AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TRAINING NEEDS OF CAMPUS SECURITY DEPARTMENTS AT PUBLIC MAJOR UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By

RONALD J. KEEL

Bachelor of Arts
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma
1964

Master of Education
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma
1985

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1992

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TRAINING NEEDS

OF CAMPUS SECURITY DEPARTMENTS

AT PUBLIC MAJOR UNIVERSITIES

IN THE UNITED STATES

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research project is dedicated to my wife, Betty, whose constant encouragement, understanding, and optimism helped me carry this study through to completion.

Special recognition is expressed to the writer's daughters, Stacie, Susie, and Debbie, for their patience and understanding during the occasions the writer was unavailable because of this study.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Bill Venable, for serving as thesis committee chairman and Dr. Cecil Dugger, Dr. Bob Nolan, and Dr. Larry Hynson for serving as committee members to guide this study. The writer's appreciation is also expressed to Dr. John Gardiner who formerly served as a committee member.

Others who deserve a special note of appreciation are: Chief Everett Eaton, Captain Ernest Tye, and Sergeant Steve Gahagans of the Oklahoma State University Police Department, Chief Bob Roberts and Sergeant Charles Griffin, Jr., of the University of Central Oklahoma Campus Police Department and Captain Duncan Burgess of the University of Oklahoma Police Department.

Gratitude is expressed to Mrs. Nita Davis for her support and help, and to Mr. RGP, Jr and Dr. Edgar Petty for their important part in this study.

A special "thank you" is extended to Cathy Lorenz and also to Debbie Brightmier for their efforts in typing the drafts.

Special recognition is expressed to Kay Porter, Administrative Assistant, School of Occupational and Adult Education, Oklahoma State University for her support and invaluable help in handling many of the administrative procedures associated with this study.

Finally, to the chiefs or administrators of campus security departments involved in this study, a note of gratitude is extended for their participation in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The primary role of campus security departments at colleges and universities in the United States has been the protection of persons and property on campus. As such, training received by the campus security officer has consisted mainly of instruction in areas relating to protective and loss-prevention techniques and procedures. The campus security officer's performance has been aimed primarily at guidance and treatment rather than arrest and punishment.

In the last few years, however, the frequency and severity of campus crimes have grown enormously. Boyer (1990) reports that in a recent survey of 355 university and college student affairs officers, 26 percent said that the number of reported crimes on their campus has increased over the last five years. He further reported that in this same study 14 percent of the student affairs officers surveyed also reported a significant increase in the severity of reported crimes on their campus.

This increase in the severity of campus crimes clearly suggests that the complexion of crime pervading contemporary American campus life is changing. Smith (1988), recognizing this change,

makes the following observation on how this change has affected the campus security officer:

> Today's campus security professional must be able to cope with everything from assuring the integrity of computer systems to providing protection against terrorist acts. In short, today's campus security effort must reflect the best of modern police techniques (p. 93).

This change in the types of crimes being committed on today's campuses has required many campus security departments to expand their functions to include various law enforcement responsibilities. Because of this, many campus security officers are being called upon to perform duties that are identical to those performed by recognized law enforcement officers, such as court-charging of criminal violators, conducting crime scene searches, and collecting and preserving evidence. In some instances these officers lack the necessary skills and knowledge to carry out such duties in a safe and effective manner. This may be due in part to a lack of appropriate training, but the types of training necessary to carry out these law enforcement responsibilities are often unavailable through their own department due to limited resources.

Campus security administrators have voiced an interest in obtaining training assistance from resources outside their departments. They have expressed an interest in a study made to determine whether or not their current training needs are of the

type that can be met through the various law enforcement training resources currently available from the federal government. Therefore, an assessment of the current priority training needs of campus security departments is the purpose of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The problem which gave rise to this study was that the increase in the frequency and severity of campus crime over the last few years has required many campus security departments to expand their functions to include law enforcement responsibilities. For many campus security departments, the types of training necessary to carry out these new responsibilities in a safe and effective manner is currently unavailable to them.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify the priority training needs of campus security departments at public major universities in the United States which offered campus housing. In view of the training resources currently available through the federal government, a study to determine whether or not these resources have the capability to meet these priority training needs was considered appropriate.

Need for the Study

The study is needed because: (1) a study involving the identification of the priority training needs of campus security departments on a nationwide scale has not been identified or found, and (2) campus security administrators have expressed an interest in such a study.

Research Questions

To achieve the purpose of the study the following questions were formulated:

1. In terms of importance to the job, what are the priority training needs of campus security departments?

2. Do the priority training needs of campus security departments differ because of geographic region?

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made for the purpose of the study:

1. The respondents involved in the study were knowledgeable about the field operation functions of their departments.

2. The respondents involved in the study were knowledgeable about the kinds of tasks generally associated with the field operation functions of campus security departments.

3. The respondents' knowledge about the field operation functions of campus security departments and the kinds of tasks necessary to carry out these functions were based on a nationwide

perspective of these functions and tasks.

Limitations of the Study

1. The list of tasks performed by campus security officers and utilized in the study may not represent all the tasks performed by campus security officers at all the public major universities in the United States.

2. The study was limited to public major universities in the United States that offered resident housing for their students.

3. The list of tasks used in the study dealt with tasks associated with the field operation functions of campus security departments. For the purpose of the study, field operation functions are comprised of patrol, investigations, communications, and special functions.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are furnished to provide clear and concise meanings of some of the terms used in the study.

Campus Security Officers: Persons employed by a college or university to maintain peace and order and enforce the laws within its jurisdiction.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: The principle investigative arm of the United States Department of Justice. It is charged with gathering and reporting facts, locating witnesses, and compiling evidence in cases involving federal jurisdiction. The

Federal Bureau of Investigation also offers cooperative services such as fingerprint examination, laboratory examination, and police training to duly authorized law enforcement agencies.

Major Universities: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching groups major universities into four categories:

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research. They receive annually at least $33.5 million in federal support and award at least 50 doctorate degrees each year.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research. They receive annually at least $12.5 million in federal support and award at least 50 doctorate degrees each year.

Doctorate-Granting Universities I: In addition to offering a full range of baccalaureate programs, the mission of these institutions includes a commitment to graduate education through the doctorate degree. They award at least 40 doctorate degrees annually in five or more academic disciplines.

Doctorate-Granting Universities II: In addition to offering a full range of baccalaureate programs, the mission of these institutions includes a commitment to graduate education

through the doctorate degree. They award annually 20 or more doctorate degrees in at least one discipline or 10 or more doctorate degrees in three or more disciplines.

Overview of the Study

Chapter II provides background information that establishes the need for the study and describes the different methods that can be used to conduct needs assessments and job task analysis.

Chapter III describes the research design used in the study as well as the process that was utilized to develop the questionnaire used in the study. It also indicates the procedures followed to select the study's population and to collect and analyze the data produced by the study.

Chapter IV presents the data collected through the questionnaire used in the study as well as an analysis of the data as it relates to the characteristics of the respondents, issues relating to training and about the questionnaire itself, and additional training needs that were not indicated in the questionnaire. It also includes an analysis of the data that relate to the training needs of campus security departments in different geographic regions as well as the priority training needs of these campus security departments.

Chapter V provides a concise summary of the study and several conclusions revealed by the researcher based on an analysis of the

data collected. It also presents recommendations for practice and for further research as well as implications of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature has been compiled to provide background information that establishes a need for the study. In addition, while the review of the literature failed to locate a study involving an assessment of the training needs of a campus security department or an analysis of the tasks performed by campus security officers, the various methods employed in conducting needs assessments and job task analyses were reviewed and are cited in this chapter.

The review of the literature has been divided into three areas: The Role of Campus Security, Training Needs Assessment, and Job Analysis.

The Role of Campus Security

Boyer (1990) reports that a survey of 355 student affairs officers from colleges and universities in the United States found that one in four said the number of reported crimes on their campuses had increased over the last five years.

In addition, observers are beginning to discover new types of criminal violence taking place on American campuses. This change in the complexion of campus crime has influenced the

function of many campus security departments and the ways in which their officers carry out their duties.

According to Smith (1989), today's campus security problems demand the establishment of a modern campus security agency that is sophisticated about crime avoidance techniques and sensitive to the unique character of a college or university community. Bess and Horton (1988) see the need for a campus law enforcement model that is based upon a training system that recognizes the unique campus environment and offers a full range of professional development for all officers.

Given the diversity of campus crime today, the design of any sort of role model for a campus security department would be difficult. Smith (1989) suggests a model that could serve as the norm for all but the smallest and most unusual types of campuses. This model would represent a blending of the principles of conventional police with the principles of private security. Bess and Horton (1988) recommend that a model patterned after a full-service law enforcement agency, with all its implications for funding, equipping and training, be adopted whenever possible and appropriate.

Wehner (1990), on the other hand, believes that, regardless of the model chosen, if an institution has a campus law enforcement agency, it is incumbent upon the administration to ensure that it is as professionally trained as possible to deal with whatever types of situations that might arise.

As previously mentioned, the role of campus security officers has also been affected by the changing complexion of crime and violence pervading contemporary American campus life. Clearly, this change has created new needs necessitating a new posture for the campus security officer.

Gelber (1972) identifies three alternative roles that the campus security officer may assume when carrying out his or her duties. These, however, generally differ somewhat from those performed by municipal police officers in that institutions of higher learning usually encourage a more discretionary and nonpunitive approach to enforcement.

1. First, the campus security officer's performance continuum begins at one end with an individualized approach aimed primarily at guidance and treatment rather than authoritarian control. This involves an integrated, close working relationship with the office of student affairs and the other aspects of the educational program.

2. The second role involves selective enforcement. This attitude recognizes the campus as unique in that dissent is tolerated and encouraged. Only in extreme situations is the total legal machinery invoked. In this role, the campus security department is viewed by other members of the campus community as a necessary adjunct of the institution but with repressive capabilities.

3. The final role is one of equality before the law, wherein each student assumes full responsibility for committing any unlawful

act. Students are held accountable and recognize the campus security officer as a full-bodied representative of law enforcement.

According to Gelber (1972), the extent to which the security officer assumes one of these roles is dependent upon several factors:

1. the existing established relationship with the university,
2. the limit of his legal authority, and
3. the interaction among various parties that arises from events requiring the exercise of authority.

Gelber (1972) points out that these three roles are not mutually exclusive and the ranking of one over the other on a particular campus is dependent upon the philosophy of the institution and the characteristics of the security officers.

The three roles for campus security officers suggested by Gelber (1972) represent a continuum starting with a non-punitive approach and ending with a punitive one. Smith (1989), however, holds a slightly different view when he says that the nature of crime on campus today dictates that campus security officers should act like real police. He elaborates:

> They should be called police and have the same training requirements, legal powers, and professional expectations as the best municipal police officers. In addition, growing white-collar crime in campus life dictates that campus security operations include a skilled and sophisticated detective force. Since all experiences are educative, students should be shown that criminal conduct brings penalties and consequences (p. 38).

Powell (1981), on the other hand, holds a different view of the role of campus security departments when he makes the following observation:

> The role of a campus security department, unlike the role of an outside law enforcement agency, is to contribute to the overall purpose of an educational institution--namely to educate. It acheives this purpose by projecting an image of courtesy, concern, and competence that gains the respect and confidence of the community (p. 29).

As the literature suggests, selecting an appropriate role for a campus security department is difficult. Bess and Horton (1988) believe that in selecting an appropriate role for a campus security department, it is essential to seek input from all segments of the university. "Once that input is obtained, the choices made must be evaluated and defined to assure that community interests are consistently served at the level of its expectations" (p. 36).

Powell (1987) summed up the problem when he concluded that defining the proper role and function of a security department is difficult because they both must be programmed to meet the changing needs of the campus it serves. The identification of these needs, then, is the first step in determining the appropriate function for the campus security department and the role of its officers.

Training Needs Assessment

The term training needs assessment, as used in this study, can be best understood when viewed within the larger context of needs identification within organizations. Laird (1985)

believed a training need exists when "an employee lacks the knowledge or skill to perform an assigned task satisfactorily" (p. 46). Kaufman and English (1979) described a need as "the measurable gap; or discrepancy, between current results and desired results" (p. 343).

Based on this observation, Kaufman and English (1979) described the concept of needs assessment in terms of gaps which exist in organizational inputs, processes, products, outputs and outcomes. Utilizing this as a foundation, they went on to define needs assessment as "a formal process which determines the gaps between current outputs or outcomes and required or desired outcomes or outputs; places these gaps in priority order; and selects the most important for resolution" (p. 8). Examples of how these five organizational characteristics relate to campus security are: (1) inputs (personnel, facilities and equipment); (2) processes (solutions and solution vehicles which are selected to do a job); (3) products (students and faculty members assisted and crimes prevented); (4) outputs (safer and more pleasant campus); and (5) outcomes (improved job performance of campus security personnel).

Within this concept of organizational functions, Kaufman and English (1979) saw a possible taxonomy made up of six needs assessment systems approach models:

1. Alpha needs assessment is characterized by a single emphasis upon "need" as an outcome or performance gap. The function of this approach is to identify the problems based upon the need.

2. Beta needs assessment involves an analysis of output gaps of the system and analysis of process and product gaps within the system. Its function is to determine solution requirements and identify solution alternatives.

3. Gamma needs assessment is concerned with cost efficient and cost effective models. The function of this approach is to select solution strategies from among alternatives.

4. Delta needs assessment involves the determination of gaps in prespecified performance. The important function here is to successfully administer the jobs to be done and manage the resources to help accomplish the overall organizational mission.

5. Epsilon needs assessment deals with discrepancies between results and objectives. The function of this approach is to determine the gaps between the goals and objectives and the accomplishments.

6. Zeta needs assessment involves evaluation of the entire input through output stages. After a job is completed, discrepancies between goals and objectives are determined and corrective action is institutied or a decision not to change is accepted. The primary function of this approach is to make revisions when necessary.

They went on to suggest that all of the six models are potentially useful for conducting a needs assessment. The only concern they saw in selecting the appropriate model is the extent to which the person responsible for the needs assessment is locked into the existing organizational goals, objectives,

and structure, and the starting assumptions that are used to begin the planning process.

There is a variety of methods available for actually conducting training needs assessments. Scott and Deadrick (1982) believed that the Nominal Group Technique (NGT), originally developed by Delbecq and Van deVen (1975), can be used for needs assessments and may represent the most effective method in many situations.

The NGT is a structured group meeting conducted by a group leader or facilitator. During the initial stage, five to nine individuals sit around a table in full view of one another, but initially no talking takes place. Each individual has a sheet of paper with the "nominal question" at the top, and then, independently and silently, writes down as many answers to the question as possible.

After five to ten minutes of controlled and intense work effort, each member in round-robin fashion presents one idea from his listing. The responses receive a sequential number and the leader writes them on a large flip chart for all members to see. No discussion takes place during this recording session, other than to clarify ideas presented. The leader encourages the sharing of ideas, yet group members should not evaluate each other's suggestions. This recording continues until members have no more ideas to offer, thus concluding one "nominal" phase of the meeting.

The next stage consists of a structured discussion of each recorded idea, in sequence. The leader asks for clarification

or expressions of support or nonsupport for each idea and encourages all group members to participate. The member however, is not required to explain his or her suggestions. Anyone in the group is free to do so. The leader must be sure that each item is thoroughly examined.

At the conclusion of this non-nominal phase, the group returns to a nominal stage with independent, private and silent balloting, in which each group member selects priorities by rank ordering, or rating, the listed ideas. The pooled outcome of the individual notes represents the group's priorities or decisions. In approximately 90 minutes, five to nine individuals focusing on a single topic generally produce 25 or more "solutions/problems" with ranked priority judgments.

According to McGehee and Thayer (1961), "There are probably as many rationales for approaching the problem of determining training needs as there are persons who are concerned with planning and directing training" (p. 25). They suggest that a needs assessment should involve a three-level, but closely interrelated, approach to thinking about the training requirements of an organization or a component of an organization. It consists of the following levels:

1. Organization analysis: determining where within the organization training emphasis can and should be placed.
2. Operations analysis: determining what should be the contents of training in terms of what an employee must do to perform a task, job or assignment in an effective way.

3. Man analysis: determining what skills, knowledge or attitudes an individual employee must develop if he is to perform the tasks which constitute his job in the organization (p. 25).

A review of the literature indicates that there are other methods for conducting needs assessments. Many of them, however, appear to have in common the central thrust of determining discrepancies and then suggesting some sort of action to take based upon these discrepancies. As Kaufman and English (1979) point out:

> There are no 'right' or 'wrong' needs assessments modes. Rather, there is an array of possible choices available to those who wish to design successful interventions without risking construction of a 'solution' for which there is no related problem (p. 53).

In spite of this, an evaluation of the different methods for conducting a needs assessment, such as those reviewed, is useful when developing a needs assessment to fit a specific situation. For example, since the ultimate goal of this study is to improve the job performance of campus security officers, the literature reviewed suggests using Kaufman and English's (1979) Alpha-Type needs assessment model for determining training needs. This model is considered appropriate for this study since it looks at gaps between current outcomes (performance) and required or desired outcomes (performance) and then places these gaps in priority order to determine needs. This model, according to Kaufman and English, is basic to survival and growth since it is the basic referent for planning and doing.

Because change is inevitable, the process of determining training needs is never final and, therefore, should be done periodically to reflect these changes. Kaufman and English (1979) suggest that needs assessments are "tools for constructive and positive change - not change solely driven by controversy and situational crises, but rational, logical, functional change which meets defined needs" (p. 8). Kaufman (1979) made the observation that because needs assessment is a problem-solving process, it is constant, ongoing and should be done whenever you have not accomplished what you set out to accomplish.

Job Analysis

According to Wexley and Latham (1981), after the appropriate method for conducting the needs assessment has been selected, the next step involves identifying the tasks involved in the job. Several different approaches can be used for identifying these tasks. Although the procedures differ somewhat from one another, they all break down human work into task units that can then be used for determining the content of a training development program.

Stimulus-Response Feedback

The Stimulus-Response-Feedback method for identifying tasks was developed by Miller (1962). He argues that each task activity consists of the following components:

1. An indicator on which the activity-relevant indication appears.
2. The indication or cue that calls for a response.
3. The control object to be activated.
4. The activation of manipulation to be made.
5. The indication of response adequacy, or feedback (p. 79).

Using this approach, an indicator may be any object that provides the cue for making a response. The indication or cue that triggers the response may appear all at once, or it may have to be pieced together by the worker from recall through periods of time. In its broadest sense, it is an out-of-tolerance signal that there is a difference between present conditions and how conditions ought to be. The control object refers to any means the employee used to correct the out-of-tolerance situation. The activation or manipulation deals with the employee's actual use of the control object. Here, Miller (1962), recommends describing the actual message conveyed by one employee to another regarding the situation. The last component, the indication of response adequacy, is the feedback that the employee receives regarding the adequacy of his or her behavior. In short, this approach basically calls for the analysis of each task in terms of a stimulus-response-feedback.

Time Sampling

Blood (1975), in an analysis of entry-level clerical jobs, used the Time Sampling approach to identify tasks. Here, direct observations of work activities are made by trained observers.

Time sampling enables trainers to determine through direct observation exactly what employees do on the job and how frequently they do it. By making randomized observations of an employee's behavior, trainers can learn in a relatively short time how employees perform their jobs.

Critical Incident Technique

Flanagan (1954) suggests that an effective method for identifying tasks that are considered critical is the Critical Incident Technique. This method requires observers, who are aware of the aims and objectives of a given job and who frequently see people perform the job, to describe to a task analyst incidents of effective and ineffective job behavior that they have observed over the past six to twelve months. This means that supervisors, peers, subordinates and clients may be interviewed about the critical requirements of a specific job. In order to obtain a comprehensive sample of incidents, it is recommended that at least 30 people be interviewed for a total of roughly 300 incidents (Wexley and Latham, 1981).

Job Inventory Approach

Gael (1983) recommends the Job Inventory approach to job analysis. This method involves a structured questionnaire that consists of a listing of tasks comprising a particular job. Once the questionnaire is constructed, it is administered to individuals who are knowledgeable about the job, usually

supervisors. These individuals are then asked to rate each task in terms of both importance and amount of time spent performing the task.

After the questionnaire is completed, the training specialist calculates the mean rating for each task for both importance and time spent performing the task. The end product of this analysis is a comprehensive picture of the job's tasks as seen by people knowledgeable about the requirements of the job.

According to Gael (1983), the rationales underlying the use of this approach to job analysis are that job tasks can be stated and listed on a questionnaire; that as large a sample as is desired can be surveyed to obtain data about each task listed in the job inventory questionnaire; and that accurate and reliable job descriptions can be developed by systematically and thoroughly analyzing the task data collected with a job inventory. This method, Gael (1983) observed, can be an effective device for employment and placement procedures, and to determine training needs.

Descriptions of other methods for identifying both the content and characteristics of jobs are well documented in the job analysis literature reviewed. Since this study involves a training needs assessment, the literature suggests using Gael's (1983) Job Inventory approach to job analysis.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide background information that establishes a need for the study and to describe the methodologies employed in conducting needs assessments and job task analyses.

According to Boyer (1990), a recent survey of 355 college and university student affairs officers found that the frequency and severity of reported crimes on their campuses have increased over the last five years. This change in the complexion of campus crimes has left the function of today's campus security departments and the role of their officers unclear.

While authorities in the area of campus security recognize this change in the complexion of campus crime, many hold different views of how campus security departments should function in light of this change. These views range form a full-service law enforcement function, to one that is primarily security oriented, to a function that represents a combination of these two functions. These same authorities also have different opinions on how campus security officers should react to the new types of crimes being committed on today's campuses. Some suggest a punitive approach while others advocate the traditional approach that is aimed primarily at guidance and treatment.

Powell (1981) summed up the problem when he concluded that defining the proper function of today's campus security departments and posture for their officers is difficult because

they both must be programmed to meet the changing needs of the campus they serve.

A training needs assessment is "a formal process which determines the gap between current outputs or outcomes and required or desired outputs or outcomes; places these gaps in priority order; and selects the most important for resolution" (Kaufman and English, 1979, p. 8).

There is a variety of methods available for conducting training needs assessments. While there is some overlap among the different methods, an awareness of each can be useful when developing a training needs design for a specific situation. For example, since the ultimate goal of this study is to improve the job performance of campus security officers, the literature suggests using Kaufman and English's (1979) Alpha-Type needs assessment model to identify training needs. This model is considered appropriate since it measures the gap between current performance and desired performance. In most instances, a reduction in the size of the gap translates into improved job performance.

Because change is inevitable, a determination of training needs is never final and, as such, should be conducted periodically to reflect these changes. Kaufman (1979) observed that because needs assessment is a problem-solving process, it is constant, ongoing and should be done whenever one fails to accomplish what was set out to be accomplished.

In many instances, training needs assessments focus on job tasks or activities. Thus, the identification of these tasks or activities are is an important part of a needs assessment.

There are various methods available for identifying both the content and characteristics of job tasks or activities. However, since this study involves the development of a list of job tasks performed by campus security officers, the literature suggests that Gael's (1983) Job Inventory approach to task identification is best suited for this purpose. This method uses a questionnaire to identify job tasks and is highly effective in a study such as this where the tasks cannot be observed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter identifies the research design, development of the survey instrument, selection of the population, data collection procedures and the statistical methods to be used in this study.

Research Design

Research design is the overall scheme or program. It includes the methods to be used to gather and analyze the data (Kerlinger, 1973). The research design is what makes a study an effective tool for evaluation of data, without good design the resultant data may be without value. In regard to research design, Kerlinger (1973) made this observation:

> Research design tells us, in a sense, what observations to make, how to make them, and how to analyze the quantitative representations of the observations. Strictly speaking, design does not 'tell' us precisely what to do, but rather 'suggests' the directions of observation-making and analysis. An adequate design 'suggests', for example, how many observations should be made, and which variables are active and which are attribute. We can then act to manipulate the active variables. A design tells us what type of statistical analysis to use. Finally, an adequate design outlines possible conclusions to be drawn from the statistical analysis (p. 301).

The approach selected for this study is based on the needs assessment and job task analysis literature reviewed. The approach can best be described as an Inventory-Based, Alpha-Type

needs assessment approach for conducting a training needs assessment.

The approach to be used in this study was chosen due to its job performance orientation to training needs assessment. It allows the use of a questionnaire to identify job tasks that cannot be observed, and a questionnaire to collect quantifiable training needs data from the large number of responding campus security departments. In addition, the approach measures the size of the gaps between current and desired work performances. As a result, a reduction in the size of these gaps has a high probability of bringing about improved work performance. Finally, the approach lends itself to the use of Likert-type responses making possible the statistical analysis of the large volume of data generated by the study.

The methodology followed in this study is consistent with Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich's (1972) eight steps for conducting descriptive research:

1. Statement of the problem
2. Identification of information needed to solve the problem
3. Selection or development of instruments for gathering the information
4. Identification of target population and, if necessary, determination of sampling procedure
5. Design of procedure for collecting information
6. Collection of information
7. Analysis of information
8. Preparation of report (pp. 304-305).

Since the purpose of descriptive research is to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation (Key, 1974), the selection of this method of research is

considered appropriate since the purpose of this study is to describe "what exists" with respect to the priority training needs of campus security departments. This method will facilitate the achievement of the purpose of this study.

Development of Survey Instrument

The instrument used to determine the priority training needs of the population in this study is a researcher-made questionnaire. The choice of this instrument over others was due to its ability to elicit relevant, quantifiable data from a large number of respondents in a relatively short period of time and at minimal costs. As a tool of research, Best (1959) made the observation that the questionnaire is most frequently a very concise, preplanned set of questions designed to yield specific information to meet a particular need for research information about a particular topic.

The design of the questionnaire used in this study allows the use of a modified version of Kaufman and English's (1979) Alpha-Type needs assessment approach for conducting a training needs assessment. Basically, the approach looks at gaps between current performance and desired performance, and then places these gaps in order to determine priority training needs. The design of the questionnaire also makes possible the collection of data concerning the amount of time campus security officers spend performing each task and the amount of harm which would result from inadequate performance of each task. The basis for the addition of these

two measurements of a priority training need was found in a 1983 study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation entitled, State and Local Law Enforcement Training Needs in the United States. In this study, researchers concluded that a needs assessment based solely on the size of the gap between current and desired performance would provide insufficient information for ranking training needs.

Using the above approach, the questionnaire contains a list of the tasks that are representative of those routinely performed by campus security officers in field operations. Respondents were asked to provide three types of information regarding each task.

a. the size of the gap between the level of ability officers should have for the given task and the level of ability they actually have,

b. the amount of harm which would result from inadequate performance of the task, and

c. the amount of time officers in the department spend performing the task.

In order to determine priority training needs, respondents were asked to rate each task on three dimensions (gap, harm, and time) using a Likert-type scale consisting of 1-5 points. The points on the scale are defined as:

1. Very small or zero
2. Small
3. Moderate

4. Large

5. Very large

The development of the task statement utilized in the needs assessment questionnaire was based on an adaption of Gael's (1983) Job Inventory approach to job task analysis. Using this approach, a list of field tasks performed by law enforcement officers was obtained from the previously mentioned study. This list formed the basis for the task statements used in the needs assessment questionnaire and was made up of 127 field tasks performed by law enforcement officers at the local, county, and state levels.

The list of 127 field related tasks was reviewed for completeness and content validity by a panel of experts consisting of campus law enforcement administrators from each of the two public major universities in the state of Oklahoma. Based on the panels suggestions, a final list of 53 field tasks broken down into five major categories was produced:

1. patrol,
2. investigation,
3. communications,
4. special functions, and
5. common.

This categorization of job tasks allows training needs to be identified and prioritized at two levels:

1. individual job tasks, and
2. major job categories.

By providing training needs information at these two levels, planners of any campus security training programs have available a more comprehensive database to draw from when designing their programs.

According to Laird (1985), training needs, although primarily concerned with people, are also concerned with the precise way an organization functions and the environment in which the organization operates. For this reason, besides the task statements, the questionnaire included questions that solicited information regarding the campus security department itself such as: size of student population served, percentage of personnel involved in field operation functions, mission of department, and size of department.

The analysis of training needs data generated by this study was organized around these types of information. This was done to ensure a more accurate needs assessment by showing the differences that exist among departments in terms of the number of students served, percentage of personnel involved in field operation functions, stated mission, and the total number of personnel employed by each department.

The list of tasks and the questions soliciting information regarding each task and the security department itself were incorporated into a draft questionnaire and sent to the panel of experts for review and comment. On completion of their review, the draft was modified to include a comment section for the respondents. The final draft was then formalized as the

Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment

Inventory/Response Booklet

In its final form the questionnaire contained four questions intended to allow the determination of how training needs differ among departments based on size of department, number of students served and their primary mission, and solicited three types of information regarding each of the 53 tasks that represent the field operations of campus security departments.

1. The size of the gap between the level of ability officers should have for the given task and the level of ability they actually have.

2. The amount of harm which would result from inadequate performance of the task.

3. The amount of time officers in the department spend performing the task.

A question asking respondents to identify any tasks not mentioned in the survey was also included. Finally, the questionnaire contained a comment section for departments wishing to provide narrative comments on training related issues or about the questionnaire itself.

Validity

The most common historical definition of validity is that it refers to the extent to which a test or a set of operations measures what it is supposed to measure Ghiselle (1981). It is clearly the most important characteristic of a measuring

instrument. No matter what other characteristics an instrument may possess, if it does not adequately serve the purpose for which its use is intended, it is of no value whatsoever (Ahmann and Glock, 1981). In an earlier writing, Ahmann and Glock (1971) list three types of validity: content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity. Each type can be defined as the degree to which a measuring instrument accomplishes the aim associated with that type.

An instrument that is content valid contains a representative sample of the universe of the content that the instrument is designed to measure (Van Dalen and Meyer, 1966). Content validity is particularly important when measuring ability and therefore, appropriate for training needs assessment measures (McGrath, Jelinek, and Wochner, 1963). Efforts were taken during the development of the questionnaire to ensure that its contents were representative of the tasks they were designed to measure. The questionnaire development process previously described in this section was conducted in a manner suggested by Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook (1976) and Jahoda (1962). After the development of the questionnaire it was submitted to the panel of experts for review and comment. Following several revisions, the questionnaire was determined to be content valid by the panel.

Criterion-related validity, while an important consideration for an instrument designed to predict future behavior, was not essential for this study. Also, any determination of criterion-related validity requires the presence of some

independent criterion with which the results can be correlated. In terms of this study, there is no independent criterion known to exist which are consistent for all campus security officers.

As with criterion-related validity, validation of the construct validity of the questionnaire was not possible due to the absence of appropriate independent criteria. In addition, since construct validity refers to the ability of an instrument to measure an individual trait or characteristic, it was determined to be inappropriate for an instrument designed to identify priority training needs.

Pilot Testing

To further enhance the validity of the survey instrument, the next step in the development process involved pilot testing of the questionnaire. This process, according to Dunham and Smith (1979), can help identify and correct many serious blunders in item writing or construction before the final questionnaire is administered.

Following the advice of Dillman (1978), the group selected for pilot testing was made up of a sample of the potential users of the survey results, the campus security administrators from the study's population of public major universities. To ensure that they were representative of the rest of the campus security administrators, six states were randomly selected from the 46 in the study having public major universities. Following this, one university was randomly selected from the population of public

major universities in each of the six states. The campus security administrator from each of the selected universities made up the pilot test group and represented approximately five percent of the total number of campus security administrators involved in the study.

Pilot survey packets were mailed out to the six campus security administrators representing the pilot test group. Each packet contained the following materials:

1. introductory letter,
2. survey questionnaire,
3. evaluation response form, and
4. a postage-paid return envelope.

Following the return of the pilot testing material, the responses to the questionnaire as well as the written evaluations and recommendations were reviewed. After this, the questionnaire was slightly revised and then returned to the pilot test group for review and comments. On completion of their review, the pilot test group indicated that the questionnaire was appropriate for the study.

Reliability

Reliability means consistency of results. This is equivalent to saying that a highly reliable instrument can be used repeatedly in an unchanging situation and produce almost constant results (Anastasi, 1965).

According to Ghiselli, Campbell and Zedeck (1981), there are four common ways of estimating the reliability of measurement. These are:

1. From the coefficient of correlation between scores on repetitions of the same test.
2. From the coefficient of correlation between scores on parallel forms of a test.
3. From the coefficient of correlation between scores on comparable parts of a test.
4. From the intercorrelation among the elements of a test (p. 263).

Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck (1981, p. 263) also made the observation that "choosing the appropriate method of estimating reliability depends on the theory of reliability, we adopt, the nature of the trait we are measuring, and the way in which we are going to use as measure to make decisions." Considering the purpose of the study, a version of the estimation of reliability from the intercorrelations among the elements of test was considered appropriate. In this regard, Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck (1981) suggested that a generalized expression appropriate for this method of estimating reliability is Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha correlation.

Following the suggestions of Ghiselli, Campbell, and Zedeck (1981) the responses from the questionnaire relating to the task statements were furnished to the University Computer Center, Oklahoma State University for a statistical analysis utilizing

Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha. The product of this analysis was a = .62. Based on this correlation coefficient, it can be concluded that the responses provided by the respondents reflect a moderate degree of reliability in the questionnaire's ability to identify priority training needs.

Selection of Survey Population

The primary focus of the study was upon the training needs at major universities in the United States which were eligible to receive training assistance from the federal government. It was therefore decided to select only state supported institutions that fell into one of the four categories of major universities as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's A Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning (Research Universities I and II, and Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II). The selection of major universities was made to ensure that the campus security departments in the survey provided a range of field operation functions broad enough to include those performed by departments of all sizes.

Another basis for selection of the survey population was that the universities offered campus housing to their students. When students live in dormitories they and their possessions are physically present on campus more than at commuter universities. Because of this, not only is the time of exposure to potential crime much greater for the students, but so is the amount of

property that might be stolen (Smith, 1989).

This selection procedure netted a population of 115 institutions selected from de Grayter's (1987) Directory of American Colleges and Universities. From this total, two institutions were eliminated because they were involved in the validation of the survey questionnaire. Six additional institutions were removed from the population since they participated in the pilot testing of the questionnaire. The resulting survey's population consists of a total of 107 public major universities offering residential housing.

Data Collection Procedures

During the latter part of December, 1991, survey packets (Appendix A) were mailed to 107 campus security departments and each contained the following:

1. letter of introduction,
2. statement of general information and instructions,
3. inventory/response booklet, and
4. a postage-paid return envelope.

Around the early part of January, 1992, campus security departments who had not yet responded to the survey questionnaire were sent a follow-up letter (Appendix B) requesting that they complete the questionnaire and return it in a timely manner.

Of the 107 departments who were furnished with the survey packets (76 or 71.3%), provided usable responses. Of these (19

or 25%), provided comments that were relevant to the study.

Approximately two weeks after the follow-up letters were mailed out, all available raw data provided by the respondents, with the exception of the responses to the four questions concerning the campus security department itself, were furnished to the University Computer Center, Oklahoma State University for statistical analysis. The product of the analysis procedure was a list of 53 field related tasks ranked, in decending order, according to their priority scores. Priority scores lists were also produced representing priority training needs by geographic regions. In addition, the analysis procedure allowed for a correlation of priority training needs for all pairs of regions. The responses to the four questions concerning the department itself were compiled by the researcher and made possible the analysis of training needs by: (1) responses by mission of department, (2) responses by number of personnel employed, (3) responses by percentage of personnel engaged in field operation functions, and (4) responses by number of students over which department has jurisdiction. This type of information would ensure more accurate future resource allocation by showing the differences that exist among the responding departments in terms of mission, size, percentage engaged in field functions, and size of student population over which they have jurisdiction.

Data Analysis

The data provided by the respondents, with the exception of the

information relating to the department itself, were analyzed using standard z scores and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Ahmann and Glock (1971) said:

> The intent of the standard z score is to transform the raw-score distribution to a derived-score distribution having a desired arithmetic mean and standard deviation. If the arithmatic mean and standard deviation are known, and if the derived-score distribution is normal, identification of the relative performance of the individual score is a simple matter (p. 259).

In this study, standard z scores were used to identify the relative value of individual responses to the time, harm, and gap dimensions. To accomplish this, raw scores across respondents for the time dimension for Task 1 were summed and their mean value obtained. Mean raw scores for the harm and gap dimensions for Task 1 were also obtained. The mean raw scores for the three dimensions for each of the remaining 52 tasks were obtained in the same manner.

Commenting further on the use of standard z scores, Ahmann and Glock (1971) made the observation that an important advantage is the ease of determining composite scores if desired. For this study, in order to create a composite score for each task across the time, harm, and gap dimensions, mean raw task scores within the three dimensions were converted to z scores. The z scores for each task were then weighted and combined as follows:

$$P = T + 2H + 3G \div 6$$

Where P = priority z score

T = time z score

H = harm z score

G = gap z score

The above formula is a modified version of the formula used in a study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as previously cited in this chapter, and represents the definition of a priority training need. As the researcher concluded in this study, a ranking of training needs based solely on the size of the gap between current and desired performance disregards the importance of the time spent performing the task and the amount of harm which would result from poor performance of this task. The researchers also concluded that the three dimensions, because of their nature, varied in importance to the job and, therefore should be weighted to reflect these variances. To this end, the weights used in the priority formula indicate each dimension's importance to the job and are based on the following concepts:

1. The dimensions time, harm, and gap are of equal weight when prioritizing training needs.

2. Of the three dimensions, harm is more critical than time.

In order to make the priority z scores more meaningful, each z score obtained was converted to more common values by dividing by six.

Runyon and Haber (1967) make this generalization concerning the meaning of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient: "Pearson r represents the extent to which the same individual or events occupy the same relative position on two variables"

(p. 82). For the purpose of this study, the Pearson r was utilized to determine if priority training needs of departments were different because of geographic region.

Summary

Research design is the overall scheme or program. It includes the methods to be used to gather and analyze the data (Kerlinger, 1973).

The research method selected for this study can best be described as an Inventory-Based, Alpha-type needs assessment approach for conducting a training needs assessment. This approach allows the use of a questionnaire to identify job tasks that cannot be observed, and makes possible the collection of quantifiable training needs data from a large number of respondents. The approach measures the size of the gap between current and desired job performance and then places these gaps in order to determine priority training needs. The approach also allows the use of Likert-type responses which makes possible the statistical analysis of the large volume of data generated by the study.

The questionnaire utilized in this study was a researcher-made survey instrument. The choice of this instrument over others was due to its ability to elicit relevant, quantifiable data from a large number of respondents in a short period of time and at minimal costs.

The design of the questionnaire allows the use of the Alpha-Type needs assessment to determine the size of the gap between current

and desired job performance. In addition, the design makes possible the collection of data on the amount of time spent performing a job task and the amount of harm which would result from poor performance of a task.

The development of the job tasks utilized in the study was based on an adaption of Gael's (1983) Job Inventory approach to job task analysis. Using this approach, a list of 127 tasks performed by law enforcement officers was obtained from a 1983 study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation entitled, State and Local Law Enforcement Training Needs in the United States. From this list, 53 tasks representing those performed by campus security officers were selected by a panel of campus security administrators.

In order to develop a priority ranking of the 53 tasks, three questions were included in the questionnaire and solicited three types of information concerning each task:

1. The size of the gap between the level of ability the officer should have for the task and the level of ability they actually have.
2. The amount of harm which would result from poor performance of the task.
3. The amount of time officers spent performing the task.

In addition to the above questions, the questionnaire included questions that solicited information regarding the campus security department itself such as, size of student population served, percentage of personnel engaged in field related tasks, mission of department, and size of department. Also included was a question

asking respondents to identify tasks not included in the questionnaire and a section for respondents to provide comments on training related issues or the questionnaire itself.

The content validity of the questionnaire was determined through a panel of campus security administrators and by pilot testing with a sample of the population. The reliability of the questionnaire was determined by statistical analysis utilizing Cronback's (1951) coefficient alpha.

The study's population was made up of state supported educational institutions that fell into one of the four categories of major universities as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's A Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning. This selection procedure netted a population of 115 major universities. From this total, eight universities were removed from the study's population since they had participated in the development of the questionnaire used in the study. As a result, the study's population consisted of a total of 107 major universities.

During the latter part of December, 1991, the questionnaire was mailed to campus security administrators at the 107 universities involved in the study. Subsequent to this, around the early part of January, 1992, follow-up letters were sent to administrators who had not responded to the questionnaire. Of the 107 departments making up the study's population, 76 provided useable responses.

The data relating to the questions about the security department itself, additional tasks not included in the questionnaire, and

respondents' comments were compiled and analyzed. The data involving the task statements were analyzed using standard z-scores to determine the priority training needs. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to correlate the priority training needs between all of the nine regions involved in the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains data collected through the demographic information items on the questionnaire and from the responses to the question soliciting information about the tasks performed by campus security officers. Also included in this chapter are additional tasks provided by a number of respondents as well as information from the comments provided by several of the responding departments. The data were used to describe the characteristics of the respondents as well as provide information about issues relating to training and about the questionnaire itself. Responses to the question at the end of each task category were utilized to identify additional training needs not included in the questionnaire. A statistical analysis was also made to identify any difference in training needs that may exist because of geographic location. Finally, the data gathered were to be used to identify the priority training needs for all the campus security departments participating in the study.

Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Campus security departments from 46 states participated in the study. Nearly all the responding departments reported that their mission involved enforcing the law and providing protection for persons and property on campus. Table I shows the distribution of responses by mission of the department.

Over half (45 or 59.2%) of the responding departments indicated that they employed 50 or more persons. Table II contains a complete breakdown of responses by the number of persons employed.

Almost half (36 or 47.4%) of the responding departments indicated that 80 percent to 100 percent of their personnel were engaged in field operation functions. Table III illustrates the percentage of personnel involved in field operation activities.

As previously mentioned in Chapter III, 76 campus security departments responded to the survey out of a total of 107. Of these, almost half (36 or 47.4%) of the respondents indicated that they had jurisdiction over 25,000 to 49,999 students. Table IV gives a breakdown of responses by size of the student population over which the departments exercise jurisdiction.

Priority Training Needs for All Departments

Lending support to the basic premise of the study, a ranking of priority training needs indicated that certain tasks ranked high in priority by campus police agencies were also ranked high in

TABLE I

RESPONSES BY MISSION OF DEPARTMENTS

Mission	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
Enforce the Law	2	2.63
Protect Persons and Property	3	3.95
Both of the Above	71	93.42
Total	76	100.00

TABLE II

RESPONSES BY NUMBER OF PERSONNEL EMPLOYED

Number of Personnel	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
50 or more	45	59.2
40 to 49	8	10.5
30 to 39	15	19.7
20 to 29	3	4.0
10 to 19	5	6.6
5 to 9	---	---
1 to 4	---	---
Total	76	100.00

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN FIELD OPERATION FUNCTIONS

Percent	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
80 to 100	36	47.4
60 to 79	30	39.5
30 to 59	9	11.8
20 to 29	---	---
0 to 19	1	1.3
Total	76	100.0

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED BY RESPONDING DEPARTMENTS

Size of Student Population	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
50,000 or more	6	7.9
25,000 to 49,999	36	47.4
10,000 to 24,999	32	42.1
5,000 to 9,999	2	2.6
2,500 to 4,999	---	---
1,000 to 2,499	---	---
500 to 999	---	---
1 to 499	---	---
Total	76	100.0

priority by respondents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's nationwide training needs assessment of law enforcement agencies as previously mentioned in Chapter III of this study. This indicates that certain training needs of campus security departments were identical to the training needs of law enforcement agencies and, in some instances, equal in priority. This finding further indicates that training resources designed to meet the training needs of law enforcement agencies might, in some instances, be suitable for meeting training needs of campus security departments. Table V lists the training priorities for all responding campus security departments in rank order.

Correlation of Training Priorities by Geographic Region

The data generated by the study were gathered in a manner that allowed the training needs of campus security departments located in one region to be compared to the training needs of departments in another region. Overall, with the exception of two regions, the training needs of campus security departments in different locations were found to be similar. Of the 36 comparisons made involving all nine regions of the country, 34 comparisons produced correlation value ranging from a high of r=.75 to a low of r=.15, with the greatest number of correlation values falling between r=.75 and r=.51. A correlation value of r=.07 was obtained from the comparison made between the New England and South Atlantic region and a comparison between the Pacific and Middle Atlantic

TABLE V

PRIORITY TRAINING NEEDS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS
(N = 76)

Task	Task Ranking
Handle Personal Stress	1
Promote Positive Image	2
Maintain Appropriate Level of Physical Fitness	3
Identify and Develop Probable Cause for Obtaining Warrants	4
Provide Assistance in Potential Suicide Situations (Counsel, Comfort, Rescue, etc.)	5
Make Arrests With/Without Warrants	6
Conduct Interviews/Interrogations	7
Provide Crowd Control	8
Control Individuals Placed Under Arrest	9
Provide Executive/Dignitary Security/Protection	10
Search Persons, Dwellings, and Vehicles for Illegal Drugs	11
Collect, Maintain, and Preserve Evidence	12
Write Affidavits for Search Warrants	13
Search Persons, Dwellings, and Vehicles for Other than Illegal Drugs	14
Maintain Confidentiality and Security of Cases/Information	15
Conduct Frisk/Pat-Down Searches	16
Write Crime/Incident Reports	17
Identify and Resolve Legal Issues in Obtaining Search Warrants	18
Conduct Detail Search of Suspects/Prisoners	19

TABLE V (Continued)

Task	Task Ranking
Develop and Maintain Control of Informants	20
Prioritize Radio Calls	21
Conduct Crime Prevention Programs	22
Identify Crimes Being Committed	23
Search, Photograph, and Diagram Crime Scenes	24
Fire Weapons for Practice/Qualification	25
Develop Sources of Information	26
Control Traffic at Scene of Accident, Busy Intersections, Special Events, etc.	27
Perform Campus Patrol	28
Detect, Gather, Record, and Maintain Intelligence Information	29
Testify in Criminal, Civil, and Administrative Proceedings	30
Use Two-Way Radio in Campus Communications	31
Handle Student Disturbances	32
Check Security of Buildings	33
Operate Law Enforcement Networks	34
Conduct Stationary/Mobile Surveillance of Drug Suspects	35
Process Complaints/Inquiries	36
Provide Assistance to Students and Faculty	37
Conduct Suspect Identification	38
Conduct On-Scene Suspect Identification	39

TABLE V (Continued)

Task	Task Ranking
Disseminate Information/Intelligence to Appropriate Authorities	40
Determine Case Priorities	41
Identify High Crime Areas	42
Take Field Notes	43
Provide Student Assistance in Drug Abuse Education	44
Investigate Student/Faculty Complaints	45
Fill Out Field Contacts, Logs, Cards, Etc.	46
Check for Driver's License and Other Required Documents	47
Interview Drivers/Witnesses About Motor Vehicle Accidents	48
Issue Traffic Citations/Warnings	49
Take Lost/Stolen Property Reports	50
Provide Accident Scene Maintenance/Security	51
Inspect for Vehicle Identification Numbers	52
Enforce Parking Rules and Regulations	53

Region produced a correlation value of r=.09. For the designers of any campus security training program, this high degree of similarity found between the majority of comparisons made suggests that the training needs in one region can be used to predict the training needs in most other regions of the country with a fairly high degree of accuracy. Table VI illustrates the nine geographic regions and the states within each region and Table VII lists the correlations for all pairs of regions.

Summary of Comments Provided by Respondents

In addition to the data provided by department responses to the Demographic and Task Statement sections of the Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment Inventory/Response Booklet, a second set of data concerning department perceptions of training related issues as well as the survey instrument itself was collected from the responses to the Comment Section in the booklet. This section was to be completed on an optional basis by the responding departments.

Of the 76 departments that took part in the study, one-fourth (19 or 25%) provided comments of relevance to the study. Inasmuch as the furnishing of comments was optional, a random sample was not taken. This fact, coupled with the low number of respondents providing comments, suggests that the comments provided should not be viewed as being a representative sample of the comments of the entire study's population.

TABLE VI

REGIONS AND STATES

West North Central	East North Central	Middle Atlantic
Iowa	Illinois	New Jersey
Kansas	Indiana	New York
Minnesota	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Nebraska	Ohio	
North Dakota	Wisconsin	
South Dakota		
Mountain	**West South Central**	**Pacific**
Arizona	Arkansas	Alaska
Colorado	Louisiana	California
Idaho	Oklahoma	Hawaii
Montana	Texas	Oregon
Nevada		Washington
New Mexico		
Utah		
Wyoming		
East South Central	**South Atlantic**	**New England**
Alabama	Delaware	Connecticut
Kentucky	District of Columbia	Maine
Mississippi	Florida	Massachusetts
Tennessee	Georgia	New Hampshire
	Maryland	Rhode Island
	North Carolina	Vermont
	South Carolina	
	Virginia	
	West Virginia	

TABLE VII

CORRELATION OF TRAINING PRIORITIES BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION
(P = .05)

Region	WNC	ENC	MA	MT	WSC	PA	ESC	SA
ENC	.71							
MA	.31	.41						
MT	.53	.59	.55					
WSC	.57	.57	.51	.72				
PA	.32	.30	.09	.24	.35			
ESC	.62	.63	.47	.58	.64	.36		
SA	.61	.75	.46	.59	.60	.48	.59	
NE	.30	.23	.18	.44	.19	.15	.16	.07

WNC - West North Central
ENC - East North Central
MA - Middle Atlantic
MT - Mountain
WSC - West South Central
PA - Pacific
ESC - East South Central
SA - South Atlantic
NE - New England

The majority of the comments referred to the law enforcement role of departments. In this regard, the respondents indicated that while departments carry out security responsibilities, most department resources are devoted to law enforcement activities. Generally, departments have officers who provide protection for persons and property on campus and officers who perform duties almost identical to duties performed by officers employed by municipal police departments. For this reason, several of the respondents indicated that they preferred to be recognized as police agencies rather than security departments.

Other comments indicated that the format of the survey questionnaire appeared to be primarily designed to solicit information concerning the security function of campus security departments. It was suggested that the survey questionnaire be redesigned to allow an assessment of the training needs in both areas of responsibilities, security and law enforcement, with greater emphasis being given to the law enforcement area where training is generally most needed.

Additional Training Needs Indicated by Respondents

In order to allow input from the respondents concerning any training needs not covered in the study, a question at the end of each task category asked respondents to list any training needs they felt should have been included in that category. Of the 76 departments that responded to the questionnaire, nine

departments provided a total of 22 additional training needs. Following the elimination of 11 training needs which were duplicates, a list of 11 additional training needs involving four of the five categories was produced. Table VIII illustrates these 11 additional training needs by category.

Although the additional training needs listed in Table VIII were provided by a small percentage of the respondents, the nature of the training needs lent support to the data produced by this study, indicating that a large number of the activities performed by today's campus security departments are identical to those performed by municipal law enforcement agencies.

TABLE VIII

ADDITIONAL TRAINING NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS

Patrol Category
Respond to Chemical and Hazardous Material Spills
Respond to Medical Emergencies
Provide Assistance in Rape Situations (Counsel, Comfort)
React to Pursuit Driving Situations
Handle Interpersonal Relationships
Investigation Category
Develop and Follow-up On Case Leads
Conduct Administrative Investigations
Special Functions Category
Conduct S.W.A.T. Training
Handle Bomb Threats
Conduct Hostage Negotiations
Common Category
Identify and Understand Legal Liabilities

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to identify the priority training needs of campus security departments at public major universities in the United States which offered campus housing.

The main research effort was addressed to the problem of the expanding law enforcement duties of campus security departments caused by an increase in the frequency and severity of crimes on American college campuses. For a number of campus security departments, the types of training necessary to carry out these duties in a safe and effective manner is unavailable due to limited resources. In view of law enforcement training currently available from the federal government, the study sought to determine whether or not this training would be appropriate for meeting the training needs of campus security departments.

To achieve the purpose of the study, a list of 53 common tasks representing field related activities of campus security departments and broken down into five job categories was developed. Following this, three questions designed to solicit three types of information for each task were developed and are as follows:

a. What amount of time do officers in your department spend performing this task?

b. What amount of harm would result from inadequate performance of this task by officers in your department?

c. What size is the gap between the level of skill your officers need to perform this task and the level of skill they currently have?

In order to determine priority training needs, respondents were asked to respond to each of the three questions asked for each task using a Likert-type scale consisting of 1-5 points and defined as follows:

1. Very small or zero
2. Small
3. Moderate
4. Large
5. Very large

Besides the questions relating to each task, questions soliciting demographic information regarding the campus security department itself were formulated such as, (1) mission of agency, (2) number of employees, (3) percentage of personnel engaged in field related activities, and (4) size of student population served.

The respondents in the study consisted of the chiefs or their designees at institutions that made up the population of public major universities in the United States that offered campus housing. A survey of the population of 107 universities

resulted in 76 campus security departments returning completed questionnaires.

The data generated from the demographic information items on the questionnaire were compiled by the researcher and revealed the following information: nearly all of the agencies indicated that their mission involved enforcing the law and providing protection for persons and property on campus (93%); over half of the agencies reported that they employed 50 or more individuals (59%); almost half of the responding agencies said that 80% or more of their personnel were assigned to field related activities (47%); and over half of the agencies reported that they exercised jurisdiction over 25,000 to 49,999 students (47%).

The responses to the questions concerning the 53 task statements were analyzed using standard z-scores and resulted in a priority ranking of training needs for all departments. The three tasks ranked the highest in priority were identical to the three tasks ranked the highest in a study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation involving a nationwide training needs assessment of law enforcement agencies.

In addition to standard z-scores, the responses to the task statements were further analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient which allowed a comparison to be made of the priority training needs for all pairs of geographic regions. In this regard, the priority training needs for all of the nine regions were found to be

similar. Of the 36 comparisons made, the majority of the correlation values fall between r = .75 and r = .46.

Respondents to the survey reported a total of 22 additional field related tasks that were not included on the survey questionnaire. Following the elimination of duplicates, the following list of 11 tasks was produced.

Respond to Chemical and Hazardous Material Spills (Patrol Category)

Identify and Understand Legal Liabilities (Common Category)

Respond to Medical Emergencies (Patrol Category)

Conduct Hostage Negotiations (Special Functions Category)

Develop and Follow-up Case Leads (Investigation Category)

Provide Assistance in Rape Situations (Patrol Category)

Handle Bomb Threats (Special Functions Category)

Conduct Administrative Investigations (Investigation Category)

Handle Pursuit Driving Situations (Patrol Category)

Conduct S.W.A.T. Operations (Special Functions Category)

Handle Interpersonal Relationships (Patrol Category)

The majority of the comments provided by the respondents referred to the fact that departments normally perform both security and law enforcement duties. They also indicated that in most cases departments devote a greater amount of resources to law enforcement activities than they do security activities. For this reason, they indicated that they would prefer to be called police agencies rather than security departments.

Several of the comments made reference to the fact that the two areas of responsibility for most departments, security and law enforcement, are mutually exclusive of each other and, therefore, require different training. Because of this, they suggested that any subsequent training needs assessments are designed in such a manner that will allow the training needs for these two areas to be accurately identified.

Conclusions

Many of the training needs of campus security departments are similar in kind and priority to the training needs of recognized local and state law enforcement agencies in the United States. Three of the tasks ranked highest in priority were identical in the three tasks ranked highest in the 1983 study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation involving an assessment of the training needs of law enforcement agencies on a nationwide scale.

Certain training programs offered by the federal government to law enforcement agencies may be suitable for campus security departments.

The priority training needs of campus security departments in different geographic regions are similar. Of the 36 comparisons made involving all of the nine regions, the majority of the correlation values fell between $r = .75$ and $r = .46$.

The training needs of one region can be used to predict the training needs of another region with a fairly high degree of accuracy.

Most campus security departments carry out both law enforcement and security responsibilities. Seventy-one out of 76 departments reported that their mission involved enforcing the law and providing protection for persons and property on campus.

More than half of the individuals employed by campus security departments are engaged in various field related activities. Out of the 76 departments that took part in the study, 66 reported that over 60 percent of their personnel were assigned to field related duties or activities.

Recommendations for Practice

Several recommendations appear to be appropriate as a result of the study. The following recommendations are aimed at facilitating the development of resources that can adequately meet the training needs of campus security departments.

1. Administrators of federal training programs designed for law enforcement agencies should be furnished with the results of this study. This study indicated that many of the training needs of campus security departments are similar to the training needs of recognized law enforcement agencies. Because of this, the possibility exists that certain law enforcement training programs currently offered by the federal government may be appropriate for campus security departments.

2. The results of this study should be made available to participating campus security departments. The training needs information produced by this study can be readily utilized by appropriate personnel for curriculum planning and program design.

3. Administrators of federal training programs designed for local and state law enforcement agencies should consider including campus security departments in future training needs assessments. This study revealed that the field of campus security consists of significant numbers, both persons employed and students served, to warrant support from the federal government. In addition, the results of the study indicate that many of the tasks performed by campus security officers are very similar to the tasks performed by recognized law enforcement officers.

4. Administrators of campus security departments should consider conducting an assessment of their department's training needs on a regular basis. This would allow the identification of training needs to be done in such a manner as to make it possible to effectively monitor any changes which may occur in the tasks required to carry out the department's areas of responsibility.

5. The study found that the majority of campus security departments reported that their responsibilities involved enforcing the law as well as providing protection for persons and property on campus. Therefore, any subsequent training needs assessment should be designed in a manner that will allow an accurate assessment

to be made of the training needs in both areas of responsibility.

6. Data produced by the study indicated that the majority of campus security departments reported that over 60 percent of their personnel were assigned to field related duties. For this reason, any further training needs assessment should give high priority to those training needs that are associated with field operation functions of campus security departments.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A study should be done to evaluate the influence of stress on the campus security officer's job performance. This study indicated that the task "Handle Personal Stress" was consistently rated as the number one skill requiring training need by all of the departments participating in the study. An appropriate format for such a study should include questions designed to solicit information regarding the effects of work related stress on the ability of an officer to perform his/her assigned duties in a safe and effective manner.

2. A number of respondents to this study identified additional tasks performed by campus security personnel that were not included in the Task Statements section of the survey questionnaire. Therefore, it is recommended that these additional tasks be included, where appropriate, in subsequent training needs assessments.

Implications

The data in this study were gathered in a manner which made possible the analysis of campus security training needs from the perspective of different geographic regions. In the study, the training needs of campus security departments in different regions were found to be similar with the exception of comparisons between the New England and South Atlantic regions and between the Pacific and Middle Atlantic regions. In reference to the former comparison, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient yielded a correlation value of $r = .07$. In regard to the latter comparison, a correlation value of $r = .09$ was obtained.

The lower correlation values for the New England and South Atlantic regions, and for the Pacific and Middle Atlantic regions, may possibly be attributed to cultural differences between regions, a lower number of returned questionnaires, or the small number of major universities within the regions. Because of this, the lower correlation values do not necessarily mean that the training needs in these two regions are very different from the training needs in the other seven regions.

REFERENCES

Ahmann, J. S. and Glock, M. D. (1981). Evaluating Student Progress: Principles of Tests and Measurements. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Ahmann, J. S. and Glock, M. D. (1971). Measuring and Evaluating Educational Achievement. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Ahmann, J. S. and Glock, M. D. (1971). Evaluating Pupil Growth: Principles of Tests and Measurements, 4th Edition, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Anastasi, A. (1965). Individual Differences. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., and Razavieh, A. (1972). Introduction to Research in Education. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Bess, W. R., and Horton, R. R. (1988). "The Role of Campus Law Enforcement." Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 19(4), 38-39.

Best, J. W. (1959). Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blood, M. R. (1975). Job Analysis of Entry Level Clerical Jobs in the South Central Bell Company. New York, NY: American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Campus Life: In Search of Community. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika, 16, pp. 297-334.

de Grayter, W. (1987). Directory of American Universities and Colleges. New York, NY: American Council on Education.

Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H. and Gustafson, D. H. (1975). Group Techniques for Program Planning. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The total Design Method. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dunham, R. B., and Smith, F. J. (1979). Organizational Surveys: An Internal Assessment of Organizational Health. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1983). State and Local Law Enforcement Training Needs in the United States. Vol. II. Technical Report. Quantico, VA: Institutional Research and Development Unit.

Flanagan, J. D. (1954). "The Critical Incident Technique." Psychological Bulletin, 51, pp. 327-358.

Gael, S. (1983). Job Analysis: A Guide to Assessing Work Activities. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gelber, S. (1972). The Role of Campus Security in the College Setting. United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P. and Zedeck, S. (1981). Measurement Theory for the Behavioral Sciences. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., and Cook, S. W. (1962). Research Methods in Social Relations. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kaufman, R. A. (1979). Identifying and Solving Problems: A System Approach. San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Kaufman, R. A. and English, F. W. (1979). Needs Assessment: Concept and Application. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Key, J. P. (1974). Research Design. Stillwater, OK: Agricultural Education Department, Oklahoma State University.

Laird, D. (1985). Approaches to Training and Development. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishers.

McGehee, W. and Thayer, P. W. (1961). Training in Business and Industry. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

McGrath, G. D., Jelinek, J. J. and Wochner, R. E. (1963). Educational Research Methods. New York:, NY The Ronald Press Company.

Miller, R. B. (1962). "Task Description and Analysis." in Gagne, R. E. Psychological Principles in System Development. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Powell, J. W. (1981). Campus Security and Law Enforcement. Boston, MA: Butterworth Publishers, Inc.

Runyon, R. P. and Haber, A. (1967). Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Scott, D. and Deadrick, D. (1982). "The Nominal Group Technique: Applications for Training Needs Assessment." Training and Development Journal (June), 26-32.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L. S. and Cook, S. W. (1976). Research Methods in Social Relations. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, M. C. (1989). Coping with Crime on Campus. New York, NY: American Council on Education and Macmillian Publishers.

Smith, M. C. (1989). "Cops or Watchmen? Policy Considerations in the Role of Campus Security." Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 19(1), 38-39.

Van Dalen, D. B. and Meyer, W. J. (1966). Understanding Educational Research. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Company.

Wehner, J. G. (1990, November). "Enhancing the Campus Community: Effective Approaches to Campus Security." National University Teleconference. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University.

Wexley, K. N. and Latham, G. P. (1981). "Identifying Training Needs." in Wexley, K. N. and Latham, G. P. Developing and Training Human Resources in Organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT MATERIAL

Dear Chief:

I am currently a student in a doctoral program at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. In connection with this program, I am presently doing research in the area of campus security. More specifically, my research involves an assessment of the training needs of campus security departments at selected colleges and universities in the United States.

As you are aware, in the last few years there has been an increase in the frequency and severity of criminal activity on college and university campuses. This change in the complexion of campus crime has necessitated changes in the field of campus security. Skills and abilities unheard of a few years ago are now becoming basic to safe and effective performance.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has traditionally provided training assistance to law enforcement agencies through its Comprehensive Law Enforcement Training (CLET) program. Generally, this training is not readily available to campus security departments due to the belief that their training needs are, for the most part, non-law enforcement in nature. However, in view of the changing complexion of campus crime, I am conducting a study to identify any training needs of campus security departments that can be met through training resources currently available from the CLET program. Since these resources are limited, they must be allocated in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Therefore, the focus of the study will be to identify training needs based on their importance to the job.

Enclosed, you will find your copy of the Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment Inventory/Response Booklet. This booklet contains questions concerning the campus security department itself and a list of field related tasks performed by campus security officers. It was developed with the help of campus security officials who were kind enough to provide their time and expertise in its preparation.

Your participation is a vital part of this study. Your input will help ensure an accurate assessment of today's campus security training needs which in turn may lead to the development of training resources designed to meet these needs.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Keel

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION

The survey consists of the enclosed Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment Inventory/Response Booklet. It is divided into the following sections:

A. Demographics
B. Task Statements
C. Comments

Your participation in this survey will take less than 20 minutes. Please return the completed Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment Inventory/Response Booklet in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within one week of its receipt.

The information gathered in this survey will be reported in the aggregate, thus will not be identifiable to any one department. Upon request, a summary report of the final results will be sent to you.

I encourage you to put any suggestions or comments you may have in the Comment Section of the booklet.

Thank you for your participation in this vital training needs survey.

Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs

Assessment Inventory/Response Booklet

A. DEMOGRAPHICS

INSTRUCTIONS

Record your responses to items 1-4 below by placing an "X" inside the bracket you select.

1. Select the mission of your department.

   [ ] Enforce the law.
   [ ] Protect persons and property
   [ ] Both of the above.

2. Indicate the number of personnel employed by your department

   [ ] 50 or more
   [ ] 40 - 49
   [ ] 30 - 39
   [ ] 20 - 29
   [ ] 10 - 19
   [ ] 5 - 9
   [ ] 1 - 4

3. Indicate the percentage of personnel in your department engaged in field operation functions

   [ ] 80% - 100%
   [ ] 60% - 79%
   [ ] 30% - 59%
   [ ] 20% - 29%
   [ ] 0% - 19%

4. Indicate the approximate size of the student population over which your department has jurisdiction

   [ ] 50,000 or more
   [ ] 25,000 - 49,999
   [ ] 10,000 - 24,999
   [ ] 5,000 - 9,999
   [ ] 2,500 - 4,999
   [ ] 1,000 - 2,499
   [ ] 500 - 999
   [ ] 1 - 499

B. TASK STATEMENTS

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages are 53 different field tasks, broken down into five categories, which campus security officers perform Please examine each task and then respond to the three questions asked about each task These questions are as follows·

A What amount of time do officers in your department spend performing this task?

B What amount of harm would result from inadequate performance of this task by officers in your department?

C What size is the gap between the level of skill your officers need to perform this task correctly and the level of skill they currently have?

For your response to each of the three questions, select only one of the following five responses

VS = Very Small or Zero
S = Small
M = Moderate
L = Large
VL = Very Large

Example 1

One of the task statements (number 14) reads, "Conduct Frisk/Pat Down Searches" If you feel that officers in your department spend a small amount of time performing this task, you would place an X in the enclosed space below S and opposite Time as shown on the next page

Task 14 Conduct Frisk/Pat Down Searches

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time		X			
Harm					
Gap					

Example 2

Another task statement (number 43) reads, "Handle Personal Stress". If you feel that a very large amount of harm would result from inadequate performance of this task by officers in your department, you would place an X in the enclosed space below VL and opposite Harm as shown below

Task 43. Handle Personal Stress

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					X
Gap					

In addition to the above questions concerning Time, Harm, and Gap, there is a question at the end of each category meant to capture a task or tasks not mentioned The question asks

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below

For the above question, use the space provided at the end of each category.

B. TASK STATEMENTS

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

VS = Very Small or Zero
S = Small
M = Moderate
L = Large
VL = Very Large

PATROL CATEGORY

Task 1. Handle Student Disturbances

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 2. Conduct On-Scene Suspect Identification

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 3. Take Field Notes

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 4. Conduct Detail Search Of Suspects/Prisoners

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 5 Issue Traffic Citations/Warnings

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 6 Develop Sources Of Information

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 7 Provide Crowd Control

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 8 Interview Drivers/Witnesses About Motor Vehicle Accidents

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 9 Perform Campus Patrol

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 10 Control Traffic At Scene Of Accident, Busy Intersection, Special Events, Etc

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 11 Conduct Crime Prevention Programs

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 12. Identify Crimes Being Violated

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 13 Check Security Of Buildings

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 14 Conduct Frisk/Pat Down Searches

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 15. Fill Out Field Contacts, Logs, Cards, Etc

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 16. Inspect For Vehicle Identification Numbers

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 17. Make Arrests With/Without Warrants

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 18. Control Individuals Placed Under Arrest

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 19 Provide Accident Scene Maintenance/Security

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 20 Provide Student Assistance In Drug Abuse Education And Prevention

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 21 Check For Drivers License And Other Required Documents

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 22. Enforce Parking Rules And Regulations

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 23. Take Lost/Stolen Property Reports

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

INVESTIGATION CATEGORY

Task 24 Conduct Interviews/Interrogations

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 25. Search Persons, Dwellings, And Vehicles For Illegal Drugs

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 26 Search Persons, Dwellings, And Vehicles For Other Than Illegal Drugs

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 27. Conduct Stationary/Mobile Surveillance Of Drug Suspects

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 28 Identify And Develop Probable Cause For Obtaining Warrants

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 29 Write Affidavits For Search Warrants

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 30 Collect, Maintain, And Preserve Evidence

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 31 Detect, Gather, Record, And Maintain Intelligence Information

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 32 Disseminate Information/Intelligence To Appropriate Authorities

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 33 Conduct Suspect Identification

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 34 Develop And Maintain Control Of Informants

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 35. Identify And Resolve Legal Issues In Obtaining Search Warrants

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 36 Search, Photograph, And Diagram Crime Scenes

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 37. Investigate Student/Faculty Complaints

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below.

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

COMMUNICATION CATEGORY

Task 38 Process Complaints/Inquiries

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 39 Prioritize Radio Calls

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 40 Operate Law Enforcement Networks (NCIC, etc)

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below.

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

SPECIAL FUNCTIONS CATEGORY

Task 41 Provide Executive/Dignitary Security/Protection

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 42. Provide Assistance In Potential Suicide Situations (Counsel, Comfort, Rescue, Etc.)

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

COMMON CATEGORY

Task 43. Handle Personal Stress

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 44. Use Two-Way Radio In Campus Communications

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 45. Determine Case Priorities

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 46 Promote Positive Image

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 47 Provide Assistance To Students And Faculty

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 48 Maintain Confidentiality And Security Of Cases/Information

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 49 Fire Weapons For Practice/Qualification

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 50. Write Crime/Incident Reports

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 51 Identify High Crime Areas

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Task 52 Maintain Appropriate Level Of Physical Fitness

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

VS	S	M	L	VL
Very Small or Zero	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large

Task 53 Testify In Criminal, Civil, And Administrative Proceedings

	VS	S	M	L	VL
Time					
Harm					
Gap					

Are there any other field related tasks that you feel should be included in this category? If so, please list below.

C. COMMENTS

Instructions

This section is for any suggestions or comments you may wish to make regarding this survey or concerning campus security training needs.

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Chief:

During the latter part of December 1991, a packet containing a Nationwide Campus Security Training Needs Assessment Inventory /Response Booklet was mailed to your department. If you have already completed the booklet and returned it to me, please accept my thanks for your participation in this survey. If you have not had the opportunity to do so, please complete it now and return it to me.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Keel

VITA

Ronald J. Keel

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TRAINING NEEDS OF CAMPUS SECURITY DEPARTMENTS AT PUBLIC MAJOR UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, April 20, 1940, the son of Lawrence B. and Agnes Keel.

Education: Graduated from Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in May, 1959; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma in May, 1964; received Master of Education degree at Central State University in May, 1985; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December, 1992.

Professional Experience: Teacher, Blackwell High School, Blackwell, Oklahoma, August, 1966 to May, 1969; Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, June, 1969 to present.

Name: Ronald J. Keel Date of Degree: December, 1992

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TRAINING NEEDS OF CAMPUS SECURITY DEPARTMENTS AT PUBLIC MAJOR UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Pages in Study: 95 Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Scope and Method of Study: The purpose of this study was to identify the priority training needs of campus security departments. The problem was the expanding law enforcement duties of campus security officers related to the increase in the frequency and severity of crime on university campuses. For many officers, training necessary to carry out these duties was often unavailable due to limited resources. Considering the training resources currently available from the federal government, this study sought to determine if these resources would be appropriate for meeting the training needs of campus security departments. The subjects of the study consisted of the chiefs of campus security departments of public major universities in the United States which offered campus housing. The population of universities totaled 107, of which 76 participated in the study. A questionnaire was developed which contained four demographic questions and three questions designed to rank 53 tasks performed by campus security. Statistical techniques employed were the Standard Z-score and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Findings and Conclusions: Findings were that certain tasks performed by campus security officers were identical in priority and kind to those performed by traditional law enforcement officers. Also, priority training needs of campus security departments in most regions of the United States were very similar. Conclusions were that certain law enforcement training offered by the federal government might be appropriate as a source of training for campus security departments. Also, an assessment of the training needs of a campus security department in one region could be used to predict the training needs of campus security departments in most other regions with a fairly high degree of accuracy.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL William R. Venable

586 /914 02
SWO#-177536 PC#-8
CUS#-23899 04/07