

ABSTRACT

For decades crime has been an issue faced by different communities on a daily basis. With ever evolving dynamics within communities, crime has found a way to change and become a much more serious problem within societies, institutions and the country at large. This research, which was conducted at one of the University of KwaZulu Natal campuses (Howard College), showed that students faced victimisation throughout their academic careers. However, students enrol at universities with the shared dream of ensuring a secure and better future for themselves. Many students sacrifice much and go to great lengths to find their niche in the academic world. One facility that universities make available to students is student residences. However, these places of student accommodation are reportedly becoming crime zones where many students feel unsafe. The main aim of the study was therefore to explore university students' perceptions of the nature and incidences of crime in on-campus residences. It is an undeniable fact that residences no longer offer safe accommodation for students. Daily routines and changing environments create an atmosphere that is conducive to criminal activity. The question that was therefore addressed was: What are the contributing factors and how can this violence be effectively dealt with? This research revealed that various dynamics impacted crime at university on-campus residences and that this was a common problem across different institutions. For instance, perpetrators of crime in campus residences were both fellow students and community members that infiltrated residences from the neighbouring community. It was concluded that theft, burglary and sexual assault were the most problematic crimes. Although the majority of crimes were not life-threatening in nature, they did affect student's social and academic lives.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

Generally, university institutions are perceived as safe environments where education is the common language for everyone. However, it is perceived knowledge that students have become victims of crime on campuses and particularly in residences. This chapter presents a review of the literature in order to introduce the background to the study and to discuss the motivation behind the conception of the topic. It also provides an outline of the study report.

Crime on campus is a problem that affects students and staff. The frequency and types of crime on campuses have implications for students' educational and social development because they are less likely to attend, spend time on, or participate in social activities on high crime campuses (Barton et al., 2010). Some of the studies of crime on campus were relatively broad as they required close investigation of variables such as home environment, negative peer influences, inadequate parenting styles, poor coping skills, low self-esteem, poor interpersonal skills, inappropriate solutions to stressful situations, and drug and alcohol abuse.

Cross (1976) stated that some students may enter college with negative academic experiences in his or her background. Negative academic experiences may be not attending classes, scoring low marks for assessments or not having interest in doing academic work leading to failing to write exams. This could be a result of a shaky high school life that left the student traumatised or even motivated to engage in criminal activity. Such factors may act as a catalyst to the rates of crime that occur on campus. Gover et al. (2008) identify two major categories of crime that occur on the campuses of tertiary institutions. The first type referred to as 'low-probability, multiple-death' incidents where the consequences are wide-spread and long-lasting. The second category includes crimes such as robbery, sexual assault, physical assault, theft, burglary and fraud and has a much higher rate of occurrence in contrast to the first. Both these types of crime have entered into university institutions leaving many students victims of crime. As much as these two categories of crime might not have the same kind of impact, they both may leave a footprint of trauma, fear and distraction among students at institutions of higher education.

1.2 Background to the Study

As violence within our country increases and filters into the experiences of adolescents and the youth with a concomitant rise in the number of students registering at universities, there will inevitably be an increase in the rates of crime in our tertiary institutions. This phenomenon is evident in the nature and incidences of crime as depicted in previous studies such as the one by Jennings et al. (2007).

Crime analysis began with scholarly investigations into crime in the mid-1700s. The first scholars started what was called the 'classical school of thought' with Cesare Beccaria (1738-1794) as its principal author. Other well-known scholars of this phenomenon were Cesare Bonesana and Jeremy Bentham. Later, the so-called 'school of criminology' was actually a by-product of a judicial reform movement in Europe during the 18th century (Hartjen, 1974). These theorists suggested that crime was a result of free choice and free will that all individuals have and that any act of crime must therefore be viewed as a deliberate choice.

While students and staff at tertiary institutions engage in their routine activities on campus in an attempt to maintain the idealistic view of a tertiary institution, they are not immune to becoming victims of crime on campus. According to Tseng et al. (2004), criminal activities on campus not only undermine the quality of the learning environment, but also reduce the positive activities of people associated with campus (cited in Jennings et al., 2007). However, access to on-campus crime records and statistics is tenuous, because prior to the late 1960s and early 1970s universities and colleges were permitted to privately handle criminal matters due to a legal understanding that college administrators were serving as guardians to students (Fisher, 1995). Due to this fact, before and during this period crime statistics and criminal reports of a campus were considered private educational records. Unlike in the United States of America (USA), South African tertiary institutions are not legally bound by legislation to report on all campus crime incidents. In South Africa, campus crime statistics and crime/incident reports are considered private records of the education institution. Hence, not all tertiary institutions make their crime incident reports publicly available.

However, as we entered the 21st century, perceptions regarding the incidences of campus crime changed drastically because campus crime statistics became more readily available to the community at large since the advent of the democratic dispensation in South Africa. The availability of crime statistics of a particular institution has become important because students, faculty and staff need to consider this information before deciding to enrol or work at a

university. High campus crime rates may therefore discourage prospective students from attending certain universities and may similarly dissuade parents from paying tuition fees to send their children to institutions that could be regarded as unsafe (Fisher & Nasar, 1992).

Campus crime is a serious issue of concern for current university students, parents of prospective students, campus law enforcement personnel, and the campus community as a whole (Jennings et al., 2007). South African tertiary institutions are often affected by the country's consistently high crime rates. In this context, the underreporting of campus crime has become a fatal problem to all stakeholders of campus security, which is why researchers endeavour to investigate this phenomenon. In particular, the factors of the availability and transparency of campus crime statistics motivated research on this issue. For example, studies such as those by McPheters (1978), Fox and Hellman (1985), and Jennings et al. (2007) have created a platform for researchers to view and evaluate the incline and/or decline of campus crime across different institutions in various regions at different time periods. To expand on one important study that shed light on campus crime, the Jennings et al. (2007) study examined on-campus experiences that involved victimisation, fear, the threat to safety, and other aspects. This study was conducted at a large, traditional land-grant university in the south. Almost 15% of the students in the Jennings et al. (2007) study lived in campus housing and the average age of the student undergraduate body was 20.41 years.

A lot of relevant research has broadened our understanding and awareness of campus crime and has also put into perspective the different crimes that take place on campus. The aim of the current research was to illuminate the perceptions of students that reside in on-campus residences about the issue of crime and the manner in which it impacts resident students. There is no better way to understand a phenomenon than to hear views on it from people directly affected by it.

The rape, theft, assault, vandalism and murder crimes of the nation are beginning to affect university institutions dramatically. As more students make the choice to register for tertiary education because financial assistance has become more available, students from various socio-economic contexts and from economically challenged societies and communities that hold culturally diverse values that may result in conflict will also increase in numbers on tertiary institution campuses. These are common factors that will contribute to ever increasing crime rates at tertiary institutions. Cognisance must be taken of the fact that many students entering the campus setting may hold beliefs, attitudes and behaviours that may "predispose, enable and

reinforce violence” (Pezza & Bellotti, 1995). In this context, Cohen (1977) commented as far back as in the 1970s that young people were being arrested in ever increasing numbers. Since then, it has become an observable fact that young people are the main perpetrators of crime on university campuses and in residences.

This study drew from the reports of other relevant studies that had studied crime on university campuses and the impact it had on the academic and social life of students. These studies were however conducted in the USA and not in the South African context. Other studies looked at causal factors of and preventative measures to address crime. This study in particular shifted its investigation from the campus in general to on-campus residences in particular.

1.3 Motivation for the Study

Research has suggested that crime, violence, delinquency and antisocial behaviours are not new and are on a rising curve. It has therefore become adamantly necessary for the extinction of these antisocial behaviours on university campuses in order to create an environment that is conducive to learning and achieving successful higher education outcomes. There is a growing body of research that aims to examine university campuses with regards to crime prevention strategies, services for victims of crime, and the prevalence of victimisation. However, the majority of these studies focused on campuses in predominantly rural and traditional settings rather than on urban campuses situated in rapidly expanding urban environments.

According to Lederman (1995), since 1992 all colleges in the USA are required by federal law to compile annual statistics about crime on their campuses. In response to the alarm caused by the lack of information provided to students and families about violent and non-violent incidents on campuses, the Clery family and their organisation advocated for the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy Campus Crime Statistics Act (also known as the Jeanne Clery Act). This Act was passed in 1990 with the aim of proactively dealing with crime and making students and prospective students aware of criminal activities that occurred on university campuses. However, this Act naturally only applies as federal law in the USA, which leaves African countries, and in particular South Africa, unaffected. In light of the proactive action taken in the US to address the availability of information regarding on-campus violence, the current research was motivated by the fact that criminal activities at tertiary institutions are underreported and hence overlooked. This can be related to South Africa and depicts the same issue of underreporting of crime which we have the term “grey area of crime”, meaning the crimes that are not reported to the police.

The challenging nature of underreporting is one motive why research on campus crime incidences and prevalence is a significant issue for campus administrators, students and general staff. As Fisher (1995:94) notes, "...this underreporting leads, in turn, to a distorted picture of crime on campus."

One study reported that approximately 50% of crime is reported by students to campus or local police (Sloan et al., 1994). Urban campuses face unique issues, including the concept of 'spill-over' where criminals from the environment surrounding an institution of higher education (IHE) are attracted to prey on university students and staff (Fox & Hellman, 1985). Some attribute this to the 'drinking culture' common to college campuses, while others blame drugs, stress, unaddressed mental illness, or a combination of these factors for this phenomenon (Sandbox Networks, 2016).

In light of the above, the current study aimed to document the incidences of victimisation amongst resident students attending an urban university. This was done in an effort to contribute meaningfully to the existing scholarly literature on campus crime that, in the past, only focused on traditional sub-urban university environments. The study was further prompted by the desire to add to the discourse on crime at urban universities with particular reference to on-campus residences, as an extensive review of the literature had revealed a paucity of studies that investigated criminal activity in on-campus residences as an independent unit of study. Therefore, the study focused on the frequency and the nature of the crimes committed in university on-campus residences by drawing a link with previous studies in order to determine areas that may require urgent attention or that may be addressed by future, more comprehensive studies.

One challenge that was encountered was that the South African government has not yet bound any institution to annual reports of on-campus criminal activities. All institutions that report data containing crime records do so voluntarily as this information is still treated as private record. In this context, the underwritten assumption of the study was that if crimes in university on-campus residences were compiled and publicly reported, there would be a higher reporting of criminal activities to campus security and the local police. This also implies that if students and prospective students were made aware of the crime rates in institutions and residences, they would be greatly deterred from engaging in behaviours that make them easy targets. It also means that the entire university as a community would work together to develop proactive measures to deter and prevent crime.

Residences are a crucial facility provided by universities because it is where most of their student population resides in their period of study. As was previously stated, prevailing acts of on-campus crime are either attributed to the 'drinking culture' common to college campuses or to drugs, stress, unaddressed mental illness or a combination of these factors (Sandbox Networks, 2016). Whatever the causal factors may be, it is of great significance that crime in university on-campus residences be studied in order to generate a holistic approach to dealing with the issue of crime that students, staff and the community are faced with.

1.4 Study Aim

This study aimed at exploring the perceptions that students held about the nature and impact of crime incidences in three university on-campus residences. Here the focus shifted from studying the campus as a whole to on-campus residences which became the subject of the study. On-campus crime dynamics were therefore studied from a rarely investigated angle.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

To address the aim of the study, the following objectives were identified:

- To determine the perceptions of crime that were perpetrated in university on-campus residences. In the absence of particular quantitative data, the qualitative 'nature of crime' can be determined as either 'serious' or 'mild'. Serious crimes are those that result and death or injury while less serious crimes are those that result in possible trauma and stress. This objective served to uncover the seriousness of the crimes that occurred in the university on-campus residence. The nature of the crimes was therefore identified by the types of crime that were committed. This is what reveals the causing factors of crime on university on-campus residence. Green cut and pasted under serious or mild.
- To determine the nature and frequency of the crimes that were committed in university on-campus residences. In the absence of particular quantitative data, the purpose of this objective was to rate the crimes qualitatively as 'serious' or 'mild'. Serious crimes would be those that resulted in death or injury while less serious crimes were those that would result in possible trauma and stress. This objective served to uncover the seriousness of the crimes that occurred in the university on-campus residences under study. This objective also served to determine whether the crimes could be easily dealt with or not. The types of crimes that were reported to be most problematic automatically revealed the quality of the threat posed by the perpetrators and the reasons behind the crimes.

- To investigate who the perpetrators of crime in campus residences were. This part of the study drew from reports of crime incidences by the participants.
- To evaluate the push factors or causes that put perpetrators in a position to deviate to crime. This would be learnt by studying the types of crimes that frequently occurred and the reasons for committing these crimes. From this analysis recommendations could be made for the effective implementation of security measures in on-campus residences.
- To discover the effects of campus crime on students residing in on-campus residences. Crime has never resulted in positive energy hence students who are affected by it most likely go through a series of negative experiences. The purpose of this objective was to illuminate the impact that crime had on the university students that resided in the on-campus residences and to determine what measures would need to be implemented to deal with these impacts.

1.6 Key Research Questions

- What is the nature of the crimes that occur in campus residences?
- What are the types of crimes that occur in campus residences?
- Who are the perceived perpetrators of these crimes in campus residences?
- What effects do these crimes have on the students residing in the campus residences?

1.7 Chapter Sequence and Content

Chapter 1: Introduction. The introduction to the topic is discussed and the relevance of it is outlined. A summary of the entire research project is provided by breaking it down into sections covering the aim, motivation and background of the study. The objectives are highlighted and the fundamental questions that underpinned the study are presented.

Chapter 2: Literature review. Key concepts are conceptualised and the phenomenon being studied is explained with reference to existing literature as the research foundation. Previous studies are evaluated and used as a link to explain the significance of this study. The different dynamics of the study are illuminated with reference to scholarly discourse on the topic.

Chapter 3: Theoretical framework. This section reviews two criminological theories that best describe the topic being studied. An elaboration of what these theories mean is presented and linked to the explanation of the topic. The topic is therefore located within a theoretical

framework rather than being based purely on a literature review. Different parts of each theory are used to explain the dynamics of the topic under study.

Chapter 4: Research Methodology. In this chapter the key questions are extended and the researcher explains which qualitative research methods were used. The research design, which entailed the tool of measurement; the data collection, analysis and interpretation procedures are also discussed. All these features of the research were collaboratively employed as the research methodology to effectively conduct the study.

Chapter 5: Analysis and reporting. This chapter presents an analysis and discussion of the results that emerged from the data. The qualitative data that were collected depicted the perceptions and opinions of the sample that was interviewed. Verbatim transcriptions of the respondents' comments are presented in the interest of authenticity. In this chapter the actual findings of the study are linked with the theoretical framework and the literature review, which contributed to the validity and trustworthiness of the data and the interpretations of the findings. Ethical considerations were adhered to throughout the data reporting process.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations. This chapter serves to conclude and give a short summary of the study. The findings and recommendations are included so as to provide a clear understanding of how the objectives were met in order to achieve the aim of the study. The chapter is concluded with an explanation of the progressive manner in which the study was conducted. Recommendations are offered on the basis of what the study revealed and what measures can be implemented to deal with the phenomenon under study. It is argued that, should the findings be considered and the recommendations be implemented, the study would not only be beneficial to the researcher, but also to the campus community that is adversely affected by crime.

1.8 Conclusion

Safety is often referred to as freedom from harm; however, it is also often taken for granted. This chapter has stated the topic with reference to previous foundations set by studies done in the past. The puzzle of what the study aimed to achieve and what the objectives were was completed. Moreover, a brief summary and breakdown of the following chapters have been provided to guide the reader through the dissertation. The following chapters offer more in-depth discussions of what has been briefly highlighted in this chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Crime is present not only in the majority of societies of one particular species but in all societies of all times. With South Africa being a developing country, crime is undeniably a very serious issue that affects societies everywhere and the country as a whole. Criminality seems to be an issue that no society is immune to. While statistics agencies engage in research to figure out statistical changes in crime which depict increasing crime rates, it has become an area of interest in the academic field, especially in criminology, to research what these crimes that impact society are, what the causes of these crimes are, and what can be done to curb crime. This research focused on crimes that occurred in three university on-campus residences and sought to address many relevant underlying factors with regards to campus crime.

2.2 Conceptualisation of Key Terms

Like any other phenomenon under study, a study of crime on university campuses will involve important terminology that needs to be defined and understood. For a clear understanding of the topic at hand, it is a requisite that the key terms be clearly defined and contextualised as they serve as a foundation for the unambiguous operationalisation of the topic being studied. When used together, these terms create a clear picture of the different dynamics that this topic aimed to address. The most important terms are as follows:

2.2.1 Crime

According to Tappan (1947:96), crime is an intentional act in violation of the criminal law (statutory and case law) committed without defence or excuse, and penalised by the state as a felony or misdemeanour. The most common and frequently applied definition of crime is that which links it to substantive criminal law. This implies that an act is only a crime when it violates the prevailing legal code of the jurisdiction in which it occurs. According to Michael and Adler (1933: 18) the most precise and least ambiguous definition of crime is behaviour which is prohibited by the criminal code. In this definition the core element is the 'code of jurisdiction' which means that an act may be considered to be a crime in one area but not in another. Crimes that are often referred to here are crimes of property or crimes that result in

injury. With regards to crime in the context of tertiary institutions, studies have shown that most of the acts of crime committed in these settings are environmental crimes.

Situ and Emmons (2000) define environmental crime as an unauthorised act or omission that violates the law and is therefore subject to criminal prosecution and criminal sanctions. However, this definition omits certain practices or behaviours that many may see as environmentally irresponsible, negligent or destructive. Yet these authors argue that until an act actually breaks a law, it cannot be considered a crime (Bricknell, 2010). This statement further discourages the assumption that what is a crime in one location may not necessarily be a crime in another; and what is most important here is therefore what the law says about that particular crime.

2.2.2 Crime of the environment.

A university on-campus residence is a linking term to crime of the environment which therefore becomes an important term in this study. Crimes of the environment could be break-ins or vandalism of buildings. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (1987), a residence implies living or staying regularly at or in a specified place for the performance of official duties, for work, or to comply with regulations; (also) the period during which such a stay is required of one. In this context, campus residences where students reside have become one of the driving forces to campus crime, as the location where crimes are committed on campuses has become a vital factor in dealing with campus-related violations.

2.2.3 Victimisation

Victimisation is the third most important concept in this study. Vast arrays of behaviours have been deemed 'deviant' or 'criminal' because they violate legal or normative prescriptions. To support this statement, a criminal act can be an act which infringes a human right or causes harm to an individual and this concept elucidates the concept of victimisation. A victim is one who is at the receiving end of an act of crime either "voluntarily or involuntarily, directly or indirectly, abruptly or gradually, consequentially or inconsequentially, by the proven or alleged criminal or crime-like actions of another (Rock, 2002:24).

Victimisation is critically a progression of alter-casting, and the victimisation of one can cause the criminalisation of another, meaning that when someone hijacks a car, the hijacker is a criminal and the owner of the car becomes the victim of hijacking. In this context, concepts such as socio-political milieu, geographical positioning and community involvement cannot be

disregarded. The concept of violence is therefore linked to and underpins the term victimisation.

Galtung (1969) distinguishes between structural violence and direct violence. While the latter entails the infliction of physical violence, the general formula for structural violence is inequality; above all, the distribution of power. This could be explored in terms of physical or property crimes where the perpetrator has a motive to gain something from the act, for example robbery, theft and rape. The perpetrator gains sexual gratification from raping their victim. Contrary to that, it could also be explained in terms of crimes that defame and discriminate due to attitudes and power such as using derogatory language on someone or publicly insulting that person. Crime, whether minor or serious, contains an element of victimisation that is violent and violates the human rights of the victim.

All these terms provide synergy in understanding the study of crime in university on-campus residences. They contribute to the comprehension of what campus crime really is and illuminate its effects on the sociological well-being of a community. Crime on campus affects the lives of students, especially those who reside in campus residences, because many of them become direct victims of various forms of crime. This study sought to discover what these student residents themselves thought about the fact that crimes were committed in university campus residences. The investigation also determined whether their perceptions were in line with the definitions of crime and victimisation as presented in this section.

2.3 Campus Crime

When students enter university, they do so on a blank slate effect, meaning that they are not entirely aware of everything that happens on campus and in its surrounding areas. Perotti (2007) indicates that campus life is an open environment where free expression and the exchange of ideas are core principles. With reference to this argument, one can naturally expect university facilities to be safe until, in reality, they become the locations for the perpetration of crimes. Campus crime is irrefutably a serious issue of concern for current university students, parents of current and prospective students, campus law enforcement agencies and university authorities, because it affects each stakeholder in one way or another. Tertiary institution campuses comprise certain characteristics that render them alluring targets for perpetrators of crime which, in turn, generates fear of crime on these premises. A university campus is regarded as a community because it entails all the elements that make up a community. Mansour and Sloan (as cited in Rengert, Mattson & Henderson, 2001) argue that tertiary

institutions are communities because they contain the three basic elements of a community: a fixed geographical location, common ties among people, and social interactions. The three elements are what influence the crime rates and times of crimes that occur on a university campus. For example, a campus located in a busy urban area with a high rate of unemployment is likely to experience higher crime rates than more rural-based universities.

Jennings, Gover and Pudryzyska (2007) state that, South African institutions are often affected by the country's consistently high crime rates. Many dimensions of the campus environment are linked to institutional history or campus tradition. Campus tradition could refer to the social or political status of that institution but also zooms in closely on the security provisions on that campus. University campuses that are left unattended, unsafe and unhealthy have a negative effect on students' success. This will cause the university as a whole to suffer the loss of prospective students as they will be aware of its low success rate.

2.3.1 Legislation to combat campus crime in the United States of America (USA)

To try and combat crime on campuses in the US, legislation was introduced as far back as 1974 to give students the right to access their education records. This law was known as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERD), and was left untouched until 1990. In 1990 the law was amended to allow higher education institutions to distribute information to current and prospective students regarding campus crime statistics. In 1974, Congress also enacted the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), also known as the Buckley Amendment, as a means to ensure both confidentiality and appropriate disclosure of student educational records. The 1990 FERD amendment was a small piece of a much larger legislation known as the Students Right to Know, Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act (Public Law 101-542) (Harshman et al., 2008). The latter Act applied to all public and private higher education institutions on the basis of their participation in federal student aid programmes (Guffey, 2013). It had two primary purposes which were: to provide prospective students and their families with information regarding criminal activity on particular campuses that could then be factored into their decision about potential enrolment; and current students and staff would be made aware of potential risks on their own campus, enabling them to make informed choices to protect their personal safety (Janosik, 2001).

With reference to the above legislative endeavours in the US, Janosik (2001) argues that devoting time and energy in developing a single reporting mechanism by which institutions may be compared may not have the desired effect if the purpose of the Act is to educate, change

behaviours, and protect college students. Crimes that institutions are required to disclose are those that happen on campus and in facilities and those that are reported to the police or certain campus officials. Janosik also argues that one can question the validity of these reports and how reliable the sources are. Crime is a complex area of study that needs the most precise depiction when it comes to statistics. Using data on reported crime from institutional surveys by the National Centre for Education Statistics, Lewis, Farris, and Greene (1997) found a total incidence of .626 for violent crime per 1000 students on urban campuses in 1994, with individual incidences of .0065 for sexual assault, .262 for robbery, and .295 for aggravated assault per 1000 students. Regarding property crimes, Lewis et al. (1997) found an incidence of 1.878 for burglary.

2.3.2 Crime reposting and statistics on tertiary campuses in South Africa

Unlike in the USA, South African tertiary institutions are not legally bound by legislation to report all campus crime incidents. In South Africa, campus crime statistics and crime/incident reports are considered private educational institution records. This can be seen as one of the causes for victimisation on campuses, because students do not know how unsafe their campus environment is. What university institutions do is sweep serious matters under the carpet because of the fear of publicly reporting crime and losing prospective students because no parent would want to send their child to an unsafe environment.

The table below represents some of the incidents that were reported at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (all campuses) 2 between 2010 and 2012 (UKZN, 2010; UKZN 2011 and UKZN 2012).

Table 2.3.3: UKZN (3) crime statistics 2010-2012

INCIDENT	2010	2011	2012
Assault (all categories)	113	74	58
Drug Possession	23	5	4
Housebreaking & Theft (Offices)	15	10	13
Housebreaking & Theft (Residences)	66	61	27
Malicious Injury to Property	44	82	20
Misconduct/Drunk Disorderly/Breach of Peace	102	70	44
Rape	0	3	5
Robbery	38	15	15
Sexual Harassment	5	4	7
Theft (Offices, residences and other)	452	281	218

It is depicted that crimes may be decreasing on campuses in the South African region. At this institution the most significant crimes were theft, assault and misconduct/drunk disorderly/breach of peace. Research previously done has shown that increased use of drugs and alcohol by students has resulted in increased campus crime rates. As Table 2.3.3 indicates

that crimes associated with these practices among students were already unacceptably high in 2012, one may assume that, with forever changing crime skills and an increasing permissiveness and sense of 'freedom' among students, in the present day and age such criminal activities may have become more serious and detrimental.

2.4 Causes of Crime on University Campuses

2.4.1 Location of campuses in relation to community areas

Numerous factors impact the manifestation of crime on campuses. Some of these include the geographical positioning of the campus and the student population. This means that campus crime is not caused just by one independent factor, but that it is caused and accelerated by a number of different contributing factors. For example, Shaw and McKay (1972) argue that delinquency and disorder are more common in urban areas with greater concentrations of students from various racial and ethnic origin, and residential instability. These factors were indeed found to impact the rate and nature of the various crimes that occurred in the campus residence that was investigated by the current study. Research has shown that if a high proportion of students live in dormitories/residences on campus, this resulted in higher crime rates. Some of the causes are the diversity of the student population, their transitory occupancy, and their possessions, which create many opportunities for offenders. Students who live in campus residences tend to have a lot of valuables in their rooms, such as expensive cell phones, laptops and other gadgets that attract perpetrators of crime.

2.4.2 Outsiders residing in campus residences

It is a known fact that perpetrators of crime are not outsiders only, but may also be students residing in the same or other residences. In this context, Gover et al. (2008) argue that larger populations and inferior academic value also contribute to higher crime rates. This supports the statement that not all the students that occupy residence accommodation are registered students. Some come in as unauthorised guests or even visitors and cause chaos. The openness of campus environments renders the campus vulnerable to such forms of abuse because strangers commonly use campus grounds and facilities (Rengert, Mattson & Henderson, 2001). This results in a larger resident population than the administration is aware of, which results in crimes that cannot be traced to any known suspect. A serious factor under this assumption is the fact that inferior academic value is strongly proportional to crime rates. This stance is

appropriate when the institution harbours individuals that are not there solely for academic achievement but are there to push side agendas of crime and destruction.

2.4.4 How unemployment and poverty in surrounding communities contributes to crime.

The next strong contributing factor to the rates of crime, according to McPheters (1978 as cited in Gover et al., 2008), is the proximity of a campus to urban areas with high unemployment rates. This factor in particular results in elevated crime rates. It is common knowledge that a campus which is located in proximity to an area of low education status and high unemployment rates will most likely experience a high rate of crime. However, it is perhaps most important to note that, although poverty and unemployment may account for criminal behaviour in general, they are not always sufficient in explaining the problematic nature of crime that occurs in on-campus residences in particular.

Unemployment and poverty, with their resultant frustrations, form an important socio-economic background for approaching the issue of crime in South Africa. For instance, many neighbourhoods surrounding campuses have a propensity to encompass the physical and social disorders that would give impetus to a large number of motivated offenders (Skoan & Naxfield, 1981 as cited in Fister, 1992). The motivated offenders from the surrounding area that the university is located in, are the same ones that trespass on university campuses where they commit criminal acts. Victimized students will therefore often not know who the perpetrators of crimes such as break-ins, robbery and rape are, because they have never seen them in their residences before.

2.4.5 Alcohol abuse

In today's modern world, workers in work places and students in a classroom setting have a greater potential of being compromised due to mind-altering substances. Research has shown that increased use of drugs and alcohol by student's results in increased campus crime rates, which brings attention to the fact that substance and alcohol abuse contributes to the causes of crime. In the case of alcohol, the Boyer (1990) report regarded its abusive use as one of the greatest threats to the quality of campus life. Students who abuse alcohol are much more likely to be the ones who break rules and disturb campus life after their intake of alcohol. Even with the increased emphasis on creating awareness, upgrading security, implementing notification systems and providing resources to troubled students, drug and alcohol abuse that often results in violent crimes across campuses appears to be increasing at tertiary institutions.

The criminologists Cohen and Felson (1979) note the keen irony of how the elements of an enjoyable life also expose us to a greater crime threat. This statement by the two criminologists gives rise to the assumption that alcohol consuming students are not only perpetrators of crime, but are also part of the statistics of victims of crimes on campuses. Studies have also indicated that alcohol and drug use by students increases their risk of becoming victims of violent crime, including sexual assault (Gover et al., 2008). The way students, particularly girls, behave after alcohol consumption renders them alluring targets to opportunists or even to dangerous perpetrators of crime. For example, a male student is less likely to be a victim of robbery on any ordinary day but would most likely be an easy target when walking around when intoxicated and defenceless.

Alcohol's most devastating characteristic is its link to destructive behaviour (Fenske, Rund & Contento, 2000). Binge drinking, which is known to occur when a person drinks five or more drinks on one occasion, is a very common problem on many university campuses. Destructive behaviour could entail making too much noise, vandalising the institution's property, or can even go as far as assaulting other students. Alcohol-related violence against persons or property, general misconduct, suicide and related self-destructive behaviour have persisted in the collegiate culture. The ever-ready availability of alcohol and drugs is a factor that fuels mischievous and criminal behaviour among the youth. Some of these behaviours are not only caused by alcohol use, but are also caused by the simultaneous use of alcohol and drugs.

2.4.6 Drugs and substance abuse

Drug use is amongst the causes of crime on university campuses due to the effects they have on the mental reasoning of users. Moreover, drugs are expensive and many of the users end up having to deviate to crime as a means of satisfying their addiction and constant need of drugs.. As stated in DSM IV (APA, 1994), substance abuse is a maladaptive pattern of use of psychoactive substances that act specifically on the central nervous system to alter thought processes, mood, cognition and behaviour. The psychological and logical reasoning of a drug user, whether an academic or not, is altered when under influence of that particular drug.

This explains why drug users tend to be violent and restless people who frequently involve themselves in behaviours that are not humane, let alone legal. In the South African Community Epidemiology Network on Drug Use (Pluddeman et al., 2004), growing concern was expressed about the potential for increased cocaine (especially crack) and heroin use, with their associated problems. Students often tend to use 'weed' as a drug due to its easy accessibility and cost

effectiveness. Although no empirical reports could be traced on drug use amongst university students, it is known that some students do take drugs and that drug traffickers from surrounding communities will invade universities as a lucrative field to sell their products and to victimise students. Drug addicts on the other hand most likely commit crimes such as robbery, break-ins and theft so that they can steal valuables and sell them at a cheap price to get money to buy the drugs they need. Some attribute this to the drinking culture common among college students, while others blame drugs, unaddressed mental illness or a combination of these factors for students' susceptibility to drug use (Sandbox Networks, 2016). Observation attests to this assumption as it has been noticed that some students enter university without ever having consumed alcohol, but due to the drinking culture, they will leave university as a confirmed consumer of alcohol. Sadly, others succumb to drug use, which becomes an addiction that is extremely difficult to overcome.

2.5 Perpetrators of crime

Crime in on-campus residences is a complex area of study due to the multidimensional influences that surround this setting, more especially because relevant statistics are underreported. In this context it becomes a challenge to accurately create a profile of the perpetrators of crime in campus residences. Palmer (1996) recognises that university campuses serve as microcosms of society and that the circumstances prevalent in society manifest in this setting as well. This statement assumes that the perpetrators of crime are people from the academic community as well as people from the local and surrounding environment. The reason that communities surrounding campuses are considered as perpetrators is because it has been shown that unemployed and poverty-stricken persons who reside in areas surrounding university campuses are driven by need to commit criminal activities on the campuses. While McPheters (1978) found a slightly higher rate of non-violent crime on urban campuses compared with rural campuses, Fox and Hellman (1985) observed no difference in the overall crime rates between the two campus types, with urban campuses experiencing only slightly higher rates of violent crime than rural ones. Registered students are undeniably victims as well as perpetrators of crime. Urban campuses face unique issues, including the concept of 'spill-over', where the environment surrounding an IHE campus influences the attraction of criminals to prey on the university (Fox & Hellman, 1985). Also, individuals or gangs from communities around campuses practise their criminal behaviours by taking advantage of poor security and easy access to university facilities.

Campuses generally allow easy access and open movement at all hours, and the diversity of those accessing these sites allows perpetrators to come and go and remain unnoticed (Fisher, 1992). When perpetrators of crime have easy access to university facilities, it means that they go in and out as they please and do as they please. This becomes an issue that cannot be changed due to the fact that university institutions have facilities that are used by outsiders. For example, facilities like libraries cannot be limited for use by that institution's students only, as students from other institutions can use them too. Some institutions have cafeterias and other shops that members from the surrounding community may want to have access to. This means that it becomes a challenge to identify who the perpetrators of crime are if they come from outside the university community. Perhaps if a student is caught breaking into someone's room and stealing, the system can easily identify him/her and deal with that person accordingly. However, when outsiders commit criminal acts they leave the premises and thus cannot be identified, which may be one of the primary reasons why criminals target university campuses and residences? However, the fact of the matter remains that both students and outsiders are perpetrators of crime, as some students are not exempt from criminal inclination and practice.

2.6 The Location of the University Campus Crime

It may be argued that crime can never achieve the same rates in different environments. Generally, upper-class locations are much safer than areas plagued by poverty-stricken communities. Areas and people are thus distinguished in terms of their socio-economic status and residential location. One can then question if institutions in different environmental settings are differently affected by crime. Also, the nature of the crimes that occur at universities that serve more traditional areas might differ drastically from those that occur on campuses located in urban areas. McPheters (1978) suggests that the significance of location as an indicator of campus crime could be partially explained by an exchange of risk factors (e.g., a campus with a small dormitory, but located in a large city). This can be explained in such a way that an institution has students from all walks of life who enter university with different cultures and background. Hence, to judge campus crime rates according to the environment that it is located in could be invalid. To expand on the study by McPheters (1978), Fox and Hellman (1985) used a sample of 222 college and university students to: (1) identify correlates of campus crime; and (2) examine the safety of the campus in relation to the communities in which they were located. They found that the location of a college campus had no significant effect on campus crime (Fox & Hellman, 1985). Their findings were an indication that the environmental

location of a university campus is not much of a factor in explaining the rates of crime in different university settings.

However, on closer examination of the data of their study, Fox and Hellman (1985) discovered that location, while not having a differential influence on the rate of crime, did however affect the mix of campus crime. From this the authors came to the conclusion that campuses located in larger metropolitan areas had significantly larger shares of violent crime, which was a statistic that had been hidden in the total crime index. From previous studies, there had been no explanation that deemed location to be a contributing factor to the rates of particular crimes in university settings. However, in essence the above studies accounted for the argument that different institutions located in different environmental settings will have different crimes ranging between nature and seriousness.

2.7 Gender and On-Campus Crime

Although the current study did not study crime in university on-campus residences based on gender, it cannot be ignored that males and females don't generally experience the same levels of victimisation. Despite the relationship between victimisation and fear, a large body of research has indicated that gender is the strongest factor predicting fear of victimisation (Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Warr, 2000). This statements explains that some reports will be driven more by fear than by actual victimisation because women tend to overestimate the incidence of crime due to fear and males will take the issue less seriously since they are not frequently victimised.

Decades of empirical scrutiny by sociologists, victimologists, psychologists, planners and geographers has established that there are gender-based differences in fear levels across crime types and in certain types of environments, such as public places (Day et al., 1994). A safe campus is one that provides students the opportunity to pursue their academic potential in an environment free of discrimination, intimidation or threat to physical or emotional well-being. The sad truth is that both males and females do experience some sort of crime. For example, Fisher et al. (1997) reported that young male students were at a greater risk of property victimisation than older students and females, and that those who lived on campus in an all-male dorm or a co-ed dorm were at a greater property crime risk than students who lived off-campus or in all-female dorms. It is also important to note that both females and males were identified as both perpetrators and victims.

The only difference between male and female students is the level of victimisation they experience. A contributing factor to females experiencing higher levels of victimisation and fear may be that the genders reside in separate residences, because a general fact that needs no academic reference is that females are generally easier crime targets than males. Another difference is found in the crimes committed against people of different gender. For instance, more rape cases are reported in female-only residences than in male residences. Also, more women tend to report feeling at risk for all types of crime than men, particularly in terms of sexual assault (Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Jennings et al., 2007). One could also assume that higher levels of assault may occur in male residences because males are more likely to respond physically to conflict and that are also perceived to indulge in higher rates of alcohol intake than females, which leads to destructive and reckless behaviour. All these statements are assumptions that have not yet been empirically investigated by any research on the topic of crime in university on-campus residences.

2.8 Parents' Awareness of Crime on University Campuses

The issue of crime at university institutions is one that not only affects students. Today parents of students are, as a generation, better educated than at any time in the past (Daniel et al., 2001). Many parents have already been alerted to issues of violence in the nation's elementary and secondary schools, hence they search for reassurance that their children will be safe throughout the duration of their university life. However, there may be a growing awareness among parents of the potential for their children to experience problems at university with issues such as drug or alcohol abuse, credit card debt, and crime. Instantaneous reporting of campus tragedies alerts parents to crises happening on campuses throughout the country, raising their concerns that similar events could happen elsewhere, even to their own children. Before choosing which university to attend, parents along with children evaluate news reports about assault incidences on campus, alcohol-related crimes, and the torching of facilities during protests. Contrary to this statement, Janosik (2001) states that in one study, less than 4% of the students surveyed indicated that they had used crime statistics as a factor in choosing a college.

In the USA, with as many as 98% of first-time, full-time freshmen at four-year institutions remaining teenagers throughout the full semester (Sax et al., 2000), it is not surprising that many parents harbour expectations of active involvement in their children's college experience (Daniel et al., 2001). When students enter university for the very first time, they are not aware of many life issues that are relevant to the new environment that they are entering into. For the

first few months or even the first full year they need their parents' guidance and protection, especially from behaviours that might make them prone to victimisation. In a study of parental goals for their students' overall college experience in the USA, 'health and safety' was listed as a more frequent response than 'preparation for citizenship', 'improving social skills', or 'developing faith/values' (Turrentine et al., 2002). This shows that parents are much more concerned about the safety of their children than they are about other issues.

When their children become victims of crime on university campuses, parents also become indirect victims because they have to deal with their traumatised children and rectify bad academic performance that is a result of victimisation. This is the reason why parents end up questioning university policies and administrative protocol. They pose questions that compel the institution to explain how a safe and conducive environment is created for students. The majority of current case opinions cast the university and student in a business-consumer relationship. This is the reason why staff members do not commit themselves to a guardianship role over the students and that is where conflict arises with parents.

Regardless of financial or emotional support provided by parents, the contract with the institution is deliberated between the student and the university. This is the reason why parents don't have much of a say when it comes to the running of the institution. Sadly enough, this also implies that they don't have the power to come up with strategies that could help in the prevention of campus crime. The perspective of many parents was summarised in a report entitled *Campus life: in search of community*. This report states: "The assumption persists today that when an undergraduate 'goes off to college', he or she will, in a general manner, be 'cared for' by the institution. And it is understandable that parents feel the institution has betrayed them if a son or a daughter is physically or emotionally harmed while attending college" (Boyer, 1990:6).

The general assumption behind the statement made above is that parents view the university as a guardian to students once they leave home and enter university. It also assumes that the university has to provide explanations for the rates of crime on their campuses to parents. Parents become really unhappy upon victimisation of their children because of the large amounts of money they have to pay for tuition and residence accommodation in the hope that their children will be protected against crime or any other problems they might be faced with. Making expectations unambiguous and developing multiple opportunities for clear and

accurate communications are the key elements to effectively working with parents regarding issues of campus safety and security and how crime can be dealt with.

2.9 The Community and Crime on Campus

As local communities that surround university institutions go through a series of transformation, so does campus crime. It then becomes imperative for the university institution to create a partnership with the surrounding community that will promote a safe environment that is conducive to studying. Each tertiary institution must find its independent way of taking into account how constitutional history, mission, and purpose overlap with local conditions: i.e., the socio-economic circumstances of community residents, the need for social services, housing availability, employment patterns, school quality, and population migration patterns.

Developing effective campus and community partnerships involves taking a broader view of the challenges facing the institution (Sandeem, 2000). Student affairs professionals find themselves integrally involved in efforts to improve the safety and security of a campus through the development of institutional collaborations with the local community. In many cases one finds that students are silent yet have ideas that could proactively deal with the issue of crime on their respective campuses. Today's students believe they can have a more substantial impact on improving society when they get involved in activities that are closer to their sphere of influence: their friends, school, neighbourhood, and family (Levine & Cureton et al., 1998). Creating a culture of service and collaboration is important in today's global society. Stage and Daniels (2002) state that powerful learning is also taking place when students are involved in collaborations with their local community.

Crime is a universal as well as a local phenomenon that needs the attention of all individuals who are affected by it. With regards to crime on university campuses, it becomes necessary that crime is not shunned, but faced and dealt with. It becomes the responsibility of students, staff, family members and parents, the institution's personnel and the community as a whole to tackle the issue of crime. This approach will ensure that all angles that need to be evaluated for the effective implementation of preventative measures are covered.

2.10 Academic and Social Impact of Crime on a University's Population

Crime on university campuses disrupts academic, social and even occupational activities that occur on that campus. As education is critical to a democratic society, every effort therefore needs to be made to ensure the success of all students as an investment in the common good

(Cheatham et al., 1991). For each criminal act that is directed at a particular victim or even at the institution's property, there is a negative consequence. These negative consequences disrupt life and obstruct students' academic progress (Gover et al., 2008). This means that once students become exposed to fear of crime and victimisation, their routine academic and social activities are bound to change. For example, a student who usually leaves the campus late in the evening and walks alone to his/her residence will not do that once they experience being a victim or witnessing someone else being victimised. Friends who meet in study groups at night may no longer attend these study groups due to fear of victimisation. Research has suggested that factors related to fear of crime may differ depending on whether fear of crime during the day or fear of crime during the night is examined (Ferraro, 1995; Fisher et al., 1995). This can differ due to the fact that perpetrators victimise people according to visibility and if anyone else will be a witness. As Brantingham and Brantingham (1994:160) remark:

“Fear of crime may constitute as big a problem for universities as the actual crimes that occur on campus. High levels of fear can drive away promising students and valuable faculty.”

Fox and Hellman (1985) also argue that the quality of education is associated with the crime rates on campus. This means that the increase in crime rates is inversely proportional to the decrease of quality education. When students spend less time on campus to use the facilities, this is likely going to influence the way they perform in their studies because there will be less usage of support structures such as the institution's library, computer labs and other educational facilities.

Gover et al. (2008) identify two major categories of crime that occur on tertiary institution campuses. The first type is referred to be the 'low-probability multiple-death incident' where the consequences are wide spread and long lasting. Such crimes are serious crimes such as rape and murder. They often result in serious trauma, injury and even death. News about these types of crimes tend to travel through the grapevine and by the next day students already know about it. It is these crimes that bring campus life to a cold standstill because students, staff and parents face the trauma of not knowing who the next victim is going to be. Not only do such crimes impact negatively on current students, but if information is leaked to the media, other prospective students will not feel safe to register at an institution where this type of crime occurs.

The second category includes crimes such as robbery, sexual assault, physical assault, theft, burglary and fraud and has a much higher rate of occurrence in contrast to the first. Due to factors such as the diversity of the student population, all these crimes may occur concurrently on campus. This type affects the daily life of students but seldom results in death. However, students who are victimised by these criminal acts may be subjected to negative mental health effects such as anxiety, depression, reduced self-esteem, escalated stress, and assorted physical health consequences. As much as these crimes may be perceived to be only 'petty' crimes because they don't result in death, the consequences they leave behind really distract the life of victims at that institution. For example, someone who comes back to their room to find that all their possessions have been burgled is most likely going to go through a series of anxiety, depression and escalated stress emotions. These types of crime are categorised differently according to the level of harm they cause the victim but in the true sense, no matter how trivial this form of victimisation might seem to the next person, the actual victim suffers a lot and this does distort their perception of their learning environment and also their success that they obtain from continuous engagement with the same environment that they were victimised in. These consequences of crime impact negatively on the lives of students, staff and the institution's personnel at large.

2.11 The Impact of Crime on Campus Residents

Safety or feeling safe can be referred to as freedom from harm, yet it is often taken for granted in everyday life. According to Sloan (1992), the proportion of students who reside in on-campus housing can be significantly related to campus crime. There is also ample evidence cutting across a variety of academic disciplines that supports a significant association between specific features of the immediate physical environment and crime-related fear (Brownlow et al., 2005). It is such evidence that often reports on the fear of crime from students that reside in campus residences. This fear is driven by many contributing factors but the main factor is that most crimes that occur at tertiary institutions actually occur in dormitories/residences. McPheters (1978) notes that high proportions of students living in campus locations near high unemployment urban sites is predictive of increased campus crime rates. In contrast, Fisher et al. (1997) argue that victimisation is lower on campuses where a greater proportion of students live on campus.

Institutional residences may be located both on campus and off campus. As the number of students who enrol at universities increases, accommodation issues become more pronounced. Therefore, one cannot deny the fact that more students are accommodated in dormitories/residences for whom there really is space, which in turn may increase crime and delinquency in the residences of university institutions. In the case of off-campus residences, security control becomes more complicated, which in turn places demands on costly security systems over a wide area. Although a precise report has not been made on comparative crime rates between off-campus and on-campus residences, the fact of the matter remains that residences have become crime zones in the majority of tertiary institutions. As was implied above, there are often significantly more individuals living in student residences than are legitimately allowed. This is a critical security risk for tertiary institutions because administrators are unaware of who is on the premises at any particular time (Editor, 2004). Apart from safety and health risks, the consequences of having more students than required in an institutional residence are overpopulation, chaos and crime. Perpetrators of crime from within residences and from surrounding communities take advantage of the fact that there is a large population and turn residences into crime zones.

Off-campus residences are at a higher risk of being crime zones because they are accessible to a wider community than on-campus residences. Accordingly, access control systems have to be designed to accommodate a range of traffic types including people in vehicles and pedestrians on foot or persons on bicycles and motorcycles (Coetzer, 2008). Persons with criminal tendencies who access these residences do so under the guise of legitimate visitors to the residence, but the sad reality is that the same visitors who have access to the residence facilities, along with residing students, form criminal groups that victimise other student residents. For example, in August 2012 the University of KwaZulu Natal (Howard College campus) was forced to close due to student protests over (amongst other issues) the lack of security at off-campus residences. One issue that was voiced was that outsiders invaded the privacy of students while they were in their rooms. The protests were prompted by a rape that had occurred on campus two months before, as well as an armed robbery (SAPA, 2012). It is clear that students reverted to collective protest due to on-going victimisation among their peers. This demonstrated that both on-campus and off-campus residences are at risk of crime and that students residing in both forms of accommodation are prone to victimisation.

2.12 Campus Security Services

Ensuring an open environment free from intolerance, discrimination and violence is paramount. However, tertiary institutions all over the world are increasingly required to upgrade their campus protection and physical security systems in order to maintain safe campuses and effectively deal with contraventions of campus regulations and state laws. Campuses with high levels of security expenditures tended to have higher rates of crime in the past (McPheter, 1978). Due to the constantly changing world and the advent of digital technology, it is an undeniable fact that criminals have caught up with how many of the security systems put in place operate. That is the reason why even security-tight buildings have also become areas of crime. In securing tertiary education, campuses are challenged with the task of having to strike a balance between the achievement of effective security and rigorous control of access to the campus and its facilities for staff, students and legitimate visitors (Coetzer, 2008).

The debate remains that a university is an accessible environment to other members of the community who need to utilise its facilities. This creates the assumption that security should not be so tight that outside users cannot access the facilities. Bickel and Lake (1990) offer the model of the 'university as facilitator' as a way of conceptualising this balance between institutional authority and student/community freedom. This highlights the need for a platform for collective action and responsibility from which the university, students and parents can address the issue of campus-related crime.

Many campuses are virtually autonomous cities, consisting of multiple buildings, sports venues and research facilities, all of which will require security procedures and protection (Fox & Burstein, 2010). All these venues are utilised by staff, students and other academic visitors who are allowed to access them. However, there is often conflict between the need for security in order to protect students, personnel and property and maintaining an open environment (Perotti, 2007). It may be argued that this conflict is generated by the crime rates that most institutions face. The extent to which advanced new technological systems are used as aids in the provision of all-encompassing 24/7 safety and security at selected higher education campuses must be evaluated. In order for a campus security system to be effective, Gover et al. (2008) illustrate that it must meet the following requirements:

- Early detection of incidents and immediate assessment of the magnitude of the threat/crime;

- Provision of fast and effective intervention measures;
- engendering a sense of safety and protection among students;
- serve as a deterrent to potential perpetrators of crime and threat;
- allow free movement of and a non-threatening environment for legitimate visitors and those with a vested interest in the institution.

It may be argued that the reason why crime rates increase each year is that the structural requirements as stipulated by Gover et al. (2008) are not met at most tertiary institutions. For instance, in the 21st century the security systems in place at most universities are still not meeting the requirements because they serve as a ‘reactive’ system rather than a ‘proactive’ one. Perhaps if most systems deterred crimes on university campuses then they would serve as effective security systems. One of the major problems tertiary institutions face is managing students’ access - i.e., who goes where and when. The reason for this is that students have discovered ways of manipulating security systems in their own interest. For example, a gate that requires a student card swipe-in is in most cases swiped by one student more than once so that their friends can visit them.

Most institutions have reacted to increasing crime on campus by implementing student and personnel awareness procedures and programs, victim services, changes in the styles of campus law enforcement, and changes in the physical environment of the campus (Fisher, 1995). All of these implementations are aimed at providing a safe and functional learning environment that is free of crime where students, staff and the institutions’ personnel can function effectively to ensure the desired academic outcomes for the students.

2.13 The Law and Crime on University Campuses

2.13.1 Legislation in the USA

In the USA, the Students’ Right to Know and Campus Security Act was passed in 1990 and was signed into law by President George Bush (Janosik, 2001). This Act binds all institutions in the USA to publish reports on the crime rates of their institutions. This is referred to as ‘truth advertising’ or ‘consumer protection’ legislation. Current regulations call for institutions to distribute the security report defined by the Act annually to all current students and employees upon request (Federal Register, 1992). The Act has two primary purposes. First, it provides prospective students and their families with information regarding criminal activity on a

particular campus that could then be factored into their decision about potential enrolment. Second, institutions now endeavour to keep their crime reports clear because they are trying to protect their reputation.

Title two of this Act is known as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 and requires all recipients of federal students' aid to disclose information about the occurrence of certain crimes on campus and about the campus safety and security policies and procedures. According to Janosik (2001), the most recent official title under this Act is the 'Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Crime Statistics Act' (Public Law 105-244). This legislation grew out of a tragic incident at Lehigh University involving the rape and murder of a young woman residing in university housing. Since their daughter's death, the Clery family worked tirelessly to force colleges and universities to be more forthcoming about criminal activity on their campuses. The implementation of this Act was a way to try and deter future occurrences of this nature and to also alert other people so that they can protect themselves. Through publishing of criminal reports, institutions in the USA began to see a trend in the rates of crime because more crimes were dealt with accordingly and a proactive approach was followed rather than a reactive one.

In addition, current students would be made aware of potential risks on their own campus, enabling them to make informed choices to protect their personal safety (Janosik, 2001). Thus, in as much as it could jeopardise the institution's reputation, this practice puts the prospective student in a position to make an informed decision. In the event of the prospective student being aware of the criminal activities at that institution but still enrolls at it, it would mean that the student's family may establish precautionary measures to make sure that their child does not fall victim to crime. It also makes students aware of potential threats and allows them to adopt proactive behaviour that will, as far as possible, safeguard them from being victims of crime.

A similar Act that was implemented was the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 which was passed in 1990. This Act ensures that students and other members of the academic community have access to information pertaining to campus safety (Janosik, 2001). The motivation for this Act was to ensure that university students, staff and other personnel knew of criminal incidences on their campus and how they should safeguard themselves from being victims or even help prevent these crimes from further occurring.

2.13.2 The South African context

However, unlike in institutions in the USA, South African tertiary institutions are not legally bound by legislation to report on all campus crime incidents. This means that whatever happens on a South African institution remains private to that institution, unless the media is informed and reports on the incident. Students that are enrolled at South African institutions only get to learn about crimes happening in their institutions through becoming direct victims or hearing other students discussing it. In South Africa, campus crime statistics and crime/incident reports are considered a matter of private record; consequently, not all institutions make their crime incident reports publicly available. That is why it becomes a challenge to accurately determine actual campus crime rates at a national level. This also becomes a problem because prospective and new students regard the University of their Choice as a safe area whereas, in actual fact, most are not. It is argued that the reason some institutions don't publicly publish their crime reports is because they are trying to protect their reputation as an institution, and in this manner they ensure desired student enrolment rates.

2.14 Conclusion

In light of the ever-increasing numbers of students who wish to enrol at tertiary institutions, campus crime has become a critical issue for investigation. Campus safety and security is complex and diverse in nature and will differ from university to university depending on their location, political history and size. The crime rates on each campus will differ due to the factors discussed in this chapter; however, the hope exists that, by educating students and other members of the academic community about the real risk to their personal safety, they will make wise choices about their own behaviour and thereby reduce the chance of falling victim to criminal activity on and off tertiary campuses in South Africa.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

There are many intriguing phenomena in the arena of criminology that might prompt one to engage in research that is beneficial in explaining the causes and factors that contribute to crime. In this regard, many theories have been developed by scholarly investigators to support and give direction to research investigations. A theory can be defined as “a set of concepts linked together by a series of statements to explain why an event or phenomenon occurs” (Tibbetts, 2009). The following two theories are theories that make much effort to describe the reason why university institutions tend to be crime zones and what factors play a role in this. These theories link real-life incidents to assumptions that have been studied over decades. This research was therefore guided by the ‘lifestyle routine activities theory’ by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson (1979) as well as the ‘strain theory’ by Robert K. Merton (1938).

3.2 Routine Activities Theory

The lifestyle routine activities theory was posited in 1979 by two criminology theorists namely Lawrence E. Cohen and his colleague Marcus Felson. The routine activities theory follows the assumption that for a criminal act of any sort to take place three elements are required: (1) a motivated offender; (2) a suitable target; and (3) lack of guardianship. These elements are all linked and collectively contribute to the successful occurrence of a crime. The notion of this theory therefore requires that all three contributing factors need to be activated when criminal acts occur in on-campus residences.

The routine activities theory describes patterns of victimisation by associating crime with victims’ proximity to offenders, exposure to criminal behaviour, and attractiveness levels, either through symbolic or economic value, or a lack of guardianship (Fisher et al., 1997). Tertiary institution campuses are characterised by certain features that render them alluring targets for the perpetrators of crime and that generate the fear of crime. The general model of the routine activities theory was originally presented by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson in 1979 (Cohen & Felson, 1979) and serves as a further theoretical explanation to why crime occurs on a university campus. This study related to this theory because the latter explains the dynamics of crime in relation to the environment. It does not only look at one contributing factor but looks at crime from a holistic approach which is what this study engaged to do. It

was therefore the most suitable theory to explain the phenomenon under study because campus crime is an environmentally-situated phenomenon that takes into consideration the environmental dynamics of crime.

The routine activities theory that falls under the contemporary form of the classical school framework thus explains some contributing factors as to why crime occurs on university campuses. As cited in Fisher (1992), Cohen and Felson 1997 state that university campuses offer numerous opportunities for crime that include a pool of motivated offenders and a lack of supervision, both of which place people at risk. It emphasises the fact that people tend to follow a routine and take chances where possible and that most crimes happen on a daily basis and occur as a result of the routine habits of people. Criminals then happen to observe these routines and then take the tempting opportunity to commit a certain crime.

As part of their seminal 'routine-activities' approach to conceptualising crime victimisation, Cohen and Felson (1979) stress the importance of how victimisation probably becomes a function of the social, even ecological, convergence between opportunistic potential offenders and insufficiently guarded potential targets of crime. It is argued that structural changes in routine activity patterns can influence crime rates by affecting the convergence in space and time of the three minimal elements of direct-contact crime: (1) motivated offenders; (2) suitable targets; and (3) the absence of a capable guardian. All three these factors will be elaborated on in order to be able to explain crime on a university campus. We shall look at these factors as units that substantiate this theory.

3.2.1 Motivated offender

A motivated offender is known as a person who most likely leaves home in the morning with the mentality that if he gets a chance to commit a particular crime, then he will. (The pronoun she may of course also apply.) This explains how, during odd times of the day, there will be people simply loitering around a certain place looking for victims. The motivated offender has already taken his time to weigh the costs and benefits of committing that crime and for perpetrators of crime, the costs are less than the benefits, given the fact that they are calculating professionals who will most probably not get caught and will gain something from their criminal act. The motivated offender can be classified under opportunistic criminals because they always depend on the right opportunity to commit a crime, whether it is in public or a private location. The motivation of the offender plays a key role because as much as there could be a suitable target and an opportunity, if the offender has not committed in any way to

committing the crime then he won't, and if he sees that the costs are more than the benefits, then he is less likely to be as motivated to committing the crime as the costs will outweigh the benefits. For example, a criminal won't be motivated to snatch a woman's bag at the campus library because the chances are that the woman will scream and the offender will be caught, or that there is sufficient surveillance at the library - more so than in an open public space outside a residence.

3.2.2 Suitable target

The next factor of the routine activities theory is a suitable target. A suitable target could include many different scenarios that basically explain that some people become victims of crime because they are in the wrong place at the wrong time. A suitable target is a person who has been identified by the perpetrator of crime as the next victim. With regards to crime on university campuses where women are the preferred victims, it would then be safe to deduce that women are frequently the suitable targets for the types of crimes that take place on university campuses or in residences. However, we need to consider that there are other external factors that may contribute to identifying a suitable target. The reason why women are identified by men as the suitable targets for physical contact crime is because most of these women who are victims cannot defend themselves against these men and some of these females have behaviours that make them targets of victimisation. For example, a woman who is seen to exhibit a pattern by jogging from her residence on the street alone during the late hours of the night becomes a suitable target, simply because it is a routine activity and the perpetrators of crime easily identify such a woman who will be their next target. Another aspect of being a suitable target doesn't come from being watched by the perpetrator, but occurs because of chance. One can be a victim of opportunistic crime when the perpetrators have been searching for a victim and it happens by chance that the victim is alone at a place where it is easy to victimise her.

3.2.3 Lack of guardianship

The final aspect of routine activity is lack of guardianship. Many people fall victims of crime not because they attract the perpetrator of crime, but because they are at a place where a criminal act is possible and where no guardianship exists. This means that when a potential victim is spotted by the criminal/s, there is no way out and they will receive no help if they were to scream or fight the criminal. There are places that are known as 'hot spots'; these are places that have motivated offenders, suitable targets, and a lack of guardianship.

It is such places that most perpetrators of crime will frequent when they are in search of victims and it is in these places that motivated offenders will locate their next victim. These elements make it easier for the criminals to commit the criminal offence without being caught. The absence of any of these elements is sufficient to prevent the successful occurrence of a crime in a university on-campus residence, or in or near any other university facility for that matter. These three elements play a linking role in determining the effective definition of the routine activities theory and how it effectively explains crime, especially in light of the ever-changing dynamics within societies.

3.3 Strain (anomie) Theory

Although influenced by earlier theorists (e.g., Comte, Guerry, and Quetelet), Emile Durkheim was perhaps the most influential theorist in the state of modern structural perspectives on criminality. Working in the 1930s, Merton drew heavily on Durkheim's idea of anomie in developing his own theory of structural strain (Akers et al., 2004). Robert Merton (1938), Albert Cohen (1955) and Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) pioneered the development of the strain theory in criminology. Although in this theory the concept of anomie was altered, there are many other vital influences that helped develop this theory. For the purpose of explaining the research topic in relation to a significant theory, Merton's theory is used. The strain theory proposes that there are certain socially produced pressures or forces that drive people to engage in crime. According to Merton (1938), the socialised image of the goal is material wealth, whereas the socialised concept of the means of achieving that goal is hard work (e.g., education, labour). To put this in simpler terms, university students are studying because they have been taught to believe that the way to be successful and attain material wealth is by attending university and getting a degree. Vold and Bernard (1986) state that culture has placed a disproportionate emphasis on the achievement of the goal of accumulated wealth and maintains that his goal is applicable to all persons, and the social structure effectively limits the possibilities of individuals within this group to achieve this goal through the use of institutionalised means. It works solely on economic depression being the main factor that drives people to crime. By economic depression, one would argue that the economy has become weak and the poor have become poorer, which then places poverty as a very strong pushing factor to crime. An example of this in relation to the study at hand would be university students who turn to crime as a means of gaining material wealth.

The fact that students attend university means that they have accepted the conventional goals set by their society; but when they turn to crime it means that they do not have much interest in following conventional measures to attain this wealth. As in efforts to attain the 'American dream', many South African students epitomise a similar ideal but not much effort is put into accepting certain values to attain that dream, which is why people deviate to crime. This depicts a distinct disequilibrium in the emphasis between the goals and means of societies, which is what is called anomie. Merton (1958) states that the crime peak age of offending is approximately the age of 17, when many youngsters learn that hard work won't necessarily provide rewards. Some individuals then decide to adopt innovative ways of achieving material success without the conventional means of obtaining it. Such adolescents may cope with these strains by committing to income-generating crimes like theft, by skipping school, flouting school rules and vandalising school property (Greenberg, 1997). This statement directs us to why university on-campus residences are affected by crime, and the explanation for this is found in the fact that many people want material wealth but cannot attain it, hence they deviate to crime to try and get that. In other words, they are motivated to engage in illegitimate activities to achieve material wealth (Shoemaker, 1990). Ironically, it can also explain why some people will turn to drugs and alcohol, which puts them in a worse situation where they become the victims of their own desires. On-campus residences therefore become crime zones because the student population possesses valuables which perpetrators desire.

There are five adaptations to this theory, which are as follows:

- **Conformity:** This refers to people who buy into the conventional goals of society and the conventional means of working to achieve what they desire (Merton's social theory). These people follow the institutionalised culture of going to school, getting a degree and getting a job that pays good money so one can get all the luxury items one wants.
- **Ritualism:** This is when members of a society don't pursue the goal of material success, probably because they know they don't have a realistic chance of obtaining it. This is especially true in a poverty-stricken context where the dreams of people are shattered because they have no means of making them come true.
- **Innovation:** This is when individuals greatly desire the conventional goal of material success but are not willing to adopt conventional means to achieve it. They are people who might have the opportunities but choose to reject them.

- **Retreatism:** Individuals don't seek to achieve the goals of society, and they also don't buy into the idea of conventional hard work. These people are not interested in bettering themselves because they have become comfortable in their own failure. They are the people who are most likely to deviate to crime to make ends meet.
- **Rebellion:** Rebels buy into the idea of societal goals and means, but they don't buy into those currently in place. They rebel against institutional means by creating their own short cuts to attaining material wealth.

These five adaptations illustrate the kind of criminals that may frequent a certain location. For example, if university students are the perpetrators of crime in their own campus residence, it would then mean that they are rebels since they are interested in hard work on the one hand, but on the other hand they deviate to crime to make ends meet in a quicker way. In some cases this deviancy occurs not just as a measure to make ends meet, but in most cases it occurs simply to attain material wealth from victimising others.

3.4 Conclusion

These two theories have relevance in explaining the study on crime because they evaluate all the causal factors that transpire in a university on-campus residence affected by crime. They are effective in modern day society and can effectively put into perspective the basis of crime with relation to the environmental, social and socio-economic state of university campuses. The findings of previous studies successfully explained crime in university on-campus residences according to these theories due to the fact that they allowed an illumination of this phenomenon from a socio-structural theories perspective.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The discussion in the previous chapter referred to important literature to explain the dynamics of crime in university on-campus residences and also offered an explanation of the theoretical framework within which this study was located. This chapter serves to explain the research methodology that was adopted in order to obtain data that would address the objectives of the study. Specifically, the chapter elaborates on the research design and provides information on the procedures of sampling as well as data collection and analysis. The ethical considerations that applied to the study as well as the challenges and limitations of the research are briefly outlined.

4.2 Research Methodology

In many cases a research topic is intrinsic to the researcher, which means that the researcher pays close attention to following the proper research design. The aims of research dramatically differ among studies according to the theoretical framework that guides a specific study. In referring to critical research, Fay (1987:23) argues that its aims are to simultaneously explain the social world, critique it, and empower its audience to overthrow it. This assumes that this type of methodology is chosen with the purpose of explaining what the social reality of the study is, critically analysing it, and subsequently coming up with recommendations on how it can effectively be dealt with. The study of crime, particularly in a university institution setting, is one that requires a solid methodology and a precise execution of that methodological framework.

Lather (1992) defines methodology as being identical to a research model employed by a researcher in a particular project, including basic knowledge related to the subject and research methods in question and the framework employed in a particular context. In essence, the research methodology of a study is indirectly motivated by what the researcher already knows and directly driven by what the researcher aims to discover. Both these elements contribute immensely to the choice of methods that a research adopts and determine how the study progresses. This study adopted a non-probability sampling approach which used accidental sampling and snowball sampling as the main techniques of recruiting the sample. One-on-one interviews and a focus group discussion were conducted as the primary data collection

instruments. After the data had been collected, a thematic analysis was utilised for the effective analysis of the data. For considerations such as validity and reliability, it became imperative that the researcher followed the correct systematic approach and methods in order to attain results that could be validly reported.

4.3 Nature of the Study

A paradigm is a set of beliefs, values and techniques that is shared by members of a scientific community and which acts as a guide or map that dictates the kind of problems scientists should address and the types of explanations that are acceptable to them (Kuhn, 1970:175). This research followed the descriptive-interpretive paradigm under qualitative research which has the core purpose of understanding how people view a certain issue and how they feel about it. This method of research used by social scientists is designed to document adequately the richness and diversity of meanings people attribute to phenomena (or a particular phenomenon) (Burton, 2000).

Through interaction with research participants, the researcher is able to gain important information about the issue being studied. Barton and Lazarsfeld (1979) identify four primary phases of qualitative research: (1) exploration, which helps to analyse research objects, identify indicators and establish classifications and typologies; (2) discovery of relationships among variables, which enables the researcher to make comparisons and arrive at conclusions about the significance of certain factors that address the objectives and aim of the study; (3) the establishment of integrated constructs (or themes); and (4) the testing of hypotheses. This research dwelled mainly on the logic of exploring the phenomenon under study and analysing the objectives of the study in close relation to the environment in which the phenomenon was being studied. The researcher applied a methodology that was connected to two theories, namely the routine activities theory and the strain theory. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain data from a sample of respondents who participated in both the one-on-one interviews and the focus group discussion.

This study was completed on the premise of using two types of data to consolidate the aim and objectives of the study. The primary data that were used were collected by means of recording one-on-one interviews and a focus group discussion and the jotting down of notes during both processes. Secondary data were collected by reading and contextualising information from academic sources such as books, articles and journals. In the final stage of reporting, a synchronisation between the primary data and secondary data was the core point of evaluation

to draw conclusions about the findings of the study. The recommendations depict where gaps were identified in the study and what can be done to address them.

4.4 The Study Site (UKZN, Howard College)

The University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) was formalised on 1 January 2004 as a result of a merger between the former universities of Durban-Westville and Natal. It has five campuses namely Edgewood campus (Pinetown), Howard College campus (Durban), Nelson Mandela School of Medicine campus (Durban), Pietermaritzburg campus, and Westville campus (Durban).

This study focused on Howard College campus as a research site which opened in 1931 and is situated on King George V Avenue on the Berea and offers a spectacular view of the Durban harbour. The Howard College campus is surrounded by an environmental conservancy with gardens and an upper-class community atmosphere. It is the academic home to thousands of diverse students from all walks of life and serves as a home to many students who reside in campus residences. The study focused on three of Howard Colleges on-campus residences which are less than a kilometre away from the university campus, namely Ansel May, John Bews, and Albert Luthuli/Tower).

4.5 Sampling

A prerequisite before sampling could occur was that the researcher had to obtain permission from various gatekeepers to conduct the study at Howard College. First the researcher applied for permission and received a gatekeeper's letter from the registrar of UKZN. Second, the researcher had to apply for ethical clearance from the Ethical Committee of the university. A letter of approval was finally received which authorised, *inter alia*, the sampling phase of the research project. According to Kuzel (1992), qualitative studies employ forms of non-probability sampling, such as accidental or purposive sampling as well as snowball and theoretical sampling. These types of sampling techniques don't follow any strict sequence in recruitment; instead, they aim at getting respondents for the study according to purposive sampling processes. This form of sampling enables the researcher to study a rather small number of units in place of the target population and to obtain data that are descriptive of the target population.

4.5.1 Non-probability sampling

The researcher pursued the most accurate data collection method for the purpose of generating accurate data to interpret. It was therefore prudent to adopt a non-probability approach when selecting the samples. This type of sampling is used for explorative and qualitative analyses. Representativeness is not significant in non-probability sampling. The two techniques that were utilised in this study were:

4.5.1.1 Accidental sampling

This sampling technique is also known as convenience sampling. It simply implies that the researcher recruits according to his/her convenience. In this study the researcher went to visit the three residences that had been selected as research sites and randomly recruited people who were met by chance. They were told about the study and asked to participate.

4.5.1.2 Snowball sampling

This sampling technique begins with a few respondents, who then recommend other respondents who meet the criteria for inclusion and who might be willing to participate. This process is continued until the research is saturated. For the study at hand, the researcher met the first persons through accidental sampling and then, after interviewing them, asked them to recommend a person they knew who would fit the criteria of recruitment and would likely participate in the study. The same procedure was applied. Care was taken not to recruit respondents from the same group of friends or people from the same age group, until the sample frame was saturated.

By applying the two techniques mentioned above, the researcher was able to recruit an initial sample of 18 participants. All 18 identified participants resided in on-campus residences and represented different faculties, levels of study, gender and residences. Of the 18 participants who recruited, nine were interviewed and nine eventually contributed to the focus group discussion.

The residences of the University of KwaZulu Natal (Howard College) that were targeted were Residence A, which is a male only residence, Residence B, which is a female only residence, and Residence C, which is a mixed-gender residence. The reason why the researcher selected these residences as sites is because they are on-campus residences. The researcher chose to use pseudonyms for the residences due to ethical considerations. In as much as respondents are

reported in pseudonyms, it would be dangerous for them if other people knew which residence they reside on and that they participated in a study of this nature. To avoid this issue of potential victimisation, letters A, B and C represent the three residences selected as research sites.

These two sampling techniques were the best for the researcher to use because they allowed the control factors such as representativeness when selecting the sample. They were also effective in the context of this study because the researcher had no strict characteristics to consider when recruiting the sample, but just that the respondent had to be a registered on-campus resident of one of the three residences. Another reason the two techniques were used was to ensure that the sample represented the population and that the information obtained would not be biased. For this reason, every effort was made to control the sample by not recruiting people from the same group of friends, age and level of study.

4.6 Data Collection

The data were collected in two ways: (1) one-on-one interviews with nine respondents; and (2) a focus group discussion also with nine respondents altogether giving a sample size of eighteen participants for this study. The primary technique the researcher adopted was using a mobile cell phone to record each interview as well as the focus group sessions. Permission was obtained from the interviewees to audio record the conversations by requesting them to sign the 'permission to audio record' form (see Appendix C). Although the mobile cell phone was not ideal in this situation, it was accessible and functional. Pile suggests that a verbatim transcript of interviews is the only way to achieve a full qualitative analysis:

“An analysis of language can only be carried out with confidence if there is an entire record of a conversation. Hastily scribbled notes...are not accurate enough to be used in this way. Tape recorded sessions provides the only viable data for this kind of analysis.” (Pile, 1990:217).

The secondary method of collecting data was by jotting down notes which entailed key words and an indication of who said what. This played a major role in the researcher's control skills because it was very important that, during the group discussion, the researcher made sure that nobody spoke while someone else was speaking because that was going to cause chaos in the transcription of the recordings as well as distract the researcher from jotting down notes. Because 9 participants contributed to the focus group discussion, a research assistant was used to help facilitate this data collection process. This meant that both the researcher and the assistant took down notes. In situations where respondents felt uncomfortable to reveal their

names, they were allocated pseudonyms for the purpose of the group discussion. Also, for ethical reasons, all respondents will be referred to by pseudonyms in this study report.

4.6.1 Research instruments

For the data to be accurately collected, the researcher had to make sure that the research instruments carried enough strength to probe respondents for valuable information pertaining to the study. In this study the researcher used one-on-one interviews which were semi-structured in nature. This was essentially to allow the respondents to openly share their perceptions or, where relevant, their experiences of the phenomenon being studied. The second instrument that was used was a focus group discussion which also followed the use of a semi-structured schedule with questions that elicited a discussion around the matter being addressed.

The questions were listed on one interview schedule (see Appendix B), but the questions asked in the two different sessions were separated: first, a section for the one-on-one interviews, and second a section for the focus group discussion. From the eighteen participants initially selected, only nine attended the one-on-one interviews and the other nine participated in the focus group discussion.

4.6.2 Facilitation of interviews

Interviews are planned, prearranged interactions between two or more people, where one is responsible for asking questions pertaining to a particular theme or topic of formal interest and other(s) is responsible for responding to the questions (Lankshear and Knobel 2004: 198). Interviewing can be seen as a procedure of inquiring characterised by employing spoken questioning as its main technique of data collection. It is planned and executed in a systematic way with the researcher being the facilitator. This helps to avoid cases of bias and distortion and to ensure that it is related to a specific research question which has a specific purpose.

Semi-structured interviews follow a structure depending on the nature and purpose of the research topic, the resources and methodological standards, and the type of objectives that need to be addressed (Burton, 2000). In this study the semi-structured questions allowed the respondents to express their opinions and not to feel limited in sharing their views. They also allowed for the researcher to further probe for an elaboration in cases where the researcher was not clear what the response meant or she perhaps needed more information from the respondent. These interviews were voice recorded using a mobile cell phone and the respondents had to first agree to be recorded. In a case where the respondent did not consent to

being recorded, the researcher had no choice but to jot down extensive notes while the respondent shared his/her opinions or experiences. However, no participant felt uncomfortable with being recorded so they all gave consent to audio record

The researcher facilitated the one-on-one interviews in an environment that would be conducive to uninterrupted conversations between the respondent and the researcher. The times of the interviews were allocated in consideration of the availability of each respondent. A clear explanation of what the study was about was given before the interview commenced. The nature of the questions that would be posed was also highlighted prior to the signing of the informed consent form (see Appendix A). Although 18 respondents had been identified initially, the researcher interviewed nine participants, three from each of the three residences that had been selected as the study sites.

4.6.3 Focus group discussion

A focus group is a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive [i.e., voluntary], non-threatening environment (Krueger, 1988:18). The basic assumption that motivates this type of data collecting method is that a group environment is most likely, through mutual encouragement, to discuss related topical issues, to increase the motivation to address social and critical issues, and to allow the facilitator to lead the discussion towards a focal point. Lofland and Lofland (1984) suggest that group interviewing may be most productive on topics that are reasonably public and have the advantage of allowing people more time to reflect and to recall experiences. For this study, the researcher recruited nine participants for the group discussion who were selected from the eighteen interview participants. The researcher together with the participants then worked out a suitable time when they would all be available to meet at the same venue in order for the discussion to take place. The researcher used nine participants because the general principle for focus groups assumes that there should be 6-10 members in a focus group. As it was deemed unnecessary to probe deeper in multiple focus group settings that would also be time consuming, only one focus group discussion was held.

For effective focus group discussions, Lamnek (1988) lists the following steps: being strange, orientation, adjustment, intimacy, conformity, and fading out of the discussion. For this particular study, the researcher held only one focus group discussion with nine participants. The researcher was comfortable with this because it meant that the group discussion would be controllable and not time consuming. As the researcher was unfamiliar with the respondents,

the 'strange' (or stranger) requirement applied. After introductions and an explanation of the study, the ice was broken. From there adjustments were made in the atmosphere of the discussion as people opened up and then intimacy was established through the sharing of perceptions and experiences. The last two steps, which are conformity and fading out of the discussion, were carefully controlled by the researcher and then the focus group discussion came to an end.

4.7 Data Analysis

Following the process of collecting data came the longest process of the entire study, which was data analysis. Qualitative research is a complex issue, and making sense of qualitative data is not an easy task (Coffey, 1996). In this study it first required verbatim (word for word) transcriptions of the data from the recorded conversations. Once the data had been transcribed in sequence, the next step was to analyse them using a procedure of qualitative analysis known as thematic analysis.

According to King (2003), thematic analysis is a process of analysing data using themes emerging from the data. In this process the researcher reads through the data and categorises key ideas and words into linking themes and views. Making note of patterns and themes that are depicted in the data strengthens qualitative interpretation. It is the only way that the researcher can come up with logical explanations that may address the objectives of the study. This step was a systematic yet rotational step because it called on the researcher to go back and forth in the process of interpreting the data. Only once a holistic explanation had been derived from the bits and pieces of linking information, then the researcher could move on to the step of reporting the general findings of the study.

4.8 Ethical Considerations

It is very important that every researcher embarks on their study with a good work ethic just to avoid problems in the study. Professionalism is the main important thing when entering the personal spheres of respondents. Research works in a systematic manner which includes unwritten standards and principles that should be adhered to. The researcher and respondents need to have a solid ground of understanding and co-operation. It is of great importance that the researcher is as transparent as possible about the aims and objectives of the study from the get go. It is also of paramount importance that before the data collection commence, the

researcher explains the dynamics of the data collection method to the respondents and gets their full consent to voluntarily participate in the study

In adherence of these requirements, an informed consent form (see Appendix A) was signed by the participants before the interviews were facilitated. They also gave written permission for the use of audio recordings on a special form (see Appendix B). Moreover, gatekeepers' permission letters to conduct the study were obtained (see Appendix D).

Bailey et al. (1982) state that a researcher should avoid questions or issues that may cause embarrassment, guilt, discomfort, hazards, or risk to each respondent. In instances where such conditions might occur, it becomes the researcher's responsibility to inform the respondents prior to any data collection. In this study, the researcher made an attempt to involve a psychologist from the counselling unit to be on stand-by, as the researcher was aware that this topic might evoke trauma for some people who had been victimised. Others, who had been indirectly affected by the issue of crime in their respective university on-campus residences, might experience anger and frustration that would need to be addressed.

4.9 Informed Consent

According to Simons and Usher (2000), informed consent implies participants to be free of coercion or deception and having an understanding of the following: the process by which the data is to be collected; the intended outcome of the research process; the uses of the research; and as individuals or groups, having the capacity and competence to consent. Respondents are always at a voluntary point of participation, which means that no respondent should be pressured or manipulated to participate in the study. It is of paramount importance that the respondents are fully aware of the nature and objectives of the study before they participate in it. The researcher made sure that this was achieved in this study by procuring the written informed consent of each participant (see Appendix A).

This form also explained that participants could withdraw from the study at any time if they felt uncomfortable and that they had the right to contact the researcher and request a copy of the report after the study had been completed. The researcher's and the supervisor's contact details were provided. The informed consent form also highlighted that, in the case where a respondent wanted to remain anonymous, the researcher would use a pseudonym instead of the participant's real name for the one-on-one interviews as well as the focus group discussion. All the respondents are referred to by pseudonym in this study report.

4.10 Challenges and Limitations

Researchers often face challenges in the research field when it comes to general matters of research. These challenges might end up limiting many factors that contribute to the research and may cause the research findings or the report to be flawed. Miles and Hurberman (1994) stress the importance of representativeness and point to possible pitfalls qualitative researchers should be aware of.

As much as representativeness is not of great significance in non-probability sampling the research was limited to mostly post graduate student respondents because it was such students that the researcher most frequently met. Moreover, due to snowball sampling technique, the sample comprised respondents from more or less the same age group since university undergraduates and postgraduates are somewhere between the ages of 18-23. However, as age was not an inclusion criterion of this study, this issue did not influence the study negatively, although it would have been interesting to get an idea of how soon first year students were victimised after enrolling at the institution. However, this was not within the scope of the study and therefore not an objective, but future studies may make this a focal point.

Limited local scholarly articles could be traced in publications, and this meant that international publications limited the scope of the literature review and the information the researcher needed prior to the research. At the beginning of a project of this nature, the researcher should be well informed about the topic. Studying a reduced area of a larger continent means concentrating, precisely on the demarcated area of focus and not over exploring literature on other areas.

The paucity of academic literature was a great challenge which impacted the construction of the thesis. Because the topic had been under researched locally, the researcher could not relate much comparative information to the South African context. For this reason, American studies and legislation were referred to despite the huge differences in culture, environment, and policy provision between the two contexts.

Another limitation was that of objectivity. From a feminist perspective, Keller (1985) and Reinharz (1992) argue that objectivity has adverse effects on women, and that abandoning subjectivity “is to abandon free thinking from inappropriate constraints and ‘unconscious’ mythologies through disengaging thinking from notions of what is generally considered to be objective, given that such constructs are determined by patriarchal perceptions about life and social relations” (Keller, 1985:341 and Reinharz, 1992:18).

According to Becker (1989) and Stergios (1991), objectivity requires that the researcher remains distant from and neutral to the research object, the respondents, the methods and techniques of data collection and analysis, and to the findings- requirements that are against the fundamental principle of qualitative research, which encourages inter-subjectivity, closeness between the elements of the research, and involvement of the researcher in the whole research process. This was a difficult part of the study for the researcher because she had been a victim of crime in a university on-campus residence herself and was a registered student who resided in a campus residence. It was then a challenge for the researcher not to end up being subjective when analysing and reporting the data. However, by remaining within the scope of the objectives for data collection and an analysis of the emerging themes, the researcher was able to engage only the ‘voices’ of the participants and their views and perceptions, and not her own.

Domination by some respondents in the focus group discussion threatened a potential shift the direction and outcome. For this reason the researcher ended up having to probe for answers from the ‘quiet’ respondents during the focus group discussion. Some participants felt shy or inferior when others dominated the conversation. This was a limitation because the researcher might have ended up not being able to get the other participants to speak, which might have distorted data and impacted the accuracy of the data. However, by probing for responses from all the participants this danger was averted. The researcher overcame this by using simple and direct probes to get all the participants to speak without feeling picked on.

Resistance by participants was an initial limitation that was caused by the issue of trust before the study commenced. The participants might have felt that the researcher worked for some investigative agency and that their participation would lead to harm. This called for the researcher to provide the respondents with gatekeepers’ letters as well as all the necessary documentation just to put them at ease and ensure their voluntary participation. It also called for the researcher to explain about the confidentiality of the data and their safekeeping until after the report will have been made.

A final and enduring limitation of the study relates to its relatively small scope. As only eighteen participants and three residences at one university of many were involved, it is acknowledged that the findings of this study cannot be generalised across all tertiary campuses and residences in the South African context.

4.11 Conclusion

Research in modern times is increasingly used to explore social reality. It is therefore applied in many methodological contexts which each has a specified purpose. This chapter outlined the selected design that was utilised in the investigation of this topic which addressed the fundamental objectives of the research in a methodologically relevant manner. It also depicted the motivation for selecting the methods explained above. This methodology was selected with the aim of effectively addressing the qualitative objectives and research questions that guided the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the analysed data and elaborates on the findings of the study with reference to crime in university on-campus residences. The data that were collected using one-on-one interviews and a focus group discussion were analysed using a thematic analysis process. The researcher went back and forth between the literature and theory in order to precisely refine the data and the resultant findings. Key words/phrases/ideas were categorised according to the relevant themes that emerged from the participants' observations or experiences and that became visible in the data. These were then further broken down into patterns that explained the phenomenon under study. These categories outlined what was discovered by the study by linking any similarities and highlighting any dissimilarities within the collected data. The themes were then synchronised to create a comprehensive narrative, or picture, of the findings related to the study. To adhere to ethical requirements, pseudonyms are used in this report to refer to the participants and the study sites. Also, it must be noted that the students' responses are presented verbatim and that the grammatical use in some responses may be somewhat flawed as English was their additional and not their home language.

5.2 Types of Crimes that Occurred in the On-Campus Residences

This study elicited many responses that depicted a growing concern about the issue of crime in university on-campus residences. The students voiced their opinions and perceptions about the issue of crime that affected each of them in many different aspects of their lives. Some responded in voices that echoed victimisation and they shared their experiences, while others shared their observations and what they had heard. For instance, in the focus group Sam reported the following:

“Recently there was a girl who’s a student here who got mugged in the parking lot of res. The guy who was mugging her had a gun and said to her, ‘You probably can’t run faster than a gun!’”

This comment is enlightened by the routine activities argument, which suggests that crime is the result of the convergence of three elements: a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardianship. This was also evident in a response given by Selby, who said:

“Fellow students and peers who know our daily routines are the perpetrators of crime. Also, people from the outside community who have access to the premises and know that security is not tight.”

These kinds of responses served as legitimate evidence that criminal offenses did take place in university on-campus residences and that they affected the daily lifestyles of the students. It also showed that these crimes happened within the residences and that resident students were victims of common crimes.

5.2.1 Property crime

The study revealed that property crime was a grave issue of concern because the residence population predominantly reported this crime. Volkwein, Szelest and Lizotte (1995) also found that property crime patterns and dynamics differ from those of violent crimes. This finding is relevant to this study because the explanations given by students in terms of property crime and other crimes differed in nature and incidence. The former scholars argue that property crime is significantly associated with affluent institutions that accessed higher than average room and board charges and, consistent with the finding of previous studies, the researchers found that the percentage of students living on campus was another correlate of campus property crime.

As the most logical explanation, one could elaborate on the latter statement by arguing that criminals weigh the costs and benefits of a crime before committing it. In terms of property crime, the benefits outweighed the costs because criminals gained wealth by victimising residents who possessed valuables such as expensive cell phones, laptops and other gadgets. They also evaluated the costs of getting caught, which in this study was low because the students reported that security measures were not effective in combating crime.

The data indicates that respondents perceived that the crimes that commonly occurred in university on-campus residences were theft and break-ins. The majority of the respondents had been victims of theft and they further elaborated on how the residents at large were experiencing the same form of victimisation by having their belongings stolen. Items that were frequently stolen were laptops and even clothes while being washed in the laundry. In the one-on-one interviews all nine of the respondents stated that theft was the main crime and most respondents reported break-ins (burglary) as a common issue that residents were facing. This report complies with the strain theory which explains that people deviate to crime for material

wealth because the people who steal other people's belongings do so in order to sell them or to possess valuable items. The findings of this study corroborate this statement. Nomthandazo who responded in the focus group as a victim of theft reported as follows:

“This laundry theft normally occurs during vacation times, maybe in March or end of the year. I am speaking from experience because half of my clothes were stolen while I was doing my laundry.”

Six respondents in the one-on-one interviews attested to being victims of break-ins (burglary). Regarding property crime, Lewis et al. (1997), using data on reported crime from an institutional survey by the National Centre for Education Statistics, found an incidence rate of 1,878 for burglary. This report of high burglary rates was supported by the study at hand because property crime was reported by most during the interviews and the focus group discussion. This also attests to ineffective security in on-campus residences as students who had been robbed took issue with the safety measures in place because their rooms had been broken into either by their peers or people from the outside community.

Ben, who was a victim of a room break-in, said:

“So what happened was that my room was broken into, using the swiping system. I can't say who because what I've noticed is that people use this 2 litre swiping system to open their rooms so I've noticed that once I open the room using the 2 litre, I am making my room prone to break-ins. Other students who are criminals will use that to their advantage. I was a victim because of that and someone cut a 2 litre bottle to break into my room. They took all my valuables.”

5.2.2 Sexual assault and rape

According to Warr (1980), students tend to overestimate the incidence of rare crimes and underestimate the rates of less serious but more frequently occurring crimes. This could mean that many respondents who had a lot to say about crimes such as rape or sexual assault actually ignored cases of theft because they did not consider them important enough for discussions of this nature. Many respondents reported having heard that sexual assault, or explicitly rape, was an issue at the university. However, none of them had fallen victim to this traumatic experience but some actually did know of people who had been victims. Due to the sensitivity of the topic, no names were mentioned. In the focus group a different dimension to sexual assault was revealed.

In the focus group Sam said:

“I’m not sure if this is a crime but I know of a case where last year there was this guy who worked in the housing department who took advantage of girls who were in need of residence, especially first years. He would call them into his room and promise them residence and say they will sign forms to join the youth league and sleep with them. Like I’m sure that should be a crime because most of the case they don’t want to but he forced himself on them because they were naïve. That resulted in trauma because they were first years who had not been exposed to such manipulation before and were actually desperate for a place to stay.”

In a study of crime on university institutions in the USA , McCreedy and Dennis (1990) indicated that 27% of the total college student enrolment and approximately 40% of sexual violence victims reported that they avoided enrolling in classes at night due to fear.

The other respondents also had plenty to say as Thando said that the issue of sexual assault/rape was one that was overlooked by the university. Most of them nodded and sighed in agreement, and Thando and Smiso also added the following:

“Last year there was a case of a rape whereby the guy walked into a girl’s room and tried raping her. Same with robbery: one guy tried snatching a girl’s laptop at about 1 am in the morning and ran away.”

The routines activities theory can be associated with the crime or rape because females often fall victim to sexual assault by people they know. These people that are close to the victims know their routine activities and when the most suitable time to victimise them will be. In relation to the case reported above by Smiso, one could argue that the guy who walked into the girl’s room knew he would find her there at that time. From the above mentioned reports the researcher deduced that theft, break-ins (burglary) and cases of rape or enforced sexual activity for favours were crimes that frequently occurred in the on-campus residences of the university under study. Respondents from all three residences that had been selected as research sites shared the same sentiments.

5.3 Nature and Seriousness of Crimes

One can arguably say that to completely understand the true nature of crime on university campuses, it is of paramount importance to discover the actual crime rate and not just the ‘reported’ crime rate. However, actual crime figures can never be determined because it is a

known fact that not all crimes are reported. The grey area of crime rates signifies crimes that go by unreported. The general atmosphere from the respondents regarding the nature of crime was that, to their knowledge, it was not too serious and had not yet resulted in injury or death. Most of the respondents reported crime in university on-campus residences as not fatal, but traumatic. Most of the victims of these crimes ended up going through trauma and fear. Lee responded by saying that these crimes were not really serious in nature but were threatening. Others responded by also saying that these crimes were not that serious but that they resulted in trauma, as Jenny said:

“No, these crimes are the minor crimes we all get to experience and they generally don’t result in injury or death but result in long lasting trauma.”

It was thus possible to conclude that perhaps university students who resided in on-campus residences experienced predominantly petty crimes that were not too dangerous or serious in nature, with the exception of sexual assault/rape. The nature of the crimes often resulted in loss of valuable goods, for instance when someone’s room had been broken into, or trauma from their clothes being stolen. However, despite the relative ‘petty’ nature of the crimes these students experienced, all were affected by feelings of stress and trauma due to the loss of their valued possessions, even clothes, which resulted in fear of being victimised again in the absence of efficient security measures in the residences.

5.4 Perpetrators of Crime

Due to the nature of the study, the researcher could not ask the respondents in the focus group directly who the perpetrators of crime were. This was mainly to avoid victimisation after the study from divulging crucial information in a group. However, in the one-on-one interviews the respondents reported that both other residents and outsiders might be the perpetrators of crime in the on-campus residences. Typically, campuses remain public spaces, leaving security staff unable to entirely monitor individuals who work, reside, attend, or visit the campus (Paulson & Scherer, 2007).

5.4.1 Non-resident perpetrators

Lindelwa shared her views on the perpetrators of crime by saying the following:

“I have issues with the fact that people who are not students are permitted to come into the residences on the grounds that they are going to the residence cafeteria to buy food. Because

not so long ago I was coming back from campus and was almost mugged by a person that was within the premises and I identified that they did not belong to the residence. Had I panicked then he would have took my phone. It doesn't make sense to give unlimited access to outsiders because it makes the area a hot zone for crime. This needs to be scrutinized because the fact that outsiders have access means it becomes hard to track perpetrators.”

In his study, McPheters (1978) noted that higher proportions of students living on-campus and in campus locations near high-unemployment urban sites were predictive of increased campus crime rates. To support this, Selby said the following regarding this matter:

“Its outsiders from the surrounding community who have too much access to these premises as well as students that reside in the residence, some who don't have the authority to be living in that particular residence. We call them squatters because they don't own rooms here but live with their friends.”

It was evident from the responses that both students and non-students (or outsiders) were the people who committed the crimes that respondents reported to be problematic. Crimes were committed for material gain or due to the effects of drugs and alcohol, as the following section will illuminate.

5.4.2 Perpetrators who are affected by drugs and alcohol

During his interview, Dan made the following comment:

“...drug users also, because I have noticed that drugs change the way a person behaves so they might end up doing crime.”

In light of the above, Sloan (1994) found that alcohol and drugs were implicated in over 95% of all campus offenses. This finding corroborates the statement that the respondent above made about drug and alcohol use.

Also elaborating on this statement, Lindani said:

“Our peers and registered students who don't stay in this residence are the main perpetrators and then it's also people who use drugs and drink alcohol.”

Other factors that identified the perpetrators of crime related to poverty and unemployment, which generally means that if the population in the area surrounding the institution is poor and unemployed, then there will be crime because these unemployed people deviate to crime as a

way of making ends meet. These perpetrators victimise students, particularly those residing in campus residences.

5.5 Impact of Crime on Resident Students

Living in an unsafe environment flooded by crime is never a comfortable experience for anyone. Crime affects people in many ways that end up hindering the living conditions within that particular environment. A general assumption can be made with reference to a study relevant to this one that was conducted by Fox and Hellman (1985), who studied campus safety. They reported that crime affected quality education and found that the quality of education was associated with campus crime rates. This statement further assumes that, as the quality of education increases, so does the crime rate.

5.5.1 Impact on motivation to achieve academically

Contrary to this argument, the current study discovered that high crime rates resulted in poor academic performance among students. This was possibly caused by the fear invoked in students that caused them to abstain from active campus life as they experienced trauma caused by victimisation or the fear thereof. For example, Dan said that crime and the fear of being victimised affected him academically...

“...because it traumatised me to hear of cases of rape or loss of valuable goods through theft. Most people find it hard to function properly in an uncomfortable environment.”

Crime in campus residences impacted students' academic performance because they would not actively participate in academic programmes due to fear of being the next victim.

5.5.2 Fear and social withdrawal

Another way students were impacted was that they lost their sense of autonomy and safety. They were also impacted socially because they began to withdraw from any social activities that would subject them to victimisation. These could be social activities that students engaged in during their free time such as going out, and it could also be avoiding serious academic commitments such as attending extra classes. Three respondents in the one-on-one interviews had the following to say about how crime affected them:

Lee said:

“It violates my rights because my freedom of movement is infringed. It creates a sense of fear and I feel less safe to be around campus or in my residence because I’m scared.”

Selby said:

“It causes fear because a friend of mine was victimised and that caused trauma to them which directly cause fear to me and insecurities of being victimised.”

Nelly also said:

“It affects me because my freedom is gone; I always have to lock my room because I know if I leave my room open my stuff will be gone. It also causes trauma in me because I live in fear of leaving my belongings around my room.”

These responses served to show that the respondents believed that an environment flooded by crime resulted in an abnormal lifestyle with people living in fear and discomfort. Their comments also pointed to the social problem where people detach themselves from the community they are living in as they experience fear of victimisation. Based on this finding, one cannot deny that crime is indeed an issue that needs to be dealt with in order for the normal functioning of the community.

5.6 Security and Safety Issues

Students reported to have issues with safety. These reports stated that students felt unsafe while on campus and in their residences, which means that they experienced fear. Although previous research had demonstrated considerable levels of fear among students (Fisher & Nasar, 1992), there was also evidence that most students generally reported feeling safe on campus (Hummer & Preston, 2006). These contradictory reports are thus an indication that the levels of crime may differ among various facilities at institutions. This means that students might report feeling safe while on campus but that they feel unsafe when residing in an on-campus residence at the same institution.

Sloan et al. (2000) found that levels of fear on a university campus vary with regard to age, gender, race, and prior victimisation. However, the responses of the participants revealed that the fear most of them experienced was due to having been a victim of crime before or knowing someone who had been victimised. This finding is a representation of the fact that crime has stained the positive picture that is painted when universities advertise their residences as safe and crime-free zones. If institutions prioritise their students’ academic performance, safety

should be prioritised as well because academic performance can be inversely proportional to safety in the learning environment.

Three respondents from the one-on-one interviews responded to the question of how crime affected them by saying:

Ben said:

“It makes me feel less safe when I hear of stories of people who have been victims. I see myself as a potential victim too and it creates insecurities and fear within me.”

Jenny also said:

“It traumatises me causing discomfort and fear.”

Lindani responded by saying:

“Personally I think that as students we don’t take our safety seriously. When you let your friends in at any time it makes it easier for crime to happen.”

McCormick et al. (1996) found that men reported significantly less fear than women regarding being alone on campus and seeing strangers, although both men and women indicated greater levels of fear when passing a strange man or a group of men passing a group of women. The participants of this study corroborated accounts of previous studies about fear of crime, such as those reported in the McCormick et al. (1996) study.

5.7 Environmental Factors

Environmental factors also effect levels of fear amongst university students. Fisher and Nasar (1992) found feelings of vulnerability-predicted fear, with university student respondents reporting the highest levels of fear of crime regarding locations with hidden shelters where perpetrators might hide (i.e., areas without large, open spaces), and the perceived difficulty of being able to escape. This finding opens a gap that shows that the infrastructure of institutions and the nature of their facilities are also contributing factors not only to the rate of crime, but also to the manner in which people perceive their potential for victimisation. This is because the perpetrators of crime can find spots within the institution that are conducive for their criminal behaviours. Day’s (1994) research supported the concept of fear stemming from environments that offer refuge for perpetrators, noting that the fear of crime is particularly influenced by the adequacy of lighting on university campuses.

The respondents showed that students who resided in university on-campus residences felt unsafe to walk on campus at certain times in fear that they might be potential victims. The fear was not the same for different times of the day or night, although most of them reported that they felt unsafe and scared during the night. Previous research produced similar findings. For instance, Sloan et al. (2000) found that students feared victimisation more at night than during the day. In the one-on-one interview with Dan, he responded to the question of when he felt unsafe by saying the following:

“I feel unsafe during the night. It is due to a lack of lighting and the fact that I know that perpetrators are out and about looking for people to victimise at night.”

The general conclusion drawn from these responses was that the university still had a lot to do in trying to create an atmosphere conducive for living safely in on-campus residences. The element of safety was apparently lacking and this, of necessity, would affect students’ personal, social and academic life.

5.8 Questionable Security Measures

Crime is an issue that can be effectively dealt with if given the correct attention and if the correct security measures are put in place. Security measures is a topic that kept arising in the focus group discussion as most of the respondents felt that the security system that was in place was not effective in deterring criminal activity in the residences where they resided because crime still affected them. Thando responded during the focus group by highlighting the following:

“Securities need to properly do their job and not sleep on duty. And need to actually be on their stations that they are expected to be on duty on. They also need to regularly patrol the residence premises.”

The respondents also argued that security technology should be upgraded. Security personnel alone cannot fight against crime because criminals are far ahead with technology, as they know how to manipulate security systems in order to gain access to a facilities and even residences where they will find their victims. An example of how easily security systems in residences can be breached was one respondent’s narrative of how easy it was to gain access to his room by opening the door with plastic cut from a bottle.

5.9 Measures to Curb Crime

Much was discovered about the issue of crime in university on-campus residences, which led to the discussion of what could be done to deal with crime because it is an issue that affects all residents. Pollard and Whitaker (1993) argue that the effectiveness of methods for reducing campus violence depends on the specific strategies used, how they are implemented, and the atmosphere in which they are implemented. The respondents had ideas that fell mostly within the range of security as they shared how they thought security measures could be evaluated for prospective upgrading. According to Turner and Torres (2006), it is possible to prevent crime by making structural changes to one's environment. This statement is relevant to this study because many of the suggestions that the respondents came up with revolved around structural development and structurally renovating the security system.

The respondents were then asked to offer suggestions on what could be done to deal with the issue of the crimes that plagued on-campus residents. During both the focus group and the on-one interviews the respondents offered ideas on how the issue of crime could be combated by recommending the following:

- It is important to have surveillance cameras from the point of entry into the residence, which are gated, as well as in the corridors of residences so that interactions would be captured on record in order to trace any act of crime and to deal with it. Images of outsiders who enter residences unlawfully may also be captured for further action.
- Security staff need to be monitored, managed and trained effectively so that they will be empowered to perform their duties efficiently. Monitoring of security stations is vital. Regular patrols of the residence premises is also a necessity.
- Turnstiles will really help with catching perpetrators of crime because if the perpetrator is a non-student it means they will not be familiar with entry and exit points, making it easy to catch them when they attempt crime in campus residences.
- Because residences are built like halls, surveillance camera footage should actually monitor constantly from a central point because security staff members are stationed at the entrance and have no idea what happens in the passages of residences.

- It is important to ensure that there are no dark, unlighted areas on campus and in the vicinity of residences. Providing proper lighting and cutting down thick shrubs should be done as matters of urgency.
- More security staff should be employed and each floor of the residences should be patrolled by security staff.
- Security staff need to be mobile and actually patrol the area. More surveillance cameras are required.
- The locking system of doors needs to be changed.
- Unauthorised sleepovers should not be allowed.
- The security personnel need to be evaluated and the security around residences should be upgraded.
- One respondent commented: “I think it would be a good initiative for our swiping systems to be evaluated and to give access to only one person to swipe in at a time and once only. Security should also adopt precautions to restore a safe environment, meaning security systems.”

5.8 Conclusion

From the analyses of the data gathered, one could deduce that a lot needs to be done about crime as it has escalated to both social and environmental issues that students need to face on a daily basis. The students’ reports and suggestions provided insight into where the gaps existed and where developments would be needed not only to curb, but ultimately to eradicate crime in on-campus residences. The findings revealed different aspects of crime that tended to overshadow other aspects, for example an overriding sense of fear among students of falling victim to crime and their tendency to view more serious crimes as ‘more impactful’ than less serious and petty crimes, despite the fact that the latter types are crimes that occur on an almost daily basis. However, as there is a paucity of research on these topics, it is suggested that researchers will learn a lot from studies such as this one and will thus know where to focus their research in future.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This study was conducted with the aim of exploring the perceptions that university students had about the types and nature of acts of crime in university on-campus residences. This chapter highlights the general conclusions that were drawn from the analyses of the collected data. Recommendations based on the findings of this study are also offered.

6.2 General Conclusions

Underpinned by the methodological framework of this study, general conclusions were drawn which were guided by the following objectives that the researcher aimed to address:

- To investigate the nature and frequency of crimes committed in university campus residences.
- To determine the types of crimes that occurred in campus residences.
- To investigate who the perpetrators of crime in campus residences were; and
- To discover the effects of crime on students residing in campus residences.

6.2.1 The nature and frequency of crimes committed in on-campus residences

This study shows that the perceived types of crime that occurred in residences were not serious in nature. This was gathered from the reports respondents made that, to their knowledge, none of the crimes in residences had resulted in injury or death. It was observed that the types of crimes that affected residents were primarily 'petty' crimes such as theft and burglaries in which valuable items and clothing were stolen. However, the perception among the students that they were victims or potential victims of crime resulted in trauma and fear that caused stress and anxiety. The frequency of these crimes was intermittent as they did not occur on a daily basis but were mostly opportunistic. It could therefore be established that although incidences of crime did occur in the university's on-campus residences, these facilities were not perpetual crime zones as crime occurred mostly opportunistically at peak times when students were not in their rooms, which offered opportunities for burglaries in particular.

6.2.2. The types of crimes that occurred in campus residences

The atmosphere that was maintained throughout the study regarding the types of crime was on a same level of explanation for majority of the respondents. It was concluded that three types of crimes occurred most frequently which were theft, break-ins (burglary in room), and reported cases of rape. The respondents surmised that at least eight out of ten students were likely to be victims of theft while residing in university on-campus residences. The types of theft that had occurred varied from food being stolen in the refrigerators that the students shared to theft of laundry where someone's clothes were stolen while doing their laundry.

Another type of crime that was reported was room break-ins (burglary). This type of crime normally occurred during the day when students were away attending classes. Perpetrators would gain access to rooms illegally and help themselves to valuables such as laptops, clothes and electronic devices, just to mention a few. Access was easily gained by using the swiping system: the perpetrator would cut a strip of plastic from a two litre bottle and swipe it through the slot at the door to open it without a key. This practice was learnt from other students who used this technique to open their doors when they had locked themselves out. Other techniques involved using similar keys to open a padlock of the same brand and size and even breaking off padlocks.

Ordinary cases of sexual assault and coercion were concluded to be really problematic because they were commonly overlooked and not dealt with appropriately. The respondents used the words sexual assault interchangeably with rape. Rape is a serious offence that affects students who reside in on-campus residences and it is a serious crime that occurs with increasing frequency. Forms of sexual harassment occur when mostly females are taken advantage of by fellow male associates either by manipulating them and promising them services (accommodation, fancy possessions) or by bluntly just entering their rooms and trying to force themselves on the student. It was also concluded that most of these cases reportedly happened while the victim was intoxicated and the offender forced her to engage in sexual intercourse against her will. It appeared that many of these rape cases were alcohol-related.

6.2.3 The perpetrators of crime in on-campus residences

Because security personnel would not discuss cases with students or reveal crime statistics, it meant that the profile of perpetrators of crime was based on observation rather than fact. The study found that there were two types of perpetrators of crime in university on-campus

residences. The general assumption was that registered students were the ones who committed crimes such as theft and burglary. It was also found that students who committed these crimes were driven by drug and alcohol use which altered their cognition and behaviour. Frequent visitors and students who slept over at the residences without authorisation were deemed to be the ones that caused chaos. They were referred to in a derogatory tone as ‘squatters’ because they did not rent rooms but stayed over with their friends.

The second type of perpetrator was people from the surrounding community. These were the people that might be unemployed or poverty-stricken who then invade on-campus residences with the aim of stealing valuables to later sell to make ends meet or to just gain wealth. The problem with such outsiders was that they could not be barred from entering residences because visitors were allowed. There are cafeterias in some of the on-campus residences which would make it easy for perpetrators to access the premises with the excuse that they were customers. The respondents felt that such people could be suspected of stealing from and raping students.

It must be stated at this point that none of the students could corroborate any accusations with evidence of any other resident or person from outside having been arrested and incarcerated for committing crimes in residences. It is therefore acknowledged that all ‘accusations’ were in fact perceptions arising from rumour and uncorroborated suspicion.

6.2.4 The effects of campus crime on students who reside in on-campus residences.

The study revealed that campus crime was indeed a matter that affected all students who resided in on-campus residences. Crime affected students emotionally, socially and academically. Students reported that they didn’t feel safe while on campus and even in their respective residences. This resulted in students changing their behaviour by withdrawing from social activities that required them to leave their rooms when they were not attending classes. Students who had been victims and also those who had witnessed crime victimisation in their residences were often left traumatised. This trauma built up and affected the students’ academic life. Likewise, those who were witnesses of crime or who knew people who had shared their experiences of victimisation were left in fear, thinking that they might still be potential victims. Broadly speaking, this affected the atmosphere in the residences as it was reported that many students lived in fear because they had little trust in the security system and staff that should protect and safeguard them from harm.

6.3 Recommendations

Knowledge is power. Based on the findings and drawing from the students' suggestions for dealing with crime in university on-campus residences, the following recommendations are made:

- The university serves a community of people that is much larger than only its students. Access cannot be denied to people who wish to properly make use of the university's facilities just because others choose to misuse it. What needs to be done is that security measures to prevent crime need to be upgraded. A proactive system needs to be installed that will deter perpetrators of crime from even thinking of committing a criminal act in or around university facilities.
- Surveillance cameras are a good start to ensuring that all activities are monitored. This will deter perpetrators of crime from committing criminal acts because they know they will get caught.
- Visibility of security guards is key to deterring criminal activity. This could be done by making sure that security personnel patrol the entire area at all times in branded uniforms.
- In light of the consistent change in technology that becomes more sophisticated almost by the day, the importance of upgrading security technology to meet both environmental and technological challenges must be reiterated. For example, monitoring entry to the institution such as at main gates, library entrances and residence entrances will be much more effective if a fingerprint system is used. Such a system will ensure that only registered students and staff are allowed on campus. Visitors in vehicles and on foot should then be allowed entry based on an efficient control system. The check-in log book system is completely outdated and has been proven to be ineffective in deterring or dealing with perpetrators of crime.
- The locking systems of rooms need to be renewed to make sure that no break-ins can be successfully executed. This means that the locking system as a whole needs to be upgraded because both registered students and perpetrators of crime already have a way of manipulating the one currently in use.
- The proper installation of turnstiles in demarcated residence areas will be a good way of safeguarding and controlling entry to and exit from residences and will also be a good way of catching opportunistic perpetrators because they will not be familiar with the entrance and exit points of the residence.

- The students themselves need to be educated regarding their responsibilities as residents to ensure that outside friends do not compromise the safety of those legitimately residing in the residences. If the matter is not resolved, guilty parties should face a stiff fine and possible expulsion. Such practices of applying sanctions against offenders of the rights of others are successfully practised on other university campuses and could be investigated for possible implementation on campuses where crime in residences is rife.

These recommendations will make a difference in crime rates within university on-campus residences and will deter the perpetration of crime in the future. They will also ensure that students are able to feel safe while on campus and in their residences. The personal, social and academic well-being of the students will be protected concurrently.

6.4 Conclusion

University campuses and residences are perceived to have safety and security provision to make sure that no crime occurs in or around these facilities. However, students still face victimisation and fear. Students enrol in institutions with the understanding that they will be taken care of, but many fall victim to crime. This study revealed that alarming incidences of crime affect the social life and academic performance of students who attend university to seek a bright future. A lot therefore needs to be done to detect and curb incidences of crime in university on-campus residences. The different schools and faculties in a university setting must strive to be proactive in their approach to dealing with crime, and relevant staff must maintain open dialogue with the entire student population by being approachable and helpful.

The development of this country lies in an education system that permits good performance of students and the safe custody of these students in residences that are free of crime. There is a need for further research in an attempt to address the issue of crime. Researchers, university administrators, and student leadership bodies should work collaboratively to design proactive methods to deter crime and create safe academic institutions that birth professional citizens who shy away from crime, no matter what the circumstances are.

References.

- Bailey, K.D. (1982). *Methods of Social Research*, New York: The Free Press.
- Barton, A.H., and Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1979). 'Einige Funktionen von qualitativer Analyse in der Hopf and E. Weingarten (eds), *Qualitative Sozialforschung*, Stuttgart: Clett-Cotta, pp.41-89.
- Barton, M. S. Jensen., B. L. and Kaufman, J.M. (2010). *Social disorganisation theory and the college campus*.
- Becker, B. (1989), *Grundlagen soziologischer Methodologie*, Frankfurt: Selbstverlag.
- Bickel, R.D., and Lake, P.F. *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risk of College Life?* Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1990.
- Boyer, E.L. *Campus Life: In Search of Community*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Brantingham, P.J., and Brantingham, P.L. (1994). Surveying campus crime: What can be done to reduce crime and fear? *Security Journal* 5, 160-171.
- Brownlow, A. (2005). A geography of men's fear. *Geoforum*, 36, 581-592.
- Burton, D. (2000). *Research Training for Social Scientists*.
- Cheatham, H.E., and Associates. *Cultural Pluralism on Campus*. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1991.
- Coetzer, B. (2008). *Campus security demands controlled flexibility*. Hi-Tech Security Solutions. August. Available at:
- Coffey, A. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, B. (1997). *Crime in America: Perspectives on criminal and delinquent behaviour*, 2nd Edition. Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Incorporated.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routines activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588-608.

Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588-608.

Cross, K. (1976). *Accent on learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Daniel, B.V., Evans, S.G., and Scott, B.R. "Understanding Family Involvement in the College Experience Today". In B. V. Daniel and B.R.Scott (eds.), *Consumers Adverseries, and Partners: Working with the Families of Undergraduates*. *New Directions for Student Services*, no.94. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Day, K. (1994). Conceptualizing women's fear of sexual assault on campus: A review of causes and recommendations for change. *Environment and Behaviour* , 26, 742-765.

Day, K. (1994). Conceptualizing women's fear of sexual assault on campus. *Environment and Behavior*,

Fay, B. (1987). *Critical Social Science: Liberation and its Limits*.Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP.

Federal Register. (1992, July 10). 57: 30826.

Fisher, B. S., & Nasar, J. L. (1992). Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features: Prospect,refuge, and escape. *Environment and Behavior*, 24, 35-65.

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

Fisher, B.S. & Sloan, J.J. (1995). *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives*. Springfield: Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Fisher, B.S. (1995). Crime and fear on campus. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 539, 85-101.

Fisher, B.S. (1995). Crime and fear on campus. *Annals of the American Academy of*

Fisher, B.S., & Nasar, J.L. (1995). Fear spots in relation to microlevel physical clues: Exploring the overlooked. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32, 214-239.

Fisher, B.S., & Nasar, J.L. (1992). Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features: Prospect, refuge, and escape. *Environment and Behaviour*, 24, 35-65.

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

Fisher, B.S., & Wilkes, A.R.P. (2003). A tale of two ivory towers: A comparative analysis of victimization rates and risks between university students in the United States and England. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43, 339-359.

Fisher, B.S., Sloan, J.J., Cullen, F.T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the ivory tower: The level and sources of student victimisation. *Criminology*, 36, 671-710.

Fox, A.L., & Hellman, D.A. (1985). Location and other correlates of campus crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 429-444.

Fox, J., and Hellman, D. (1985). Correlates of Campus Crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 13, 429-444.

Fox, J.A., & Hellman, D.A. (1985). Location and other correlates of campus crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 429-444.

Frenske, R.H., Rund, J.A., and Contento, J.M. “Who are the New Students?” In M.J. Barr and M.K. Desler (eds), *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*. 6, 167-191.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1979), ‘Die Entdeckung gegenwartsbezogener Theories: Eine Grundstrategie qualitativer Sozialforschung’ , in C. Hopf and E. Weingarten (eds.), *Qualitative Sozialforschung*, Stuttgart: Enke.

Gover, J., Gover, A.R., Melton, D. & Swanson, R. (2008). Creating a campus security sensor and sensor system network test and training facility. Available at: <http://www.todaysengineer.org/2007/Jun/security.asp> (retrieved 24 August 2011).

Greenberg, D.F. (1977). Delinquency and the age structure of society. *Contemporary Crisis*, 1, 189-223. Halls: Perspectives of resident assistants. *Journal of College Student Development*,

Guffey, J E. (2013). National University. Crime on Campus: Can Clerys Act data from universities and Colleges be trusted?

Hartjen, C. (1979). Crime and criminalization. New York: Prager Publishers.

<http://www.securitysa.com/article.aspx?pkarticleid=5321> (retrieved 13 September 2011).

Hummer, D., & Preston, P. (2006). Target hardening the college campus through stakeholder input: Merging community and security survey. *Crime Prevention and community Safety: An International Journal*, 8(2), 118-136.

Janosik, S. M. (2001). The impact of the campus crime awareness Act of 1998 on students decision-making. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators*, 38, 348-360.

Jennings, W.G., Gover, A.R. & Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are Institutions of Higher Safe? A Descriptive Study of Campus Safety Issues and Self-Reported Campus Victimization among Male and Female College Students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18 (2): 191-208.

Jennings, W.G., Gover, A.R., & Pudrzynska, (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(2), 191-207.

King, L.A. (2003). Measures and meanings: The use of qualitative data in social and personality psychology in Sansone C., Morf, C., and Panter A., *Handbook of Methods in Social Psychology*, 173-194, New York. Sage.

Krueger, R.A. (1988). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuzel, A.J. (1992). 'Sampling in Qualitative Enquiry' , in B.F. Grabtree and W,L. Miller (eds.), *Doing Qualitative Research*, Newbury Park, CA:Sage, pp. 31-44.

Lamnek, S. (1988). *Qualitative sozialforschung*. Band 1: Methodologie; Band 2: Methoden und Techniken, Munich: Psychologie Verlags Union.

Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research from design to implementation*. New York: Open University Press.

- Lather, P. (1992), 'Critical frames in educational research; feminists and post- structural perspectives' ,*Theory into Practice*, XXXI, 2, pp. 87-99.
- Lederman, D. (1995). Colleges report rise in violent crimes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. February 3, 1995. 31-42.
- Levine, A., and Cureton, J.S. When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College National On-Campus Report, 30(2), 2002, 4-5.
- Lewis, L., Farris, E., Greene, B. (1997). Campus crimes and security at postsecondary education institutions. Washington, D.C.: US. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Lofland, J. and Lofland, L.H. (1984). *Analysing Social Settings*, 2nd edn. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- McCormick, N., Nadeau, R., Provost, J., Gaeddert, W., & Sabo, A. (1996). Feelings of safety, fears, and knowledge and the use of public safety resources, *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 26(3), 15-18, 32-33.
- McPheters, L.R. (1978). Econometric analysis of factors influencing crime on campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6, 47-52.
- Merton, R.K. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociologist Review*, 3, 672-682.
- Michael, J., and Adler, M. (1933). *Crime, Law and Social Science*. New York. Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative Data analysis: A Source Book of New Methods*. London: Sage.
- National Institute of Health (NIH). (2014). DrugFacts: Nationwide trends. Retrieved from www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugfacts/nationwide-trends.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (1987) "The definitive record of the English language".
- Palmer, C. J. (1996 May/June). Violence and other forms of victimization in resident
- Paulson, A., & Scherer, R. (2007). How safe are college campuses? *Christian Science Monitor*, 18,1.

Perroti, J. A. (2007). The role of the campus police and security department in the 21st century. (Pp. 173-184). In J.F. Jackson & M.C. Terrell, (eds). *Creating and maintaining safe college campuses: A sourcebook for evaluating & enhancing safety programs*. Virginia: Stylus.

Pezza, P.E & Bellottie, A. (1995). College campus violence: Origins, impacts, and responses. *Educational Psychology Review*. 7(1). 105-123.

Pile, S. (1990). *The Private Farmer: Transformation and Legitimation in Advanced Capitalist Agriculture*. Aldershot: Dartmouth. *Political and Social Science*, 539: 85-101.

Pluddemann, A., Parry, C. D., Myers, B., & Bhana, A. (2004). Ecstasy use in South Africa: findings from the South African Community Epidemiology Network on Drug Use (SACENDU) project. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 39(1), 87–105.

Rengert, G.F., Mattson, M.T. & Henderson, K.D. (2001). *Campus security: Situational crime prevention in high-density environments*. Criminal Justice Press: Monsey.

Rock, P. 'On becoming a victim', in C. Hoyle and R. Young (eds.). *New Visions of victims*, 3rd.ed. Oxford: Hart Publishing). 2002, pp.1-22.

Sandbox Networks Inc. (2016). *Timeline of worldwide school and mass shootings*. Retrieved from www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0777958.html .

Sandeen, A.C. "Developing Effective Campus and Community Relationships." In M.J. Barr and M.K. Desler (eds.). *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

SAPA. 2012. *Protests close UKZN campus*. Independent online. 23 August 2012. Available at <http://www.iol.co.za/news/crime-courts/protests-close-ukzn-campus-1.13>

Tseng, C.H., Duane, J. and Hadipriono, F. (2004). Performance of campus parking garages in Preventing Crime. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities* 18(1): 21-28. 68664 (retrieved 25 September 2012).

Shaw, C.R. & McKay, H.D. (1972). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shoemaker, D. (1990). *Theories of Delinquency*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Simons, H. & Usher, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Situated ethics in education research*. London: Routledge and Falmer.

Sloan, J. (1992). Campus crime and campus communities: An analysis of crimes known to campus police and security. *Journal of Security Administration*, 15(1),31-47.

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

Sloan, J.J. (1992). Campus crime and campus communities: An analysis of crimes known to campus police and security. *Journal of Security Administration*, 15, 31-39.

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

Sloan, J.J., Fisher, B.S., & Wilkins. (1994). Reducing perceived risk and fear of victimization on campus: A panel study of faculty members, staff, and students. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 81-107.

Tappan, P.W. (1947). 'Who is the Criminal?' , *American Sociological Review*, 12(1): 96-102.

Tibbetts, S.G. *Criminological Theory*. (2009).

Tseng, C.H., Duane, J., & Hadipriono. (2004). Performance of campus parking garages in preventing crime. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 18, 21-28.

Turner, K.B., Torres, A. (2006). Campus safety: Perceptions and experiences of women students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 20-36.

Turrentine, C.G., Schnure, S.L., Ostroth, D.D., and Ward-Roof , J.A. "The Parent Project: What Parents Want from the College Experience". *NASPA Journal*, 2000, 38(1), 31-43.

University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN). (2010). Crime statistics by campus - 2010 (all campuses). Available at: http://rms.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/Crime_Stats_2010/Crime_Statistics_All_Campuses.sflb.aspx (retrieved 25 August 2011).

Vold, G. & Bernard, T. (1986). *Theoretical Criminology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Volkwein, J.F., Szelest, B.P., & Lizotte. (1995). The relationship of campus crime to campus and student characteristics . *Research in Higher Education*, 36, 647-670.

Warr, M. (1980). The accuracy of public beliefs about crime. *Social Forces*, 59, 456-470.

Warr, M. (1990). Dangerous situations: Social context and fear of victimization. *Social Forces*, 68, 891-907.