programs increase the likelihood that students would report crime?					
Victim	292 (52%)	267 (44%)	.758	1	.384
Non-victim	1645 (50%)	1629 (50%)			
Total	1937 (51%)	1896 (49%)			

Table 3  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Institutional Type*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
1. Were students aware of the Act?					
Public	589 (27%)	1565 (73%)	0.10	1	.751
Private	451 (28%)	1237 (72%)			
Total	1035 (27%)	2802 (73%)			
2. Did they remember receiving the summary in an admission packet?					
Public	456 (21%)	1696 (79%)	16.94	1	.001
Private	454 (27%)	1235 (73%)			
Total	910 (24%)	2931 (76%)			
3. Did students read the summary?					
Public	420 (20%)	1734 (80%)	23.38	1	.001
Private	440 (26%)	1249 (74%)			
Total	860 (22%)	2983 (78%)			
4. Did the summary influence students' enrollment decisions?					
Public	135 ( 6%)	2014 (94%)	20.15	1	.001
Private	173 (10%)	1515 (90%)			
Total	308 ( 8%)	3592 (92%)			
5. Did students remember receiving the annual report?					
Public	404 (19%)	1750 (81%)	34.43	1	.001
Private	451 (27%)	1239 (73%)			
Total	855 (22%)	2989 (78%)			
6. Did students read the annual report?					
Public	419 (20%)	1735 (80%)	16.18	1	.001
Private	420 (25%)	1270 (75%)			
Total	839 (22%)	3005 (78%)			
7. Have students read any other crime related reports, news article, or flyers?					
Public	1246 (58%)	906 (42%)	11.08	1	.001
Private	1068 (63%)	622 (37%)			
Total	2314 (60%)	1528 (40%)			

Table 3 (con't)  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Institutional Type*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
8. Have students attended a crime prevention or awareness program?					
Public	500 (23%)	1652 (77%)	40.96	1	.001
Private	549 (32%)	1140 (68%)			
Total	1049 (27%)	2792 (73%)			
9. Did the related information or programs change how students protect their personal property?					
Public	800 (37%)	1350 (63%)	0.01	1	.933
Private	624 (37%)	1059 (63%)			
Total	1424 (37%)	2409 (63%)			
10. Did the related information or programs change how students protect themselves from harm?					
Public	858 (40%)	1294 (60%)	2.07	1	.150
Private	711 (42%)	975 (58%)			
Total	1569 (41%)	2269 (60%)			
11. Did the related information or programs change how students move around campus?					
Public	556 (26%)	1596 (74%)	1.57	1	.209
Private	406 (24%)	1365 (76%)			
Total	962 (25%)	2877 (75%)			
12. Did the related information or programs increase students' level of confidence in campus police?					
Public	560 (26%)	1589 (74%)	2.27	1	.132
Private	404 (24%)	1284 (76%)			
Total	964 (25%)	2873 (75%)			
13. Did the related information or programs increase the likelihood that students would report crime?					
Public	1074 (50%)	1068 (50%)	0.395	1	.530
Private	856 (51%)	817 (49%)			
Total	1930 (51%)	1885 (49%)			

programs (Chi-square = 40.96, df = 1, p = .001). Despite these findings, there were no significant differences when changes in behavior were examined by institutional type.

Responses by location of institution. Respondents were asked to characterize the population density in which the institution was located as either (a) urban, defined as a metropolitan area or large city or (b) rural, defined as a small town, city or rural area. Data were grouped into these two classifications based on the respondent's self-report. The results are shown in Table 4. Two significant differences were found.

Students attending urban institutions were significantly more likely to have read other awareness materials about campus crime or crime prevention (Chi-square = 12.35, df = 1, p = .001) than students attending rural colleges or universities. Based on this information, students attending urban institutions were significantly more likely to change the way they moved around their campuses (Chi-square = 5.56, df = 1, p = .018). No significant differences regarding knowledge of the Act, use of the information supplied in the federally mandated reports, were found when location was examined.

Responses by institutional size. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the size of their institutions when completing the questionnaire. Respondents attending institutions of less than 5,000 students were significantly more likely to have: remembered receiving the crime summary in an admissions packet (Chi-square = 12.41, df = 1, p = .001), read the crime summary contained in the admission's packet (Chi-square = 23.39, df = 1, p = .001), used this summary in their college choice decision (Chi-square = 20.15, df = 1, p = .001), remembered receiving the institution's annual crime report (Chi-square = 34.44, df = 1, p = .001), and attended crime awareness or crime prevention programs (Chi-square = 40.96, df = 1, p = .001) than their counterparts attending colleges or universities with enrollments of more than 5,000 students. Conversely, respondents attending institutions with more than 5,000 students were significantly more likely to have read additional other kinds of campus crime awareness and prevention materials such as posters, flyers, or newspaper articles than respondents at smaller institutions (Chi-square = 22.26, df = 1, p = .001). Based on this information, respondents attending larger schools were also significantly more likely to have changed how they moved around their campuses (Chi-square = 7.83, df = 1, p = .005). These results can be found in Table 5.

## **Discussion**

Although the sample size is quite large, the respondent group does not reflect the demographic characteristics of all Title IV institutions covered by the Act. Students attending community colleges comprised 13% of the respondent group and are underrepresented when compared to 38% of community college students in Title IV institutions. Students attending four-year schools (87% of the respondents) are overrepresented when compared to 59% of the Title IV population. The researchers

Table 4  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Location of the Institution*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
1. Were students aware of the Act?					
Urban	346 (27%)	936 (73%)	0.01	1	.931
Rural	697 (27%)	1237 (73%)			
Total	1035 (27%)	2809 (73%)			
2. Did they remember receiving the summary in an admission packet?					
Urban	290 (23%)	995 (77%)	1.25	1	.263
Rural	622 (24%)	1949 (76%)			
Total	912 (24%)	2944 (76%)			
3. Did students read the summary?					
Urban	268 (21%)	1017 (79%)	2.45	1	.117
Rural	594 (23%)	1979 (77%)			
Total	862 (22%)	2996 (78%)			
4. Did the summary influence students' enrollment decisions?					
Urban	90 ( 7%)	1191 (93%)	2.97	1	.085
Rural	222 ( 9%)	2349 (91%)			
Total	312 ( 8%)	3540 (92%)			
5. Did students remember receiving the annual report?					
Urban	291 (23%)	994 (77%)	0.189	1	.664
Rural	567 (22%)	2007 (78%)			
Total	858 (22%)	3001 (78%)			
6. Did students read the annual report?					
Urban	282 (22%)	1003 (78%)	0.018	1	.893
Rural	560 (22%)	2014 (78%)			
Total	842 (22%)	3017 (78%)			
7. Have students read any other crime related reports, news articles, or flyers?					
Urban	824 (64%)	460 (35%)	12.35	1	.001
Rural	1500 (58%)	1073 (42%)			
Total	2324 (60%)	1533 (40%)			

Table 4 (con't)  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Location of Institution*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
8. Have students attended a crime prevention or awareness program?					
Urban	338 (26%)	946 (74%)	0.989	1	.320
Rural	716 (28%)	1856 (72%)			
Total	1054 (27%)	2802 (73%)			
9. Did the related information or programs change how students protect their personal property?					
Urban	499 (39%)	782 (61%)	2.718	1	.099
Rural	930 (36%)	1637 (64%)			
Total	1429 (37%)	2419 (63%)			
10. Did the related information or programs change how students protect themselves from harm?					
Urban	525 (41%)	760 (59%)	0.001	1	.978
Rural	1048 (41%)	1520 (59%)			
Total	1573 (41%)	2280 (60%)			
11. Did the related information or programs change how students move around campus?					
Urban	352 (27%)	933 (73%)	5.563	1	.018
Rural	614 (24%)	1955 (76%)			
Total	966 (25%)	2888 (75%)			
12. Did the related information or programs increase students' level of confidence in campus police?					
Urban	328 (26%)	956 (74%)	0.177	1	.674
Rural	640 (25%)	1928 (75%)			
Total	968 (25%)	2884 (75%)			
13. Did the related information and programs increase the likelihood that students would report crime?					
Urban	639 (50%)	638 (50%)	0.179	1	.672
Rural	1296 (51%)	1257 (49%)			
Total	1935 (51%)	1895 (49%)			

Table 5  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Institutional Size*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
1. Were students aware of the Act?					
Under 5,000	575 (27%)	1572 (73%)	0.646	1	.646
Over 5,000	466 (27%)	1232 (73%)			
Total	1041 (27%)	2804 (73%)			
2. Did they remember receiving the summary in an admission packet?					
Under 5,000	555 (26%)	1595 (74%)	12.41	1	.001
Over 5,000	356 (21%)	1343 (79%)			
Total	911 (24%)	2938 (76%)			
3. Did students read the summary?					
Under 5,000	532 (25%)	1618 (75%)	14.90	1	.001
Over 5,000	332 (20%)	1369 (80%)			
Total	864 (22%)	2987 (78%)			
4. Did the summary influence students' enrollment decisions?					
Under 5,000	219 (10%)	1930 (90%)	28.17	1	.001
Over 5,000	93 ( 6%)	1603 (94%)			
Total	312 ( 8%)	3533 (92%)			
5. Did students remember receiving the annual report?					
Under 5,000	517 (24%)	1634 (76%)	8.99	1	.003
Over 5,000	340 (20%)	1361 (80%)			
Total	857 (22%)	2995 (78%)			
6. Did students read the annual report?					
Under 5,000	481 (22%)	1670 (78%)	0.879	1	.348
Over 5,000	359 (21%)	1342 (78%)			
Total	840 (22%)	3012 (78%)			
7. Have students read any other crime related reports, news articles, or flyers?					
Under 5,000	1225 (57%)	925 (42%)	22.27	1	.001
Over 5,000	1096 (65%)	604 (35%)			
Total	2321 (60%)	1529 (40%)			

Table 5 (con't)  
*Number, Percentages, and Chi-Square Results By Size of Institution*

Item	Yes	No	Chi-Square	df	p
8. Have students attended a crime prevention or awareness program?					
Under 5,000	633 (29%)	1517 (71%)	10.38	1	.001
Over 5,000	421 (25%)	1278 (75%)			
Total	1054 (27%)	2795 (73%)			
9. Did the related information or programs change how students protect their personal property?					
Under 5,000	773 (36%)	1370 (64%)	2.19	1	.138
Over 5,000	652 (38%)	1046 (62%)			
Total	1425 (37%)	2416 (63%)			
10. Did the related information or programs change how students protect themselves from harm?					
Under 5,000	853 (40%)	1293 (60%)	2.21	1	.138
Over 5,000	716 (42%)	984 (58%)			
Total	1569 (41%)	2277 (60%)			
11. Did the related information or programs change how students move around campus?					
Under 5,000	502 (23%)	1646 (77%)	7.83	1	.005
Over 5,000	464 (27%)	1235 (73%)			
Total	966 (25%)	2881 (75%)			
12. Did the related information or programs increase students' level of confidence in campus police?					
Under 5,000	522 (24%)	1627 (76%)	2.03	1	.155
Over 5,000	446 (26%)	1250 (74%)			
Total	968 (25%)	2877 (75%)			
13. Did the related information or programs increase the likelihood that students would report crime?					
Under 5,000	1059 (50%)	1072 (50%)	1.08	1	.298
Over 5,000	870 (51%)	823 (49%)			
Total	1929 (51%)	1895 (49%)			

depended upon institutional representatives of NASPA to volunteer their institutions for this study. Self-selection may have affected responses some indiscernible way. In addition, these volunteers developed their own sampling plans and these plans may have varied from institution to institution. These factors, along with the researchers' inability to do follow up contacts with the student respondents, undoubtedly influenced the results. These limitations notwithstanding, the study yields some important findings.

#### Awareness of the Act and Use of Mandated Reports

Despite a 10-year effort to increase the usefulness of the annual crime report and to distribute it more widely, only 27 percent of student respondents were aware of the Act and only 22 percent report reading the federally mandated annual crime report. The majority of students remain unaware of the Act and do not use the information contained in the summary or annual report. It is interesting to note that men were significantly more likely to be aware of the Act and to read the annual report. In this study, men (17%) reported that they had been victims of crime on their campuses more frequently than women (12%). This factor may have affected their interest in this material and their responses as a group. It also may be that men are more receptive to receiving information displayed in the form of an annual report.

Only eight percent of respondents report using crime statistics as part of their college choice decision-making. Slightly larger percentages of respondents attending private institutions (10%) and institutions with enrollments of less than 5,000 (10%) were significantly more likely to incorporate crime information into their college choice decision.

Despite these low numbers across all of the demographic variables in this study, respondents at private institutions and smaller colleges were significantly more likely to remember receiving these reports and to having read them. It may be that these institutions have more effective communication and distribution mechanisms. It may also be that since these institutions have lower crime rates (Nicklin, 2001), they may be more likely to use this comparatively good news as part of their recruitment and public relations strategies. These differences merit further study.

Janosik (2001), Woodhams (1999) and others have found student awareness and the use of the data found in these required crime reports to be low. This lack of awareness and low use rate, coupled with confusing nature of the law's reporting requirements, has led Hartle (2001) to conclude that the law itself does little to influence student behavior. There are other factors to consider, however.

#### Use of Other Crime Prevention Information and Programs

The Clery Act's primary focus is to have colleges and universities report crime statistics in a consistent manner on an annual basis. But the statute also encourages institutions to summarize their crime prevention programs and strategies for increasing awareness in their campus security reports. These programs and strategies appear to result in higher

rates of awareness and behavioral change particularly for women students. The percentage of women (63%), men (57%), and those reporting becoming a crime victim while enrolled (70%) reading other campus crime awareness or crime prevention reports, flyers, or newspaper articles were dramatically higher than the percentage of students (24%) who read the crime report summary or annual report. Women students generally, crime victims, respondents at urban institutions, and larger schools were significantly more likely to read this campus crime related material than their corresponding counterparts. Although only 22% of male respondents reported having attended a crime prevention or crime awareness program, one-third of women report doing so. The percentage for crime victims was only slightly higher (39%). Interestingly, respondents at private institutions and smaller colleges were also more likely to attend crime prevention or awareness programs.

These written materials and programs designed by campus officials to remind students about current crime prevention activities or inform students about crime awareness issues, resulted in changed behavior among women. In this study, women who attended these programs or read this type of material were significantly more likely to change how they protected their personal property (44%), protected themselves from harm (52%), and changed how they moved around the campus (33%). Crime victims, too, were significantly more likely to change their behavior. Respondents at larger, urban institutions were also likely to change how they moved around campus when compared to their private and smaller school peers. Nicklin (2001) and the U.S. Department of Education (2001) reported that smaller colleges and private institutions as groups report fewer incidents of crime. This may help explain this finding. It may also be that students in larger metropolitan areas have a greater sensitivity to their surroundings and the greater possibility of criminal activity.

#### Student Relationship with Campus Police

Twenty-five percent of students reported that these crime-related materials, program and services increased their confidence in their campus police departments. Comparisons of these response rates based on gender, victim status, institutional type, institutional location, and institutional size were not significant. While this is not a large percentage, it is noteworthy. In addition, women respondents (56%) were significantly more likely to report campus crime than their male counterparts (44%). Comparisons of these response rates based on institutional type, institutional location, and institutional size were not significant. However, creating increased confidence and a climate where crime is more likely to be reported are important residual effects of the Act's implementation by those institutions that make crime prevention a serious priority.

#### **Conclusion**

Among respondents, 89% reported feeling safe or very safe on their respective campuses, 75% reported feeling safe or very safe off campus, and only 15% reported having been victimized by a criminal act while enrolled on their campuses. These perceptions correspond to the conclusion drawn by the U.S. Department of Education

(2001) that the incidents of crime on college campuses, in most cases, are much lower than the nation as a whole. These factors may color how students respond to issues of campus safety. Motivating students to read crime reports or to request information about campus crime in such an environment will remain a difficult task. While crime victims seem to be more aware of the Act, even they fail to use the information contained in these annual reports.

Today, most of the public debate regarding the Clery Act continues to revolve around what categories of criminal activity, which school properties and geographically close areas, and which academic and co-curricular programs are or should be covered by this federal statute (Hartle, 2001; Janosik, 2001; Nicklin, 1999; & Woodhams, 1999). The National Center for Educational Statistics (1997) also reports, however, that the Clery Act was intended, in part, to encourage colleges and universities to put more emphasis on campus safety and on crime prevention services and programs. The findings of this research suggest that the energy and emphasis devoted to the reporting requirements of the Act may be misplaced. If the Act's purpose is to educate, change behavior, and protect college students, policy makers and college administrators might be better served by focusing their attention on the development of those services and programs that seem to make a difference.

## References

- Federal Register*. (July 10, 1992). 57:30826.
- Gehring, D. D., & Callaway, R.L. (1997). Compliance with the notice requirement of the Campus Security Act, *College and University*, 73, 13-18.
- Hartle, T. (January 12, 2001). Toward a better law on campus crime. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, B10.
- Janosik, S. M. (2001). The impact of the Crime Awareness Act on student behavior. *NASPA*, 38, 3, 348-360.
- National Center of Educational Statistics. (1997). *Campus crime and security at postsecondary institutions*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Nicklin, J. L. (February 2, 2001). Drug and alcohol arrests increased in 1999. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A35.
- Public Law 101-542*. The Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act.
- Public Law 105-244*. The Higher Educational Amendments of 1998.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *The incidence of crime on the campuses of U.S. postsecondary education institutions*. Washington, DC: Office of Postsecondary Education, Policy, Planning and Innovation.
- Woodhams, F. (January 15, 1999). Colleges complain of paperwork and confusion over new rules on crime reports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, B6.

The Educational Policy Institute (EPI) of Virginia Tech is sponsored and maintained by the Higher Education Program and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies of the Virginia Tech College of Human Resources and Education. Its purpose is to facilitate the distribution of information and to stimulate discussion of policy issues affecting public education and higher education in Virginia. The contents of these pages express the independent views and opinions of the authors. They are not intended to represent the official comment or position of any elected or appointed official or any state agency. Those wishing to contact EPI may do so by writing to the director, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 304 East Eggleston Hall (0302), Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061.

Virginia Tech does not discriminate against employees, students, or applicants on the basis of race, sex, disability, age, veteran status, national origin, religion, sexual orientation or political affiliation. Anyone having questions concerning discrimination should contact the Equal Employment Affirmative Action Office, 336 Burruss Hall, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061.