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ABSTRACT

FACILITATION OF SAFE SCHOOLS

by Margaret Joachim Pepper

May 2007

This study analyzed the impact of several violence prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement) on school climate in determining the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings. This study additionally analyzed the impact of surveillance cameras along with the specified violence prevention measures on school climate in determining the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings of a local convenience sample. The relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, parental involvement, and the level of order and discipline in school buildings was found to be statistically significant based on analysis of a multiple correlation coefficient, $R = -.02$, $p = .04$. A standard multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the prediction of the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings based upon the identified prevention measures, specifically the presence of employed security guards, installed metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement on school campuses in a national sample. Regression results show that the linear combination of security guards, metal detectors, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes,
intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement statistically significantly predicted satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings, $R^2 = .12$, $F(9, 10484) = 163.34, p < .001$. Surveillance cameras are used in slightly more than half of the regional schools. One hundred percent of the regional sample schools require visitor sign-ins and have intercoms/telephones in classrooms. Regional sample schools are more inclined to keep exterior doors locked during the day than are national sample schools. In both samples, parents were considered actively involved in school programs. Both national and regional sample principals reported that order and discipline was maintained in school buildings. Longitudinal studies are highly recommended for future research.
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CHAPTER I
PROBLEM

Introduction

Schools should be safe, secure environments. Yet, the existence of violence on school campuses is a reality (Astor & Meyer, 2001). The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of school security measures in establishing the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings. The following security measures will be the focus of this study: the presence of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement. This information will provide scientific evidence on the effectiveness of these specified security measures in strengthening school safety. This research has the potential to positively impact the lives of stakeholders: students, parents, educators, and communities.

This study is organized consistent with the University of Southern Mississippi’s protocols for the composition of dissertations. Chapter one introduces the study and provides background information, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, delimitations of the study, definitions of related terms, and assumptions of the study. Chapter two presents the theoretical framework, an historical foundation, and a review of related literature. Chapter three discusses information about the research design, the data sets, quantitative methodology, and the data collection and analysis procedures for a national population sample and a local convenience sample. Chapter four presents the results of the analysis to answer the research questions posed in
Chapter one. Additionally, it provides descriptive comparisons between the nationally representative sample and the local convenience sample. Chapter five presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and a discussion of the potential implications of those findings.

Background

Columbine—the word alone speaks volumes to most Americans and serves as a chilling reminder of the potential for horrifying violence in schools. Recent school violence has prompted serious concern from stakeholders—students, parents, educators, and communities (Welsh, 2000). The first priority of schools is to have a safe environment (Bucher & Manning, 2005). School officials are compelled to cultivate a climate of safety. In a sense, school safety is the ultimate form of proactive management of behavior.

A definition by K. T. Bucher and M. L. Manning provides detailed criteria as to exactly what constitutes a safe school:

A safe school is one in which the total school climate allows students, teachers, administrators, staff, and visitors to interact in a positive, non-threatening manner that reflects the educational mission of the school while fostering positive relationships and personal growth. (Bucher & Manning, 2005, p. 55)

School climate can influence order and/or disorder on a school campus. Welsh provides insight on school climate as follows:

The climate of a school includes the unwritten beliefs, values, and attitudes that become the style of interaction between students, teachers,
and administrators. School climate sets the parameters of acceptable behavior among all school actors, and it assigns individual and institutional responsibility for school safety. (Welsh, 2000, p. 89)

School-based violence prevention and reduction initiatives should focus attention and scrutiny toward the establishment of a healthy school climate. Conscious efforts on the part of administrators, teachers, parents, students, and community agencies collaboratively to plan prevention and intervention strategies can improve school safety and reduce school disorder (Welsh, 2000). School climate can play a critical role in the effective interaction and teamwork of all stakeholders resulting in schools becoming safe havens (Dupper & Meyer-Adams, 2002).

Violence in any form is completely unacceptable in schools and is a growing cause for concern not just in the United States, but also throughout the world (Zeira, Astor, & Benbenishty, 2004). Precisely defining school violence is a challenge. The definition of school violence should include deliberation with intention to harm. The consummation of such intent can result in any or all of the following: property damage, physical injury, or psychological injury (Astor & Meyer, 2001). Furthermore, the definition should encompass bullying behaviors (Gumpel & Meadan, 2000).

Factors associated with the risks of school violence are many and can originate from multiple sources. For instance, factors can include poor interaction with parents, unhealthy relationships with teachers, conflict between peers, low self-esteem, gang activity, bullying, perceived victimization of bullying, use of drugs or alcohol, access to weapons, and perceived stress (Malecki & Demaray, 2003). Social change may be an important consideration in understanding school violence and recent school shootings.
Americans of all ethnic backgrounds have become highly concerned about guns and gang violence in schools since the 1980’s (Hagan et al., 2002). Recent government statistics report an increase in gangs and gang activity in schools (Thompkins, 2000). Mental illness, assault, murder, and suicide can occur at any given time in any school. This disconcerting reality places stakeholders at risk. The urgency of this serious concern warrants immediate attention.

One of the most alarming types of school violence is the use of a firearm against students and/or staff members. Public concern over school shootings is understandably high. Much of this concern has been due to frustration associated with the inability to predict such tragedies. While lethal violence in schools is rare, the general public has rightfully demanded information on its causes and its prevention (Harding, Fox, & Mehta, 2002). Past school crimes in Colorado, Oregon, Virginia, Mississippi, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Pennsylvania are unsettling (May & Dunaway, 2000). School violence is a harsh reality that must be remedied.

News reports of Chicago’s Tilden High School multiple-victim shooting in 1992 noted that metal detectors were not functioning at the time of the tragedy (Hagan et al., 2002). In an effort to minimize costs and disruptions, the school’s metal detectors were selectively turned off. Mayor Richard Daley criticized the random use of metal detectors in schools. He pleaded for consistent utilization of metal detectors by emphatically stating, “Had metal detectors been used routinely at Tilden, Delondyn Lawson’s killer might have been deprived of his weapon—or at least forced to use it elsewhere.” (Hagan et al., 2002, p. 227)
Clearly, school based violence exists, and can result in devastating consequences for students, teachers, and school climate. Causes of school violence are varied, and overt manifestations can be diverse. School violence is deliberate and can result in intentional harm to property and people.

Statement of the Problem

Violence in schools adversely impacts the educational process. Children are affected in multiple ways by school violence, both globally and locally (Zeira, Astor, & Benbenishty, 2004). It is increasingly important to reduce and prevent violence in schools. Since causes of school violence are complex, one cannot expect solutions to be simple. As with solutions for many complex problems, anti-violence strategies must be implemented with extreme care and deliberation (Welsh, 2000). Because the presence of violence in schools has not surfaced overnight, its eradication will not occur instantly. A scientific, research-based approach reduces uncertainty in problem solving and saves valuable time. Predictors of violence must be purposefully analyzed. Efforts to craft solutions should be collaborative; input from stakeholders is important and vital (Caulfield, 2000). Viable solutions are imperative; simply stated, schools should be safe places.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to help define if the specified school safety solutions are effective for improving school safety. This study will analyze the impact of several violence prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement) on school climate in
determining the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings.

Despite an increased concern for school violence, it is surprising that so little empirical research has actually been conducted on the topic. Very few studies have focused on how schools use violence prevention measures to strategically prevent and reduce school violence. The information in this study will provide research-based evidence on the utility of such measures in strengthening safety in schools. Such findings have the potential to positively impact the lives of students, parents, educators, and community stakeholders.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be examined in this study:

Research Question 1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parental involvement and the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Research Question 2: Do certain prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parental involvement) statistically significantly predict the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Research Question 3: How does the national sample of administrator questionnaire responses compare to the regional sample of administrator questionnaire responses, including the additional measure of surveillance cameras?
Delimitations of the Study

This study will be confined to a nationally representative sample of principals from both private and public schools attended in 2003-2004 by one or more fifth-grade students taking part in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K). All school administrator participants who answered the questions on the survey completely were included in this study. These school administrators completed the self-administered questionnaires during the Spring 2004 data collection (fifth grade). The response rate was 96.4 percent. This administrator questionnaire was used as the source of all data relative to the dependent variable and the independent variables in this study.

Additionally, this administrator questionnaire was submitted to the principals of the 53 public schools housing fifth-grade students in three counties of a southeastern state. The inclusion of the local area of interest will allow descriptive comparisons to be made between the nationally representative sample and the local convenience sample. The addition of the question about surveillance cameras invites further insight into one of the latest security technologies being used in the regional area.

Definitions

*Lockdown drills* are rehearsed safety drills whereby students and staff members lock all doors and strategically place themselves out of plain view in case of intruder(s) on school campuses.

*A safe school* is one in which the climate allows students, teachers, staff members, and visitors to interact in a positive, non-threatening manner that reflects the educational mission while fostering positive relationships and personal growth.
School climate includes the unwritten beliefs, values, and attitudes that become the style of interaction between students, parents, and administrators.

School security measures, for the purpose of this study, are intentional physical alteration of the school environment potentially to increase school safety. These may include some or all of the following: the presence of school security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, and intercoms/telephones in classrooms.

School violence is deliberate aggression or activity intending to cause physical or emotional harm, injury, or damage to person/s or property while at school or when attending school functions.

Violence prevention programs are curriculum designed to increase student social competence and to decrease aggressive behavior.

Assumptions

The ECLS-K Administrator Questionnaire offers an opportunity to utilize an instrument deemed valid and reliable for a large, national sample population. Principal participation was voluntary and anonymous. Although principals had the opportunity to refuse participation, 96.4 percent of the school administrators responded to the survey. Careful review for range and logic consistency by coders validates the assumption that the respondents provided honest responses concerning their perceptions of safety in their schools. Likewise, it is assumed that principals in the regional convenience sample answered the questionnaire honestly. In both cases, the dependent and independent variables are assumed to be accurate reflections of the respondents’ perceptions.
Summary

Violence on school campuses is an ongoing national and worldwide problem that must be remedied. School violence negatively impacts education. Surprisingly, little empirical research has been conducted on the facilitation of safe schools. Solutions must be skillfully crafted based on the scientific collection of data. Determinations can then be made defining security measures that effectively impact safe schools. This study strives to answer three research questions to establish whether or not specific security measures statistically strengthen safety in schools, both nationally and regionally. Delimitations include a large national population sample, as well as a local convenience sample. Assumptions include honest survey perceptions from principal respondents. Definitions are noted, which lead to the following theoretical foundation and review of current research and literature on probable causes and possible solutions to school violence.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter two is to provide a theoretical framework on which to base the research study. A brief historical review establishes the presence of school violence for centuries. Relevant literature is reviewed in order to provide a greater foundation for recent interest in scientific and quantitative study of safety in schools.

Theoretical Framework

In addressing controversial human concerns, educators and researchers derive benefit from a strong theoretical framework. A concern for the growth and full development of the whole person permeates consideration of issues surrounding safety in schools. Maslow, an American psychologist, conceptualized a hierarchy of human needs. According to this theory, each person possesses innate needs that must be fulfilled before becoming self-actualized (Maslow & Lowery, 1998). Maslow considers a self-actualized person to be a fully developed, fully functional, and psychologically healthy person (Farmer, 2001). Maslow's hierarchy of needs is sequenced as follows: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1954). Basic physiological needs include food, water, shelter, and rest. Based on the hierarchy, once these basic needs are fulfilled a person craves a sense of safety to include freedom from fear, violence, and abuse. Needs for friendships, love, and a sense of belonging follow next in the hierarchy. Beyond these needs, a person requires a positive self-image and respect from others. According to Maslow, when a person's lower needs are met, that person is capable of
achieving his or her full potential, which he defines as self-actualization (Maslow & Lowery, 1998).

These hierarchical needs have potential applicability to education. By providing daily meals to students, schools can essentially accommodate some basic physiological needs. Additionally, school nurses are capable of providing basic first aid services to students. School counselors can teach coping skills and support as students strive to build healthy relationships and self-esteem. Deliberate, methodical nurturing of school climates by staff members can potentially result in a sense of safety and security. The combination of these resources can possibly contribute to students becoming fully functional, or according to Maslow, self-actualizing (Maslow & Lowery, 1998).

Historical Foundations of the Problem

Millions of students worldwide are victims of violence in schools (Astor et al., 2002). According to recent research literature, there has been dramatic growth in school violence since the 1990’s (Astor & Meyer, 2001). Students should feel safe and secure in schools. Psychological stress and physical harm should not be student concerns when attending school (Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002). News journalism and media reports are rife with dramatic stories of problematic youth and their actions (Achenbach, Dumenci, & Rescorla, 2002). Risk factors are many, can affect many people, and can originate from multiple sources.

School violence is not a new sociological phenomenon. Historically, violence in schools has been cited for centuries (Volokh & Snell, 1998). As early as 2000 B.C., clay tablets from Sumer describe misbehavior by youth. In 17th century France, schoolchildren were often armed and physically beat their teachers (Volokh & Snell,
1998). Between 1775 and 1836, student violence was so serious in England that teachers sought assistance from the military. In colonial times, American students in over 300 schools displayed rebellious behaviors (Volokh & Snell, 1998). In 1837, nearly 400 schools in Massachusetts reported disciplinary problems (Volokh & Snell, 1998). One of the greatest acts of school violence occurred in 1926 in Bath, Michigan. Andrew Kehoe, school board treasurer and part-time school custodian, killed 44 and wounded 90 in one of the worst bombing incidents in American history (Ellsworth, 1927). In the 1940’s, school disciplinary problems included talking, chewing gum, making noise, running, cutting in line, and dressing improperly. Comparably, school problems requiring discipline in 1995 included drug abuse, gang violence, alcohol abuse, weapons, and assault (Osofsky & Osofsky, 2001). School violence is not a new phenomenon (Osofsky & Osofsky, 2001).

School Climate and Security

School Climate

School climate research indicates that a positive school climate can impact and decrease the level of school disorder. A study conducted in 11 middle schools during the 1994-95 school years in the School District of Philadelphia, the fifth-largest school system in the United States, noted that deliberate school leadership in collaborating with all stakeholders to cultivate a positive school climate could prevent and reduce school disorder. A 118-question survey was developed to measure school climate and its outcomes. Reliability and validity of this Effective School Battery (ESB) was established across diverse age and race subgroups and urban and rural settings (Welsh, 2000).

Student perceptions of school safety, rule clarification, rule fairness, respect for students,
student influence on school affairs, and planning and action were measured. School disorder measures that were examined included safety of the school environment, student victimization, student avoidance, self-reported offending, and student misconduct. Of the five psychosocial climate variables, respect for students and fairness of rules significantly predicted lower levels of misconduct. Interestingly, the 11 schools differed significantly on school climate measures and levels of disorder. Nonetheless, this study identifies misconduct as having the greatest potential for school-based school violence prevention and intervention strategies. A significant, positive relationship was noted between respect for students and a higher perceived sense of safety (Welsh, 2000). This study notes the importance of cultivating a positive school climate as a result of administrative leadership in order to prevent disorder and school violence.

Likewise, school climate may be considered safe in some areas, such as classrooms, and be considered unsafe in other areas, such as cafeterias, restrooms, and playgrounds (Astor & Meyer, 2001). While the tendency of most research is to focus on problematic behavior and its prevention, some studies suggest that school violence is associated with specific locations on campuses. Three studies were conducted on the high-risk spaces in which school violence occurs. The studies included elementary, middle, and high schools from urban, suburban, and inner city locations containing students and teachers from diverse ethnicity. Methodologies included quantitative, qualitative, interviews, and observations. Sample populations included students, teachers, parents, and principals. The first study conducted group interviews with students, teachers, and administrators from five high schools. The second study conducted individual interviews of 100 teachers from five elementary schools and two
middle schools in urban high-violence areas. The final study interviewed 400 students from the same five elementary schools and two middle schools. In spite of demographic differences among the schools, violence locations were noted to be remarkably similar, and violent events occurred at similar times of the day among all of the schools (Astor & Meyer, 2001). Problematic times of day as noted by these studies were before and after school, during transitions between classes, and during lunch/recess break. Specific trouble spots confirmed by the studies included cafeterias, playgrounds, hallways, bathrooms, staircases, and parking lots. The most potentially violent events occurred in areas of low supervision. The studies specified that substitute teachers, part-time or temporary employees, temporary security guards, and volunteers were considered by students to be ineffective in their supervisory capabilities as compared to teachers and administrators (Astor & Meyer, 2001). These combined findings from students, teachers, and administrators from elementary, middle, and high schools suggest that the social context and climate of schools can impact the tendency and prevalence of school violence. This research implies the importance of school leaders carefully training part-time and temporary employees and volunteers in an effort to cultivate a positive school climate. Furthermore, this study verifies the importance of school leaders to deliberately cultivate and nurture a positive school climate.

Other research suggests that a school-wide approach to direct supervision of students and the prevention of problematic behavior had a significant impact on student behavior and school climate. Direct supervision of students was cited as a vital component of a comprehensive school-based program for the prevention of problem behaviors (Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002). The two-year study involved
seven elementary schools in one school district. Elements of the program included a school-wide discipline approach, individualized reading tutorials, conflict resolution, a family management video program, and an individualized behavior intervention plan. One of the most emphasized strategies was focused on improving the use of space. Modifications were made to improving unsafe physical arrangements of the school environment. Consideration was given to congestion in common areas, eliminating obscure areas, facilitating surveillance, and overall student safety. Staff members focused primarily on student supervision upon arrival, during the lunch/recess rotation, and during dismissal. A task analysis of these routines in common areas was conducted. Specific procedural routines were mapped out and taught to students with high levels of teacher supervision. Staff members received explicit training in the supervision of common areas. Specific instruction was also provided on expected corrective responses to problem behaviors. Emphasis was placed on issuing positive, constructive directions to students, rather than negative, punitive reprimands. By utilizing both certified and classified employees to directly supervise students, a more ideal ratio of supervisors to students was established. This component established more evenly balanced supervision (Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002).

Project analysis of the overall effects of the study included a cohort group of students who exhibited problem behaviors and a criterion group of students who did not exhibit problem behaviors. The Behavioral Emotional Rating Scale (BERS) was used to obtain pretest and posttest scores for target and criterion students to determine the effects of the project on social competence. Statistical analysis revealed that the social competence of target students improved significantly. However, the social competence
of criterion students remained relatively stable. In all cases, the teachers reported satisfaction with the project. Another important finding was the significant decline in administrative discipline (Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002). Providing direct adult supervision to juveniles, especially those considered being high-risk, has been shown by research to prevent and reduce crime (Crosse et al., 2001).

A system-wide approach was employed in studying school-based violence prevention policies and intervention programs in Canada from 1995-2002 (Day et al., 2002). The study noted that school board policies governing violence prevention in schools should be reviewed and evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure their enduring appropriateness and effectiveness (Day et al., 2002). The study was limited to school boards in larger urban areas, because of the perception that violence among youth is greater in those areas. As a result, 210 out of 740 school boards were surveyed. Of these, 126 responded to the survey, which was a 60% response rate (Day et al., 2002). In addition to the surveys, other methods of obtaining information were utilized. An article was published in a national newsletter describing the study and soliciting information about policies and programs. School board members were contacted about distinctive policies and appealing programs. Researchers involved in evaluating violence-prevention programs were also contacted, which proved to yield valuable information. The content of the policies was systematically analyzed. Based on analysis, categories were developed as related to literature on school-based violence. A coding sheet was developed, and equal weight was given to each category. Results of the survey responses indicated that 92.1 percent of the school boards were involved in school violence prevention via policies and/or programs (Day et al., 2002). The most frequently
occurring policy governed suspension/expulsion as noted by 93.6 percent of the school boards. Other frequently occurring policies involved fighting (M=58.7%), bullying (M=66.8%), weapons (M=63.2%), and substance abuse (M=55.0%). Less frequently occurring policies covered vandalism (M=50.0%), sexual harassment (M=47.6%), and theft (M=39.9%) (Day et al., 2002). In the end, it was concluded that school board policies should be consistent, congruent, comprehensive, and involve community focus. Furthermore, school board resources should provide supplemental programs for students and address causes of violence. School leaders should involve students in creating violence prevention policies. Student involvement would lead to empowerment and ownership of school violence solutions. When students feel empowered, school climate is potentially impacted in a positive way. This study concluded that school board policies governing violence prevention in schools should be studied on an ongoing basis, and students should ideally be involved in this process (Day et al., 2002).

The U.S. Department of Education, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Justice, initiated a study in which principals, teachers, and students were surveyed about various topics, including school climate. The Study on School Violence and Prevention during the 1997-98 school years investigated the extent of violence in schools and efforts to prevent it. The study sampled 1,287 elementary, middle, and high schools from rural, urban, and suburban areas recruited through an extensive mail and telephone solicitation (Crosse et al., 2001). Principals, program providers, teachers, and students were surveyed. Principals were questioned about leadership, organization, discipline incidents, problem behavior, school climate, and funding. Program providers answered questions on training, program selection, and implementation. Teacher surveys focused on school
safety, victimization, school climate, and prevention measures. Students were questioned about school climate, problem behavior, and safety (Crosse et al., 2001). The data were analyzed, and reliability and validity were established. Descriptive and inferential statistics showed that middle schools encountered more problem behavior than other schools. Elementary schools had the fewest serious incidents. Victimization of students and teachers was greatest at middle schools. Surveillance and security received the highest quality implementation ratings. While there were many prevention activities in place, the quality of these was poorly implemented. A need for improved predictable and consistent disciplinary practices was cited. Few schools received a “best practices” rating for responses to misconduct. Overall planning and use of research was noted to be weak. The study concluded that emphasis for schools should shift to fewer but higher quality violence prevention efforts (Crosse et al., 2001).

A well-defined partnership between schools and parents can significantly reduce school violence (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003). Truly comprehensive behavior systems involve collaborative teams of educators, related professional agents, and families. Such a system fosters comprehensive and systematic plans for proactively addressing student behaviors (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003). The PAR Model, which refers to preventing, acting upon, and resolving troubling behavior, has been documented through research at the Johns Hopkins University to work effectively for more than a decade (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003). The PAR team is composed of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, related professional agents and service providers, and parents. The PAR process is effective because faculty, administrators, and parents are given the opportunity to design systems that meet the unique considerations of their respective
schools. Stakeholders are empowered to apply research-based interventions to school-wide plans for problem behaviors (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003). Ultimately, relationships among stakeholders are enhanced and students benefit (Rosenberg & Jackman, 2003).

Parent involvement was the focus of recent research by Epstein (Pate & Andrews, 2006). Multiple measures of parent involvement were identified and studied. As a result, a framework composed of six types of involvement was created. Included were the following: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community (Pate & Andrews, 2006). It was concluded that parent involvement leads not only to improved academic success, but also to improved school attendance (Pate & Andrews, 2006). Parent involvement was also found to improve student emotional stability and foster appropriate student behavior (Pate & Andrews, 2006).

Promoting prosocial student behavior was the focus of recent research (Mooij, 1999). Seven secondary schools with high student aggression incidences were selected for participation. Four of these schools were designated as intervention schools, and three schools were control schools. Students and teachers completed pretest and posttest questionnaires. Interventions involved collaboration between teachers, staff, and researchers to increase student participation and responsibility of prosocial behavior (Mooij, 1999). Primary focus was given to teachers facilitating positive socialization between students and adults. Pretests and posttests measured aggressive student behavior and co-responsibility of class rules between students and teachers. Longitudinal multiple
regression analysis showed that implementation validity of the intervention was statistically significant (Mooij, 1999). This study makes it clear that proactive intervention implementation is valid and worthwhile. It confirms that the prevention of antisocial behavior is difficult and should begin as early as possible. This study suggests the importance of parent contact and involvement. It recommends the involvement of parents, peers, and outside agencies (Mooij, 1999).

Additional research shows the positive influence that families have on school satisfaction. Successful parent-child interrelations produce positive school outcomes (Baker et al., 2003). Families impact school attitudes by modeling academic behaviors in the home. Direct teaching, structured homework sessions, and exposing children to learning opportunities outside of school critically demonstrate some of the ways in which families contribute to school satisfaction (Baker et al., 2003). Families serve as extensions of school resources, and healthy homes can influence positive school attitudes.

Students demonstrating serious emotional and behavioral concerns in schools represent a relatively small portion of the total school population. It is important to note, however, that those students are at high risk for demonstrating problem behaviors (Eber et al., 2002). More individuals than just school personnel are required to intervene. Families are required to be actively involved. Support for youth with emotional disabilities must be networked among families, teachers, and other support service providers. This wraparound process is family-centered and can increase and sustain improved behavior functioning (Eber et al., 2002). Wraparound is based on strengths and priorities as defined by family members and the child. The family is central to the wraparound process. Family voice and choice promotes a safe environment, fosters
collaborative participation, and ensures ownership of solutions across settings (Eber et al., 2002). Mandatory parental involvement including frequent interactions and improved parent-teacher communication are encouraged as a result of recent research. Parental involvement should be genuine, active, and beyond the surface level (Adams, 2000).

Research shows the important role that school leaders have in cultivating and nurturing a positive school climate. All stakeholders should be involved in the process. Collaborative involvement leads to ownership, which in turn leads to empowerment. Nonetheless, school security should not be overlooked.

School Security

There exist more school security guards in the New York public school system than are police in the city of Boston (Caulfield, 2000). Such a statement is indubitably a sad testament to the reality of school violence. The Safe Schools Act of 1994 has provided funds to many schools for the purchase of metal detectors and has paid the salary of security guards as protective strategies in response to heightened concerns about school violence (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Metal detectors and hired security officers have become common practice in schools (Welsh, 2000). The premise is that by hiring security guards and installing metal detectors on school campuses, perpetrators will be less likely to commit crimes (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Security guards in schools have been the most prominent solution to school-based shootings (Caulfield, 2000).

According to a school violence reduction model in Jamaica, dramatic violence reduction appears to be related to the presence of a security guard, referred to as an adult protective shield (Sacco & Twemlow, 1997). The Montego Bay Secondary School was
remarkably violent. It had more than 2,400 students attending classes in two shifts. In February of 1992, an intervention was put into effect involving 75 police officers. A psychiatrist led the team composed of a variety of mental health agents, who received 100 hours of training. The team consisted of social workers, psychologists, martial artists, special education teachers, and police officers. One of the police officers was assigned to the Montego Bay Secondary School. Several hundred weapons were confiscated the first week. Within six weeks, school violence was noticeably reduced. Attendance increased, and teachers and students reported feeling safer at school (Sacco & Twemlow, 1997).

The intervention stressed a hard and soft approach simultaneously. The first phase was non-threatening, firm, and simple: “Tuck in your shirt.” (Sacco & Twemlow, 1997, p. 231) The second phase was the formation of a clubhouse for formal meetings and organized recreational sports, such as soccer. A core group of student leaders became the security officer’s support network. The third phase was more direct: weapons would not be tolerated. Random searches resulted in immediate confiscation. The fourth phase linked community therapists with parents in disciplining students and offering guidance and support (Sacco & Twemlow, 1997). Unfortunately, the positive effects of this violence prevention program were quickly reversed when the school officer departed. The incidences of violence increased to their former dramatic levels, and attendance plummeted once again. A replacement officer fell short of the original police officer in effectively disciplining with dignity (Sacco & Twemlow, 1997). Thus, success appeared directly related to choosing a dynamic school officer committed to working closely with the students and the intervention team.
School discipline moved toward "zero tolerance" in the 1980's (Adams, 2000). This tough approach is based on detection and punishment of offenses involving drugs and/or weapons. To better assure administration of consequences for such offenses, schools have increased methods for detecting misconduct. Detection strategies involve security measures, including surveillance cameras, security guards, metal detectors, hall monitors, and police officers. Punishment involves exclusionary consequences, including time outs, in-school suspensions, and out of school suspensions (Adams, 2000).

According to a recent National Center for Education Statistics study, zero-tolerance policies have no impact on the reduction of school violence (Adams, 2000).

Metal detectors are considered by many school administrators to be a viable solution for deterring weapons in schools (Skiba, 2000). While hand held metal detectors allow for random sweeps of students, fixed metal detectors scan all persons entering schools. In either case, metal detectors reduce the likelihood that weapons will be smuggled onto school campuses and cause deadly violence. However, as demonstrated recently in Jonesboro, Arkansas, shooting violence can still occur outside of the school building, while still on the school grounds (Skiba, 2000).

On the other hand, some researchers ask whether increased security measures may unintentionally cultivate a climate of fear. School administrators have taken greater security measures on campuses in response to the rash of school shootings that have taken place across the country in recent years. Effective deterrents to acts of violence on school campuses include the presence of uniformed security guards, metal detectors, and surveillance cameras (Thompkins, 2000). Thompkins wonders whether it is possible for metal detectors or other security devices to have prevented the Columbine tragedies. He
asks if it is possible that the combination of increased security measures and media reports have cultivated a climate of fear in schools today. Furthermore, he asks if this climate of fear attracts some students to gangs. Admittedly, the presence of security guards, metal detectors, and cameras on school campuses may deter school violence, but they should never be the main tools for violence prevention, according to Thompkins (2000). Simply increasing school security measures does not eradicate the problem of school violence. It is important for schools to consider the negative impact that increased security measures have on students. A climate of fear may be the unintentional result. Instead of installing reactionary security measures on school campuses, proactive alternative opportunities should be made available to students to deter their attraction to gang membership (Thompkins, 2000).

Similarly, another study statistically demonstrated that commonly employed strategies used to adapt the physical environment of schools proved to be consistently unsuccessful at reducing disorder resulting in victimization (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). In response to the heightened concern about school violence, many schools have utilized security guards and metal detectors. However, victimization still occurs in spite of the presence of these security measures on school campuses (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Administrators, teachers, and fellow students can serve as protective guardians for each other while on school campuses. By providing key employees in strategic locations, schools can provide proactive supervision in an effort to exercise greater control of social challenges. Additional shielding of students from potential victimization can be provided through the use of harder strategies, including the presence of security guards, metal detectors, locked doors, visitor sign-in, and hall passes. The
1993 National Household and Education Survey, School Safety and Discipline component (NHES-SSD) was used in studying the risk factors of junior and senior high school students as victims of theft and violence at school (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). The sample population, selected via random digit dialing, was comprised of 6,427 children in grades 6 through 12 representing all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Logistic regression was used to analyze the data. Statistical analysis showed that the target-hardening strategies, some of which included security guards, metal detectors, locked doors, visitor sign-in, supervised hallways, and hall passes, had no significant impact on student bullying (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003).

Comparable research by Michalowski (2005) noted that teacher authority and parental involvement showed greater impact on school safety than did increased security measures. Michalowski assessed the relative effects that school security measures and violence prevention programs have on student misconduct and violent behavior. This study was based on criminal research of school crime and school organization. The sample population was composed of public school teachers who participated in the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (Michalowski, 2005). The large teacher population was surveyed about whether increased security measures were associated with reductions in school violence. Structural Equation Modeling was considered to be the most appropriate statistical procedure for this study because of its capability to model latent variables and measure both direct and indirect demographics. Statistical analysis showed that increased teacher authority over discipline and parental involvement significantly superseded the benefits of increased security measures (Michalowski, 2005). This research showed that student misconduct was strongly related to student violence.
Interestingly, it was noted that increased parental involvement in junior high schools was linked with less reliance on security measures. Overall, the two facets of increased teacher authority over discipline and increased parental involvement showed greater impact on school climate than did increased school security measures, which included metal detectors, video cameras, school security officers, and violence prevention programs (Michalowski, 2005).

Administrators, teachers, and fellow students can serve as protective guardians for each other while on school campuses. By providing key employees in strategic locations, schools can provide proactive supervision in an effort to exercise greater control of social challenges. Additional shielding of students from potential victimization can be provided through the use of harder strategies, including the presence of security guards, metal detectors, locked doors, visitor sign-in, and hall passes. The 1993 NHES-SSD was used in studying the risk factors of junior and senior high school students as victims of theft and violence at school (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). The sample population, selected via random digit dialing, was comprised of 6,427 children in grades 6 through 12 representing all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Logistic regression was used to analyze the data. Statistical analysis showed that the target-hardening strategies, some of which included security guards, metal detectors, locked doors, visitor sign-in, supervised hallways, and hall passes, had no significant impact on student victimization (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Those commonly employed strategies used to adapt the physical environment of schools proved consistently unsuccessful at reducing disorder resulting in victimization.
In another study, the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2004) yields information about school crime-related topics from the perspective of school administrators (Guerino et al., 2006). This survey, developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in conjunction with the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, asks principals of public schools about the frequency of crime in their schools, such as robbery, physical attacks, and thefts. The survey also inquires about crime prevention programs, policies, and discipline. SSOCS: 2004 is based on a national random sample of 3,743 public schools in the United States (Guerino et al., 2006). Questionnaires were mailed to public primary, middle, high, and combined schools and resulted in an approximately 75 percent unweighted response rate. Selected findings were noted, as follows. High schools and middle schools reported more violence than did primary schools. High schools were more likely to report the distribution of illegal drugs at school. Middle schools were more likely to report incidents of student bullying. Large schools with 1,000 or more students were less likely to have visible parent or guardian support. City schools were more likely to employ violence prevention interventions, such as individual attention and mentoring of students (Guerino et al., 2006). Many more schools drilled students on natural disaster plans (84 percent) than on school shooting plans (47 percent). Three factors were reported to limit schools’ efforts to reduce crime: inadequate alternative placements or programs, inadequate funding, and federal, state, and district policies on disciplining special education students (Guerino et al., 2006). This high-quality data proves to be timely and useful to stakeholders.
Evolving School Safety Practices

Emerging trends in school security are noted since the shootings at Columbine and since the aftermath of the terrorism of September 11, 2001 (Lafee, 2005). Schools across the nation are relying on technology for security and safety (Lafee, 2005). Many schools are citing technological benefits from surveillance cameras on campuses. Vandalism and bullying appear to be reduced. However, there is no scientific research that surveillance cameras impact more serious crimes (Lafee, 2005).

An experimental middle school in The School District of Palm Beach County in south Florida serves as a testing site for some of the newest security measures: surveillance cameras, photo identification cards for visitors printed instantly as needed, biometric scanners in classrooms that take student attendance, and an electronic card key system that can be modified anytime to allow greater or lesser access to school facilities (Lafee, 2005). The card key system has already proven to be much more economical over time than the preexisting master key system. A card can be easily modified whenever necessary at no cost. If lost, a card key can simply be invalidated (Lafee, 2005).

Iris recognition technology is being utilized at New Egypt Elementary School in Plumsted Township, New Jersey (Lafee, 2005). Visitors are greeted at the main entrance by a locked inner door and a small, gray box mounted on the wall. Directions advise visitors to look into a lens, which scans the iris. If the visitor's iris is already in the database, a door buzzes open and allows admittance. Otherwise, the door remains locked, and the visitor must buzz for assistance. An employee viewing a monitor decides whether to grant admittance (Lafee, 2005). The iris scanner is used only during regular
school hours, and all other entries are kept locked. School officials claim that the system is a huge success and provides a sense of security (Lafee, 2005).

Many schools are requiring visitors to produce a driver’s license in order to gain entry (Dawson, 2005). Will County School District 92 in Lockport is utilizing a driver’s license scanning system to permit or deny admittance onto any school campus (Dawson, 2005). The scanning system runs on laptop computers in its attendance centers. It scans a driver’s license and checks it against a national database of known child sex offenders (Dawson, 2005). If the visitor clears the database, the computer prints a badge containing the person’s name, reason for the visit, the time in and the expected departure time, and the person’s picture from the driver’s license (Dawson, 2005). The badge would additionally serve as an alert to staff if the visitor appeared in an unauthorized area of the campus. The system can also page the police department if a name from the offender’s registry tries to gain access to the campus (Dawson, 2005). Another advantage of the scanning system is the constant tracking of parents and visitors in the district’s buildings, which generates statistics valuable for school improvement plans (Dawson, 2005).

One of the newest trends in high-tech security is digital mapping systems (Seibert, 2005). Geographic mapping technology is uniting school officials with Geographic Information Systems (GIS). This Crisis Intervention Response Application (CIRA) program allows first responders to “enter” a building virtually. Digital photography allows every area of the building to be detailed in 360-degree photographic images, from which architectural plans and aerial photographs are generated (Seibert, 2005). Next, this information is stored on a CD-ROM and provided to local police and fire departments.
These rescue agencies can then access the maps and literally “see” the building inside and out before arriving at the site (Seibert, 2005).

While emerging trends in security measures cannot replace people, technology potentially enhances school security. School officials are tasked with the responsibility of the safety of children and staff. Maximum effort should be employed in striving to meet this obligation.

Further Research Needed

Other research concludes that outcome data is lacking in determining the effectiveness of school violence prevention programs. A survey was conducted by the California Research Bureau (CRB) to assess security measures and crime prevention strategies being used in California schools (Nieto, 1999). This School Safety and Security Survey designated three goals: to understand security priorities, to assess security resources, and to identify crime prevention strategies used by school districts. Input was solicited from statewide school safety administrators and professional organizations in a series of meetings. Terminology was defined, and the 22-question instrument was constructed. The survey was distributed to a representative sample of 240 school superintendents. Surveys were completed and returned by 158 of the school districts in the sample. Interviews followed to illicit additional information and obtain clarification of responses (Nieto, 1999). The CRB survey revealed that the California school districts respond to school violence in two major ways. Violence prevention curriculum is the most common approach. This involves counseling, peer mediation, and conflict resolution. Physical alteration of the environment is the other distinct approach. This involves the use of visible security officers and detection technologies, such as metal
detectors, surveillance cameras, and locks. According to the CRB survey, many school districts are using metal detecting wands to search for drugs or weapons. Searches can occur randomly and be due to reasonable suspicion. Many of the schools indicated that they rely primarily on school personnel to provide direct supervision during school hours. The study further revealed that outcome data is seriously lacking in determining the effectiveness of school violence prevention programs (Nieto, 1999).

Similarly, a three-year descriptive study was conducted in Mississippi from 1997-2000 on student and staff safety recommending the need for further research (Chikeka, 2005). The research topic was on violence and alcohol offenses occurring on school campuses as reported to the State Department of Education by elementary, middle, and high schools. Areas of concern included student arrests, placement in alternative education programs, suspensions, expulsions, drug, alcohol, and weapons offenses, and reports of child abuse. Specific incidents cited occurred in Mississippi schools as follows. On October 1, 1997 in Pearl, 16 year old Luke Woodham, known as a loner, killed his mother, then went to school and killed his girlfriend and a fellow male student. In August 2004 in Lowndes County, five high school students were arrested for selling narcotics. On October 15, 2004, .22 caliber bullets were found on a school bus in Starkville (Chikeka, 2005).

The researcher noted that high school students were expelled more often than were younger students. Student to student assaults were more prevalent among middle school students. However, the study noted an emerging assault trend among elementary students. This descriptive study revealed that across all instructional levels throughout the state, placements to alternative school programs were similar. Additionally, several
recommendations were proposed by the researcher. A drug and violence prevention tool was strongly encouraged to be developed and evaluated to scientifically determine its effectiveness. It was advised to deliberately educate legislators about the positive impact of alternative education and to lobby for increased funding for alternative education programs. Further research on the topic of student and staff safety was highly recommended (Chikeka, 2005).

An ongoing debate exists about the optimum course for ideal school security. A viable approach may need to be aligned with corporate security operations. Another solution may lie in social services collaboration. According to a National Association of Secondary School Principals recent survey, more than fifty percent of the educators polled had confiscated at least one firearm within the last two years (Robinson, 2007). This statistic clarifies the need for data to be gathered from multiple sources, so that solutions may be multifaceted.

An example of ongoing research is the parent-teacher action research (PTAR) model as facilitated by Parent Liaisons (Kay, 2007). Parent Liaisons are specially trained paraprofessionals who mediate between parents and teachers. This Achieving Behaving Caring (ABC) Project was field tested in rural New England elementary schools. This action research model incorporates observations of students, reflection, development of theories about the students' needs, and the creation of action plans for home and school (Kay, 2007). Parent Liaisons bridge effective communication in objective terms. As a result, parents become empowered, and students become successful.
Summary

Violence in schools is an irrefutable reality. While its causes can be unpredictable, its eradication must be deliberate. Surprisingly little empirical research exists on the topic of school violence. Very few scientific studies have focused on the statistical effectiveness of violence prevention measures that may significantly prevent and reduce school violence. Recent research notes the importance of cultivating a positive school climate by school leaders in order to prevent disorder and school violence. Other studies emphasize the importance of training part-time and temporary employees and volunteers in an effort to cultivate a positive school climate. Providing direct adult supervision to juveniles has also been shown by research to prevent and reduce crime. Another study concluded that school board policies governing violence prevention in schools should be reviewed and evaluated regularly, and students should ideally be involved in the process. Fewer but higher quality violence prevention efforts were emphasized in other research.

On the other hand, school security measures are a common solution to school-based violence. The presence of security guards has been shown to be an effective deterrent to crime and school violence. Metal detectors are also considered a viable solution to weapons on school campuses. However, some researchers show concern for a climate of fear as an unintentional result of increased security measures. Statistical analysis has shown that the use of some target-hardening strategies, such as security guards, metal detectors, locked doors, visitor sign-ins, supervised hallways, and hall passes, had no significant impact on student victimization. Further research on the topic of student and staff safety has been highly recommended. Emerging trends in school
security measures are utilizing technology to enhance safety. Surveillance cameras, photo identification cards, biometric scanners, electronic card keys, iris scanners, and license scanners are a few of the newest school security technologies being used. While differences of opinions exist, outcome data is seriously lacking in determining the effectiveness of school violence prevention measures. The question remains to be answered. School violence is a serious issue. Its solution must also be taken seriously.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

Chapter 3 introduces the three research questions to be answered in this study. This chapter presents information about the research design. The independent and dependent variables to be examined are identified and operationally defined. A description of the data collection process, intended statistical methods, and intended descriptive comparisons are included. The national sample participants and the data set are explained, as are the regional sample participants and data set.

The instrumentation section describes the actual Administrator Questionnaire survey, its development, and its utilization for both the national and regional samples. A copy of these instruments are included in Appendices A and B respectively. Data collection procedures are described for both the national and regional samples. A copy of the consent form is included in Appendix C. The methods of obtaining informed consent are discussed. Data analysis processes are explained, and a rationale for the selection of each procedure is provided. The research issue being investigated includes determining the significance of the relationship among school violence prevention measures and the level of order and discipline in school buildings. The school violence prevention measures being studied include security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, parent involvement, and surveillance cameras. Finally, the limitations of the study, describing the most significant threats to the internal validity of the national sample and the regional sample, are addressed.
Research Design

Variables

The source of the national data is the ECLS-K School Administrator Questionnaire, Spring 2004. This archived data is made available by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. The independent variables in this study include the following security measures: security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parent involvement. The independent variable added to the regional study is the use of surveillance cameras on school campuses as a security measure. Table 1 presents the variables, variable descriptions, value labels, and scales that were used in this study. This information is derived directly from the Administrator Questionnaire. The presence of security guards and metal detectors potentially serve as physical indicators of increased safety in schools. By keeping exterior doors locked, visitors are forced to report to the school office. Requiring visitors to sign-in and receive personal escorts may prevent unlawful entry on school campuses. Teacher supervision of students in the hallways may serve to dissuade student-to-student victimization. Requiring students to obtain hall passes may potentially reduce bullying, theft, vandalism, and aggression. Intercoms and/or telephones in classrooms may serve as a visual reminder that classrooms are directly linked to security reinforcement. Parent involvement in school programs may indicate to students and staff the existence of a healthy school climate and interaction between school and homes. Operationally, these independent variables function as security measures to strengthen safety in schools.
Table 1

*Independent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Value Labels</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S632A</td>
<td>Security guards</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632B</td>
<td>Metal Detectors</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632C</td>
<td>Locked exterior doors during the day</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632D</td>
<td>A requirement that visitors sign in</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632E</td>
<td>A requirement that school staff escort visitors</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632G</td>
<td>Teachers assigned supervise the hallways</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632H</td>
<td>Hall passes required to leave class</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S632I</td>
<td>Intercoms or telephones in classrooms</td>
<td>Same as 32A</td>
<td>32i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S641A</td>
<td>Parents are actively involved in this school’s programs</td>
<td>1 = SD*</td>
<td>41a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = N*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree*
The dependent variable in this study is the level of order and discipline in school buildings. The source of the national data is the ECLS-K School Administrator Questionnaire, Spring 2004. This archived data is made available by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Table 2 presents the variable, variable description, value labels, and scale that were used in this study. This information is derived directly from the Administrator Questionnaire. When order and discipline in school buildings is achieved and maintained, it is likely that the level of safety within the school is optimal.

Table 2

Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Value Labels</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S641G</td>
<td>Order and discipline are</td>
<td>1 = SD*</td>
<td>41g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintained satisfactorily in</td>
<td>2 = D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the building(s)</td>
<td>3 = N*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = SA*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

Missing Data

Continuous quality assurance procedures were employed during all stages of the study. Extensive testing by project design staff, statistical staff, and the programmers of
the entire system was conducted to verify that the systems were working properly from all perspectives (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Quality control processes continued with the development of field procedures that maximized cooperation, and thereby reduced the potential for non-response bias (Tourangeau et al., 2006). During the field period, field supervisors followed up with school administrators in visits to the schools to collect completed questionnaires, ensuring that questionnaires were not missing critical information and that completed questionnaires were mailed to Westat (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

All variables in the ECLS-K data use a standard scheme for missing values. Codes are used to indicate item non-response, legitimate skips, and unit non-response (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The “Not Applicable” code (-1) has two purposes. Primarily, it is used to indicate that a respondent did not answer the question due to skip instructions within the instrument or external reasons that led a respondent not to participate (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Another use of the “Not Applicable” code is the circumstance in which it is not known whether a respondent would have answered a question series following a lead question. One example of this use is school administrator questionnaire Question 21. Question 21 asks whether the school received Federal Title I funds for this school year. If the answer is “yes,” the questionnaire skips to question 22 about whether the school is operating a Title I targeted assistance or school wide program. If the answer is “no,” the questionnaire skips to question 24. If question 21 was left blank by the respondent, question 22 is coded “Not Applicable.” (Tourangeau et al., 2006). After implementing all these measures, some data were still missing and treated as system-missing in the SPSS analyses (Tourangeau et al., 2006).
Because the School Administrator Questionnaire, Spring 2004 was abbreviated for the regional sample, missing data posed no problems. In the same manner as the national sample, follow-up telephone calls occurred as needed with regional sample school administrators to ensure that questionnaires were not missing critical information.

Participants

National Sample and Data Set

The database used for this study is the ECLS-K School Administrator Questionnaire, administered in the Spring 2004. This is an archived public domain database made available by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Fifth-Grade Restricted-Use Data Files and Electronic Codebook* (NCES 2006-033).

It is important to understand that children were the basis of the ECLS-K study. After the students were selected, then their school principal, teacher(s), and parent/custodians with the best knowledge of the student were surveyed. The base year ECLS-K was comprised of a nationally representative student sample of approximately 22,000 kindergarteners from about 1,000 kindergarten programs during the 1998-1999 school year (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The ECLS-K employed a multistage probability sample design in selecting the nationally representative sample (Tourangeau et al., 2006). In the base year, the primary sampling units (PSU’s) were geographic areas consisting of counties or groups of counties (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The second-stage units were schools within sampled PSUs (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The third and final stage units were students within schools (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Although originally intended to track students through grade five, this longitudinal study was extended through grade
twelve (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The fifth grade ECLS-K data collection was the sample used in this study. Not all sample children are in fifth grade (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The fifth-grade sample population included children from both public and private schools with both full-time and part-time kindergarten programs and included assorted racial ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds (Hausken, 2006). The fifth-grade data file includes children who were in fifth grade in spring 2004, and others who were either held back (e.g., fourth-graders) or promoted ahead an extra year or more (e.g., sixth-graders) (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Children, parents/guardians, teachers, and school administrators were asked to participate in the longitudinal study (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Only the school administrator data collected during the fifth-grade collection was used in this study.

A fifth wave of data was collected in the spring of the 2001-02 school year when most, but not all, of the sampled children were in third grade (Tourangeau et al., 2006). A sixth wave of data was collected in the spring of the 2003-04 school year when most, but not all, of the sampled children were in fifth grade (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The sample of children in the fifth-grade round of data collection of the ECLS-K represents the cohort of children who were in kindergarten in 1998-99 or in first grade in 1999-2000 (Tourangeau et al., 2006). From the fifth-grade ECLS-K data collection, the estimated number of fifth-graders is approximately 83 percent of all fifth-graders (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

A nationally representative sample of approximately 1,000 principals from both private and public schools attended in 2003-2004 by one or more students taking part in the ECLS-K comprised the participants in this study (Tourangeau et al., 2006).
school administrator participants who answered the questions on the survey completely were included in the study. The response rate was 96.4 percent from the school administrators, resulting in approximately 960 principals participating in the study (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

Regional Sample and Data Set

This study was replicated in an area of local educational interest. The administrator questionnaire was shortened and submitted to the regional sample principals of the 53 public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts. Descriptive comparisons were made between the nationally representative sample and the local convenience sample. This timely information may potentially prove to be important to practitioners and would expand the scope of the existing field of research. By including the additional measure of surveillance cameras to the regional sample and data set, the research is further broadened. Inclusion of this up-to-date video technology for security purposes adds to the timeliness of the study.

Instrumentation

National Sample and Data Set

The instrument through which the national sample was surveyed is the ECLS-K School Administrator Questionnaire, Spring 2004 survey. A standard procedure for designing and developing the ECLK-K instruments was strictly followed. The constructs/issues identified by research and by experts on the Technical Review Panel were then translated into questionnaire items (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The items were adapted from existing survey instruments that had previously been developed and validated (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The questionnaires were then tested using cognitive
labs or focus groups (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The administrator questionnaire did not pose any problems for the participants in the cognitive labs or focus groups. The only complaint was that it was lengthy (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The time required to complete the administrator questionnaire was estimated to average 45 minutes, including the time to review instructions (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Validity was established by submitting the questionnaire to independent technical experts for review. It was edited, field tested, and revised as recommended (Hausken, 2006). Due to the strict design and development procedures used by experts on the Technical Review Panel, reliability on the overall administrator instrument was not established (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

This self-administered survey contained 50 items concerning the school, its student population, the teachers, school policies, school climate, and administrator characteristics (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The principal, administrator, or headmaster at the school attended by the sampled child was asked to complete the school administrator questionnaire in the spring of 2004 (Tourangeau et al., 2006). In spring-fifth grade, it also included items that in spring-third grade had been in a questionnaire called the school fact sheet (e.g., the grades taught in the school, school sector and focus, the length of the school year) (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The school administrator questionnaire was divided into seven sections (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The first five sections requested mainly factual information about each school and the programs offered at the school. Either a principal or a designee who was able to provide the requested information could complete these sections (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The school’s principal was asked to complete the remaining two sections concerning his or her background and evaluations of the school climate (Tourangeau et al., 2006). If a
designee was chosen to do the last two sections, he or she was instructed to answer the background and education questions about the school's principal or headmaster (Tourangeau et al., 2006). A copy of the Administrator Questionnaire-Spring 2004 is located in Appendix A.

Regional Sample and Data Set

The administrator questionnaire was shortened to address only those items addressed with the national sample, with the addition of the question about surveillance cameras. It was then submitted to the principals of the 53 public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. A copy of the Administrator Questionnaire-Spring 2007 is located in Appendix B.

Procedures

National Sample

After the surveys were designed, developed, edited, field-tested, revised, and validated, the Administrator Questionnaires were submitted to a nationally representative sample of principals from both private and public schools that were attended in 2003-2004 by one or more students taking part in the ECLS-K study. The ECLS-K fifth-grade data collection was conducted in the fall and spring of the 2003-2004 school year (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Fall data collection included contacting sampled schools to set appointments to conduct the child assessments in the spring of the school year, verifying the parent consent procedures, linking children to teachers, identifying children who had withdrawn from the school, and obtaining location information about their new schools (Tourangeau et al., 2006).
In September 2003, an advance package was mailed via Federal Express to all participating ECLS-K schools asking them to prepare for the fall preassessment telephone call. The schools were asked to identify a school staff coordinator to serve as a liaison with the study. The advance package contained study findings from first grade and an overview of fifth-grade data collection activities. The school coordinators were asked to complete an information form about the ECLS-K sampled children prior to the telephone call (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

The fall preassessment contact was made by telephone between September and December 2003 (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Based on the information collected in the fall of 2003, packets of hard-copy teacher and school administrator questionnaires and instructions were assembled and mailed to schools beginning in January 2004, along with letters confirming the scheduled visits to the school (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Teachers and school administrators were asked to complete the questionnaires for pickup on assessment day. In February 2004, letters were also mailed to parents reminding them of the spring-fifth grade data collection activities (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Field supervisors conducted most preassessment activities by telephone starting in February 2004 (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The preassessment activities for these schools were similar to those conducted in previous rounds of data collection and included confirming the assessment date and receipt of the hard-copy questionnaires and arranging for space to conduct the assessments (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Data were collected from school administrators from February through June 2004 (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

Spring data collection instruments included the direct child assessments, parent interviews, teacher and school questionnaires, student record abstract, and facilities
checklist (Tourangeau et al., 2006). School administrators, including principals and headmasters, completed the self-administered questionnaires during the spring 2004 data collection (fifth grade) (Tourangeau et al., 2006). These principals were solicited to participate in the study voluntarily and anonymously (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Confidentiality was assured via a statement on the questionnaire cover (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Informed consent was obtained via an introductory letter within the questionnaire cover (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The response rate was 96.4 percent, resulting in approximately 960 principals responding in full to the 50 question surveys (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

Several in-person training sessions were conducted to prepare staff for the fifth-grade data collection (Tourangeau et al., 2006). In the fall of 2003, supervisors were trained to contact original schools and recruit transfer schools (Tourangeau et al., 2006). A total of 39 field supervisors and two field managers completed training (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Additionally, supervisors and assessors completed eight hours of home study training on the study design, field procedures, and computer keyboard skills (Tourangeau et al., 2006). In the spring of 2004, two trainings were held: one for field supervisors and one for assessors (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Two hundred sixty-two (262) assessors and 81 field supervisors completed training (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Field supervisors managed all the data collection activities within their assigned work areas, supervising the assessors and conducting child assessments and parent interviews (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

Upon completion of the questionnaires, the forms were returned by assigned field supervisors (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Coders recorded the receipt of these forms into a
project-specific forms tracking system (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Coders reviewed the questionnaires to ensure readability of data for proper transfer into an electronic format (Tourangeau et al., 2006). The data were manually entered into computers (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Finally, the data were carefully reviewed for range and logic consistency (Tourangeau et al., 2006). Consistency checks, or logical edits, examined the relationship between and among responses to ensure that they did not conflict with one another or that the response to one item did not make the response to another item unlikely (Tourangeau et al., 2006).

**Regional Sample**

After the human subjects criteria of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) were met, the abbreviated administrator questionnaire was submitted to the principals of the public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts. In the same manner as the national sample, principals of the public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts were solicited to participate in the study voluntarily and anonymously. Confidentiality was assured, and informed consent was obtained via an introductory letter with the questionnaire. The forms were returned via pre-addressed, stamped envelopes that were provided to the respondents. Letters followed-up the original consent letters thanking the principals for their participation in the study. These forms are included in the Appendices.

**Data Analysis**

**National Sample and Data Set**

Research Question 1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior
doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parent involvement and the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Method of Analysis for Research Question 1: A multiple correlation coefficient ($R$) was calculated to assess the statistically significant relationship among school violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings. The multiple correlation coefficient is a useful measure of the linear relationship between a dependent variable and any number of independent variables. Its advantage is most evident when there are several independent variables, as in this study.

Research Question 2: Do certain prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parent involvement) statistically significantly predict the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Method of Analysis for Research Question 2: A standard multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the statistically significant prediction of the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings based upon the identified prevention measures, specifically the presence of employed security guards, installed metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement on school campuses in the ECLS-K longitudinal study data. The standard multiple linear regression analysis is useful in predicting the variance in the dependent variable based on the combination of independent variables, as in this study. This process establishes whether the set of independent variables explains a proportion of the...
variance in the dependent variable at a statistically significant level.

**Regional Sample and Data**

Research Question 3: How does the national sample of administrator questionnaire responses compare to the regional sample of administrator questionnaire responses, including the additional measure of surveillance cameras on school campuses?

Method of Analysis for Research Question 3: Statistical analysis included the use of descriptive statistics to compare the specified violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings between the ECLS-K (fifth grade) and the regional sample. A descriptive comparison describes similarities and differences between the nationally representative sample and the local convenience sample. Frequencies and percentages are compared. Based on the combination of inferential statistics and the descriptive comparison of the two samples, this timely study is useful to practitioners.

**Limitations**

**National Sample and Data**

Although validity was established by a team of independent technical experts, no study is perfect. The data were collected by NCES, and therefore the researcher was limited to the data made available through the ECLS-K database. This study may not be generalized to middle school and high school administrators. It should be noted that this study is based on principals’ survey responses according to their perceptions. However, it is believed that the results of this specific study offer substantial information to facilitate safe school.
Regional Sample and Data

A limitation of this replicate study is its lack of generalization. Due to personal interest, the purposeful selection of the local convenience sample of those 53 principals of public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts may not be generalized to all administrators in the region. It should be noted that this study is based on principals’ survey responses according to their perceptions. However, it is still believed that the results of this specific study offer substantial information to facilitate safe schools within the regional sample.

Summary

In summary, Chapter three introduced the variables in this study. Details about the research design were presented. The independent and dependent variables were identified and operationally defined. An explanation about the handling of missing data was provided. Details about the database, its access, and the participants were described. Procedures used in the instrument development were explained. A description of the data collection procedures, the intended statistical methods, and the rationale for their use was included. A description of the most significant threats to internal validity was also described. All methodology information included discussion of the national sample and data, as well as of the regional sample and data. The prediction of the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings based upon the identified prevention measures was scientifically assessed. This scholarly research contributes to the literature on facilitation of safety in schools. The conclusions benefit all stakeholders: students, parents, educators, and communities.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Overview

Chapter four presents the descriptive statistics for the national and regional samples. Also included are the results of the statistical analyses and descriptive comparisons of the national and regional samples. Statistical analysis includes the use of the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS 13.0). Inferential statistics scientifically establishes whether or not a significant relationship exists among the specified violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings.

Description of National Sample

Of the ECLS-K fifth grade student sample population, approximately half were male (50.7%) and half were female (49.3%). The race/ethnicity designations of the sample as reported by the parents were white, non Hispanic 57.0%; black or African American 11.4%; Hispanic, race specified 9.3%; Hispanic, race not specified 9.8%; Asian 6.9%; native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander 1.3%; American Indian or Alaska native 1.9%; more than one race, non Hispanic 2.4%. The average size of the schools participating in the ECLS-K study was between 300-499 students (32.2%). While the students were the focus of the ECLS-K study, the school administrator data providing student-related information collected during the fifth grade year were the basis of this study. Approximately 960 principals participated in the study (96.4%).
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Statistical Results

Research Question 1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parental involvements and the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Results for Research Question 1: A multiple correlation coefficient \((R)\) was calculated to statistically assess the significance of the relationship among the school violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings. Data for the dependent variable (level of order and discipline) were gathered from respondents’ replies to Item S641G, which read “Order and discipline are maintained satisfactorily in the building(s).” The results of the multiple correlation analysis were statistically significant, \(R = .02, p = .04\). The relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, parental involvement, and the level of order and discipline in school buildings was statistically significant. Table 3 presents a summary of the descriptive statistics of the nominal variables.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Guards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9488</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Detectors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locked Exits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Sign-Ins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Escorts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Hallways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Passes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercoms/Phones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents a summary of the descriptive statistics of the scaled variables.
Table 4

*National Sample Descriptive Statistics of the Scaled Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Active</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and Discipline</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2: Do certain prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, and parental involvement) statistically significantly predict the level of order and discipline in school buildings?

Results for Research Question 2: A standard multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the prediction of the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings based upon the identified prevention measures, specifically the presence of employed security guards, installed metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement on school campuses in the ECLS-K national sample data. Because the national sample data set is so large, outliers presented no threat to normality and were retained in the data. Evaluations of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity showed that the assumptions were met within acceptable limits. Regression results show that the linear combination of security guards, metal detectors, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement statistically significantly predicted satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings, $R^2 = .12$, 
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This model accounted for 12.3 percent of the variance in satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings, based on information from the identified prevention measures. Table 5 presents a summary of the regression coefficients. Based on B coefficients (standardized) the strongest predictor is parent involvement. The weakest predictors include locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, and visitor escorts. The predictors having a positive impact on the dependent variable are security guards, metal detectors, and hall passes. The predictors having a negative impact on the dependent variable are teacher supervision in hallways and intercoms/telephones in classrooms.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Seβ</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32A</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32B</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32C</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32D</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32E</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32G</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32H</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q32I</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Q41A</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variables significant at p < .05
Description of Regional Sample

Upon receiving Institutional Review Board approval, the abbreviated administrator questionnaire was submitted to principals of the public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts. Quality of data collection was assured throughout the process. Of the 11 superintendents within the local convenience sample, nine gave permission to invite principal participation within their respective school districts. This reduced the field of principals from a possible 53 participants to 39 participants. In the same manner as the national sample, principals of the 39 public schools housing fifth-grade students were invited voluntarily and anonymously to answer the questionnaires. Confidentiality was assured, and informed consent was obtained via an introductory letter with the questionnaire. Pre-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided to the respondents. Follow up telephone calls were made encouraging the principals to complete and return the surveys in the self-addressed, stamped envelopes. Thirty-eight surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 97.4 percent.

Descriptive Comparisons

Research Question 3: How does the national sample of administrator questionnaire responses compare to the regional sample of administrator questionnaire responses, including the additional measure of surveillance cameras on school campuses?

Results for Research Question 3: Frequencies and percentages were used to compare the specified violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings between the national and local convenience samples. Table 6 presents a summary of the descriptive statistics of the nominal variables.
Table 6

*Regional Sample Descriptive Statistics of the Nominal Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Guards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Detectors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locked Exits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Sign-ins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Escorts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Hallways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Passes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercoms/Phones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameras</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presents a summary of the descriptive statistics of the scaled variables.
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Table 7

*Regional Sample Descriptive Statistics of the Scaled Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Parents</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order/Discipline</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics show that most of the regional sample schools do not have security guards or metal detectors. Most of these schools keep exterior doors locked. One hundred percent of the regional sample schools require visitor sign-ins and have intercoms/telephones in classrooms. Most regional sample schools do not require visitors to be escorted. However, hall passes are required, and hallways are patrolled. Surveillance cameras are in slightly more than half of the schools. The majority of regional sample principals consider parents actively involved in school programs. Overall, the majority of regional sample principals consider order and discipline to be satisfactorily maintained.

Comparisons of the regional sample to the national sample show that most schools do not have security guards or metal detectors. The regional sample schools are more inclined to keep exterior doors locked during the day than are national sample schools. One hundred percent of the participating regional sample schools require visitors to sign-in and provide intercoms/telephones in classrooms. Of the national sample schools, 88 percent required visitors to sign-in and 85 percent provided intercoms/telephones in classrooms. In both samples, visitor escorts are infrequent. While national sample teachers patrol hallways approximately 50 percent of the school
day, the regional sample teachers patrol hallways over 90 percent of the school day. Likewise, while the national sample principals report the use of hall passes slightly more than 50 percent of the day, the regional sample principals require hall passes 85 percent of the day. In both samples, parents were considered actively involved in school programs. In assessing the regional sample principals about the use of surveillance cameras on their campuses, 53.8 percent of the regional sample schools utilized surveillance cameras on their respective campuses. The use of security cameras ranked sixth in the implementation of security measures. Visitor sign-ins, intercoms/telephones, patrolled hallways, hall passes, and locked exits were utilized more frequently than were security cameras. Thereafter, visitor escorts, security guards, and metal detectors were utilized with less frequency. Finally, both national and regional sample principals reported that order and discipline was satisfactorily maintained in school buildings.

Summary

Chapter four presented a description of the national sample. It reported statistical results of the multiple correlation analysis. In answering Research Question 1, the relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the classrooms, parental involvement, and the level of order and discipline in school buildings was statistically significant. It reported statistical results of the standard multiple linear regression analysis. In answering Research Question 2, the linear combination of security guards, metal detectors, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement statistically significantly predicted satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings.
Chapter four presented a description of the regional sample. In answering Research Question 3, descriptive comparisons of the national and regional samples were given. Similarities and differences were noted. In answering administrator surveys, both national and regional principals reported that order and discipline were satisfactorily maintained in school buildings.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Overview

Chapter five provides a brief summary of the present study. It discusses conclusions based on the statistical analyses of the research questions. The results of previously published studies are compared to the results of the present analyses. Implications of the present study are discussed in reference to policy and practice. Finally, suggestions for further research are made.

Study Summary

The purpose of this study is to help define if the specified school safety solutions are effective for improving school safety. This study analyzed the impact of several violence prevention measures (security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, visitor sign-ins, visitor escorts, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement) on school climate in determining the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings of a national sample. This study additionally analyzed the impact of surveillance cameras along with the specified violence prevention measures on school climate in determining the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings of a local convenience sample. The archived public domain database used for this study was the ECLS-K School Administrator Questionnaire, administered in the Spring 2004. This questionnaire was abbreviated for use with the regional sample.

The relationship among the school violence prevention measures of security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in the
classrooms, parental involvement, and the level of order and discipline in school buildings was found to be statistically significant based on analysis of a multiple correlation coefficient in answering Research Question 1. The linear combination of security guards, metal detectors, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement was found to statistically significantly predict satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings according to analysis of a standard multiple linear regression in answering Research Question 2. Where parent involvement was high, the level of order and discipline were better. Descriptive statistics compared the specified violence prevention measures and the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings between the national and local convenience samples, including the additional measure of surveillance cameras in answering Research Question 3. Both national and regional sample principals reported that order and discipline was satisfactorily maintained in school buildings based upon the identified prevention measures. The researcher notes that this study is based on the principals’ survey responses according to their individual perceptions.

Discussion

Violence prevention in schools is a particularly troublesome concern. Solutions are challenging. While research on the topic of safe schools exists, it is limited in quantity. Supervision, parent involvement, and violence prevention measures have been the focus of recent research. However, opinions differ, results conflict, and conclusions vary.

Some previous studies report that direct supervision of students is a vital component of prevention programs for problem behaviors (Astor & Meyer, 2001;
Nelson, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2002). Providing direct adult supervision to juveniles, especially those considered being high-risk, has been shown by research to prevent and reduce crime (Crosse et al., 2001). The Study on School Violence and Prevention in 1998 investigated violence in schools and its solution. The study specified that emphasis for schools should shift to fewer but higher quality violence prevention efforts (Crosse et al., 2001). Additional research by Rosenberg & Jackman (2003) reported that a well-defined partnership between schools and parents could significantly reduce school violence. Parent involvement was found to improve student emotional stability and foster appropriate student behavior (Pate & Andrews, 2006).

According to Skiba (2000), metal detectors are considered by many school administrators to be a viable solution for deterring weapons in schools. Effective deterrents to acts of violence on school campuses include the presence of uniformed security guards, metal detectors, and surveillance cameras (Thompkins, 2000). Conversely, other research has also shown that the utilization of security measures on school campuses has no significant impact on student safety (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Research by Michalowski (2005) noted that teacher authority and parental involvement showed greater impact on school safety than did increased security measures. Statistical analysis showed that increased teacher authority over discipline and parental involvement significantly superseded the benefits of increased security measures (Michalowski, 2005).

While the present study shows there is a statistically significant relationship among security guards, metal detectors, locked exterior doors, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, parental involvement, and the level of order and
discipline in school buildings, some empirical studies report that security measures had no significant impact on student safety (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Furthermore, while the present study shows that the linear combination of security guards, metal detectors, teacher supervision in the hallways, hall passes, intercoms/telephones in classrooms, and parent involvement was found to statistically significantly predict satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings, other research shows that such security measures had no significant impact on student victimization (Schreck, Miller, & Gibson, 2003). Limited empirical research has resulted in differences of opinion on the topic of violence prevention in schools. Clearly, the need for further research exists. Nonetheless, the reality is that violence in schools does exist. If nothing is done, then nothing changes. School officials, more than any other stakeholders, must attempt to proactively intervene to avoid unnecessary risk. Safety of students and staff must be securely maintained. After all, in education no one should ever get hurt.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

School policy and practice should address the promotion and enhancement of safety in schools. School boards should concern themselves with developing, implementing, and enforcing policies dealing with school safety and crisis response plans. Lockdown drills, in case of intruder(s) on school campuses, should become routine practice. Attention to lockdown drills on a regular basis should be a priority item. The safety of students and staff is considered one of the most important obligations of school principals today. Increasing surveillance of critical locations should be a primary objective of all school personnel. Principal leadership is crucial in effective implementation of school board policies and procedures. School principals as lead
practitioners can diplomatically influence all other practitioners on school campuses likewise. School safety should not be left up to chance. Safety-savvy principals should realize that safe schools, violence prevention, and crisis planning is an ongoing process. All staff members must be actively trained. Best practices must be well rehearsed. Regular drills are a necessity. Routine procedures will then become automatic.

The community should be utilized collaboratively and kept informed. Co-planning with law enforcement agents, emergency medical teams, and other schools improves the processes associated with crisis management. In addition to severe weather and fire drills, schools should develop evacuation plans and lockdown drills. Parents and community stakeholders should be kept informed of these regular safety drills. Familiarity leads to confidence, which in turn, eases unnecessary alarm and worry.

A promising strategy for the prevention of school violence is meticulously assessing the potential of a threat. If one can predict an incident may occur, proactive interventions can be implemented to potentially prevent a crisis. Violence is learned. School shooters, for instance, do not simply snap. They methodically plan. Usually someone knows about the plan ahead of time. School principals and other stakeholders can collaboratively cultivate positive school climates, while molding the physical environment to promote and enhance safety. Fostering personal relationships with students can cultivate within them a sense of hope. Positive rapport with adults can prevent students from feeling desperate. Conditions can be changed and improved. Replacement behaviors can be modeled and taught. Violence can be unlearned. Potential violence can be prevented. Possible harm can be avoided or reduced.


Recommendations for Future Research

The inclusion of emerging trends in violence prevention measures is noteworthy for future research. Progressive technology can optimally enhance school safety. While the ECLS-K study included the specified violence prevention measures on its administrator survey, other emerging violence prevention measures presently exist that should also be given serious consideration in future studies. When replicating the national study on a regional level, the addition of surveillance cameras was included in the administrator questionnaire. This relatively new video technology has become common in many of our schools today, whereas it was considerably more limited when the original ECLS-K survey was developed. Today’s video surveillance systems can incorporate computerized digital cameras that have the capability of recording nonstop. Camera angles can be remotely controlled and motion sensitive. Video cameras can be equipped for low lighting, nighttime vision, and outdoor weather conditions.

Digital cameras can produce instant photo identification cards for employees, students, and visitors. Biometric scanners in classrooms can monitor student attendance. An electronic card key can be utilized to optimize and/or limit access to school facilities. Iris recognition technology is being utilized in some schools. Admittance onto school campuses can be permitted or denied based on a driver’s license scanning system. Web cameras can video live classroom activity. Websites can allow parents to utilize passwords to virtually log into their child’s classroom. Administrators can view and monitor surveillance video from any computer on campus.

By studying additional variables, the knowledge base about the facilitation of safe schools becomes broadened. Shortages of studies add to present confusion and
uncertainty in addressing school violence. Longitudinal studies are especially needed. It is highly recommended that future research should focus on a more specific population sample composed of principals of schools designated as persistently dangerous according to the U.S. Department of Education's definition. By studying schools meeting the government's criteria for being persistently dangerous, the sample field would be narrowed and leveled. The resulting data would be more robust in defining which security measures statistically significantly impact the level of order and discipline in school buildings. By concentrating the investigation on a more specific sample, scientifically based constructive action could result in a reduction of school violence.

When students feel safe, performance improves. Improved performance begets higher achievement levels. After all, schools should be primarily concerned with academics, not with potential dangers. Ultimately, schools should be safe learning institutions, not institutions where the learned must be preoccupied with keeping learners safe.
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Assurance of Confidentiality

The collection of information in this survey is authorized by Public Law 107-279 Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part C, Sec. 151(b), and Sec. 153(a). Participation is voluntary. You may skip questions you do not wish to answer; however, we hope that you will answer as many questions as you can. Your responses are protected from disclosure by federal statute (PL 107-279, Title I, Part C, Sec. 183). All responses that relate to or describe identifiable characteristics of individuals may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose, unless otherwise compelled by law. Data will be combined to produce statistical reports. No individual data that links your name, address, telephone number, or identification number with your responses will be included in the statistical reports.
INTRODUCTION

Dear Principal or Headmaster,

This questionnaire is an important part of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K), and a major longitudinal study of children's early educational experiences beginning with kindergarten and continuing through grade 5.

This questionnaire is directed to the school principal in schools attended in 2003-2004 by one or more children participating in the study. The questionnaire is divided into 9 sections:

The first sections request information about the school and its programs. These sections can be answered either by the principal or by a designee who is able to provide the requested information.

The final two sections request judgmental evaluations about school governance and climate and information about the principal's background and experience. The school principal or headmaster should complete the last two sections of the questionnaire. If a designee is chosen, please be sure that the background and education characteristics provided are about the school's principal or headmaster.

Some questions request information that is not readily available from school records (e.g., the percent of children in your school who are members of various racial and ethnic groups). Informed estimates are acceptable for such questions.

Please answer directly on the questionnaire by circling the appropriate number or by writing your response in the space provided.

Thank you very much for your help.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0750. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collected. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving the survey instrument, please write to U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual response to this survey, write directly to National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006.
I. SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1. How many days are children required to attend school this academic year? WRITE IN NUMBER BELOW.
   _______ Number of School Days

2. Approximately, what is the Average Daily Attendance for your school this year? WRITE IN PERCENT OR
   NUMBER BELOW. TO CALCULATE PERCENT, DIVIDE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ATTENDING ON
   AN AVERAGE DAY BY THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED AND THEN MULTIPLY BY 100.
   _______ % Average Daily Attendance

   (i.e., (number of students attending on an average day) X 100 number of students enrolled
   OR
   _______ Average Number Attending Daily

3. School enrollment. WRITE IN THE APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF CHILDREN FOR EACH OF THE
   FOLLOWING. IF NO CHILDREN HAVE LEFT OR ENROLLED IN YOUR SCHOOL, ENTER "0" ON THAT
   LINE. Number of Children

   a. Total enrollment in your school around October 1, 2003,
      or the date nearest to that for which data are available? .............

   b. Number of children who have enrolled in your school since
      October 1, 2003? ............................................................................

   c. Number of children who have left your school since
      October 1, 2003, and have not returned? ................................

4. Circle all grade levels included in this school.
   a. Ungraded .............................................................. 1
   b. Programs for special needs children .......................... 2
   c. Prekindergarten ................................................. 3
   d. Kindergarten .................................................. 4
   e. 1st ................................................................. 5
   f. 2nd ................................................................. 6
   g. 3rd ................................................................. 7
   h. 4th ................................................................. 8
   i. 5th ................................................................. 9
   j. 6th ................................................................. 10
   k. 7th ................................................................. 11
   l. 8th ................................................................. 12
   m. 9th ................................................................. 13
   n. 10th .............................................................. 14
   o. 11th .............................................................. 15
   p. 12th .............................................................. 16

5. Is this a public school? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. Yes ........................................................................... 1 (GO TO Q6)
   b. No ............................................................................ 2 (SKIP TO Q7)

6. Is this public school a... CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
   1=Yes  2=No
   a. Regular public school (do not include a magnet school or
      school of choice)? ......................................................... 1  2
   b. School with a magnet program (e.g., science/math school,
      foreign language immersion school)? ................................. 1  2
   c. School of choice (charter school, open enrollment,
      non-specialized curriculum)? .............................................. 1  2
   d. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) or tribal school? .................. 1  2
71

c. Special Education school – primarily serves children with disabilities? ............................................... 1  2
f. An Early Childhood Center (school or center includes preschool and/or early elementary grades)? ............. 1  2
  
SKIP TO Q8

7. Is this private school ... CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
  1=Yes  2= No
a. Catholic? .....................................................................................1  2
  Diocesan? .....................................................................................1  2
  Parish? ..........................................................................................1  2
  Private order? .............................................................................1  2
b. Private, other religious affiliation? ........................................1  2
c. Private school accredited by NAIS? ......................................1  2
d. Other private? .............................................................................1  2
e. Special Education school—primarily serves children with disabilities? ................................................1  2
f. An Early Childhood Center (school or center includes preschool and/or early elementary grades)? ............1  2

8. Approximately, what percentage of the children in your school belongs to each of the following racial/ethnic groups? WRITE NUMBER OR PERCENT ON EACH LINE. ENTER “0” ON THE LINE IF YOUR SCHOOL HAS NO CHILDREN OF THAT RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP. THE TOTAL ON THE PERCENT COLUMN SHOULD ADD TO 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number OR Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Asian or Pacific Islander ............</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hispanic, regardless of race ..........</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Black, not of Hispanic origin .......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. White, not of Hispanic origin .......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. American Indian or Alaska Native .....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (Please specify) ...............</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. TOTAL ........................................</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What percent of children in this school and in fifth grade are limited English proficient (LEP)? WRITE IN THE PERCENTS BELOW.

| a. LEP in entire school ..................... |     |
| b. LEP in Fifth Grade ....................... |     |

10. What are the start and end dates for this school for the 2003-2004 school year?
    START _____ / _____ / 2003
    END _____ / _____ / 2004

Morning School Schedule

11. What time does the first bus usually arrive in the morning? WRITE IN TIME BELOW.
    ______ AM

12. What time does the last bus usually arrive in the morning? WRITE IN TIME BELOW.
    ______ AM

13. What time does school officially start in the morning? WRITE IN TIME BELOW.
    ______ AM

School-Level Breakfast and Lunch Eligibility and Participation

14. Does your school participate in USDA’s (U.S. Dept, of Agriculture) school breakfast program? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
    a. Yes ................................................................. 1 (SKIP TO Q16)
b. No ................................................................. 2 (GO TO Q15)

15. What are the reasons why your school does not participate in USDA's school breakfast program?
CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
1=Yes  2= No

a. Too few eligible students .............................................. 1  2
b. Program too costly ......................................................... 1  2
c. School starts too late to serve breakfast .......................... 1  2
d. School lacks facilities to serve breakfast .......................... 1  2
e. School lacks staff to serve breakfast ................................ 1  2
f. Other (Please specify) ________________________________ 1  2

16. What time is breakfast served at the school? WRITE IN TIME BELOW.
Start Time ________AM End Time ________AM

17. Where is the breakfast typically served for fifth graders? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
a. Cafeteria ................................................................. 1
b. Classroom ............................................................... 2
c. School bus (as a bag breakfast) ................................... 1  2
d. In some other common area of school
(as a bag breakfast) ..................................................... 1  2
e. Other (Please specify) ____________________________ 5

18. Are children who are served breakfast in the cafeteria allowed to take it to the classroom? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
a. Yes ............................................................................... 1
b. No ............................................................................... 2

19. How many children in your school were (a) eligible for and (b) participating in the school breakfast program as of October 2003? WRITE IN NUMBERS BELOW.

(a) Eligible Children (b) Participating Children

a. Any school breakfast? .................................. All Enrolled
b. Free school breakfast? ..........................
c. Reduced-price breakfast? ..........................

20. How many children in your school were (a) eligible for and (b) participating in the school lunch program as of October 2003? WRITE IN NUMBERS BELOW. IF SERVICE IS NOT PROVIDED, WRITE ZERO.

(a) Eligible Children (b) Participating Children

a. Any school breakfast? .................................. All Enrolled
b. Free school breakfast? ..........................
c. Reduced-price breakfast? ..........................

21. Did your school receive Federal Title I funds for this school year? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
a. Yes ................................................................. 1 (GO TO Q22)
b. No ................................................................. 2 (SKIP TO Q24)
c. Not applicable .................................................. 3 (SKIP TO Q24)

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO QUESTIONS 21 AND 22 BELOW:
A targeted assistance program uses Title I funds to provide supplemental academic services (usually in reading and/or math) to specific "Title I students" who have been identified as low achieving.

A school wide program may use Title I funds to improve the quality of educational programs and services throughout the school. A school may use Title I funds for a school wide program if at least 50 percent of its students are from low-income families, or if it receives a waiver permitting it to operate a school wide program.

22. Is your school operating a Title I targeted assistance or school wide program? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. Targeted assistance program ................................................ 1
   b. School wide program ............................................................. 2

23. Does your school use Title I funds for any of the following purposes? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To serve targeted children in a pull-out setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To serve targeted children in an in-class setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce class sizes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide extended time learning opportunities before and/or after school for targeted children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the entire educational program through a school wide program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide professional development activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide family literacy services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide summer learning opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. SCHOOL FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

24. In general, how adequate is each of the following school facilities for meeting the needs of the children in your school? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Do not Have</th>
<th>Never Adequate</th>
<th>Often Not Adequate</th>
<th>Sometimes Not Adequate</th>
<th>Always Adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cafeteria?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Computer lab?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Library/media center?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Art room?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Gymnasium?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Music room?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Playground?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Classrooms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Auditorium?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Multi-purpose room?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How many portable classrooms are on the school grounds? WRITE IN NUMBER BELOW. IF NONE, WRITE ZERO.

Number of portable classrooms
### Food Consumption Questions

26. At this school, can students purchase food or beverages from...CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
   1=Yes  2=No
   a. One or more vending machines at the school? ............... 1  2  
   b. A school store, canteen, or snack bar? ..................... 1  2  

27. Does this school offer a la carte lunch or breakfast items to students, that is, items not sold as part of the NSLP School Lunch or the School Breakfast Program? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER
   YES ................................................................. 1  
   NO ................................................................. 2  

28. Can students purchase, from either vending machines, school store, canteen, snack bar or a la carte items from the cafeteria during school hours? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
   1=Yes  2=No
   a. Chocolate candy? .................................................. 1  2  
   b. Other kinds of candy? ............................................. 1  2  
   c. Cookies, crackers, cakes, pastries, or other baked goods that are not low in fat? .................................................. 1  2  
   d. Salty snacks that are not low in fat, such as regular potato chips? .................................................. 1  2  
   e. Ice cream or frozen yogurt that is not low in fat? .......... 1  2  
   f. 2% or whole milk? ................................................ 1  2  
   g. Fruits or vegetables, not juice? ............................... 1  2  
   h. Low-fat cookies, crackers, cakes, pastries, or other low-fat baked goods? .................................................. 1  2  
   i. Salty snacks that are low in fat, such as pretzels, baked chips, or other low-fat chips? ..................... 1  2  
   j. Bread sticks, rolls, bagels, pita bread, or other bread products? .................................................. 1  2  
   k. Low-fat or fat-free ice cream, frozen yogurt, or sherbet? 1  2  
   l. Low-fat or non-fat yogurt? ........................................ 1  2  
   m. 1% or skim milk? ................................................ 1  2  
   n. Bottled water? ................................................ 1  2  
   o. 100% fruit juice? ................................................ 1  2  
   p. 100% vegetable juice? ........................................... 1  2  
   q. Soda pop, sports drinks, or fruit drinks that are not 100% juice? .................................................. 1  2  

29. At your peak mealtime, how full is the cafeteria compared to the maximum seating capacity? Would you say it is...CIRCLE ONE
   Less than 50% full, .......................... 1  
   50 to 75% full, ................................. 2  
   76 to 100% full, or ........................... 3  
   Over capacity? ................................... 4
III. COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND SCHOOL SAFETY

30. How much of a problem are the following in the neighborhood where this school is located? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a problem</th>
<th>No problem</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Tensions based on racial, ethnic, or religious differences?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Garbage, litter, or broken glass in the street or road, on the sidewalks, or in yards?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Selling or using drugs or excessive drinking in public?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Gangs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Heavy traffic?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Violent crimes like drive-by shootings?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Vacant houses and buildings?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Crime in the neighborhood?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Have any of the following types of problems happened during this school year at this school? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

1=Yes  2=No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children bringing weapons to school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Things being taken directly from children or teachers by force or threat of force at school or on the way to or from school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Children or teachers being physically attacked or involved in fights?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Children bringing in or using alcohol at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Children bringing in or using illegal drugs at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Vandalism of school property?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Does your school take any of the following measures to ensure the safety of children? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

1=Yes  2=No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Security guards?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Metal detectors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Locked exterior doors during the day?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A requirement that visitors sign in?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. A requirement that school staff escort visitors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Limits on going to the restrooms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teachers assigned to supervise the hallways?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Hall passes required to leave class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Intercoms or telephones in classrooms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. To what extent is each of the following matters a problem in this school? Indicate whether each is a SERIOUS problem, a MODERATE problem, a MINOR problem, or NOT a problem in this school. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>SERIOUS Problem</th>
<th>MODERATE Problem</th>
<th>MINOR Problem</th>
<th>NOT a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student tardiness?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student absenteeism?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
IV. SCHOOL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

34. What grades are tested with standardized tests? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

IF NO GRADE TESTED, CHECK HERE _____ (SKIP TO Q36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 3rd?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 4th?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 5th?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 6th?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 7th?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 8th?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Based on recent standardized tests, approximately what percent of elementary children currently enrolled in this school tested at or above grade level nationally in...WRITE IN PERCENTAGES BELOW.

a. Reading or verbal skills? ___________________________ %

b. Mathematics or quantitative skills? ___________________________ %

36. Are either of the following programs or services for children available at your school site? Please include programs run by the school and those run by outside groups. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

1=Yes 2=No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Before-school childcare?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. After-school childcare?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Is there a gifted and talented program at this school? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.

a. Yes ___________________________ 1

b. No ___________________________ 2

V. STAFFING AND TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

38. Approximately how many staff members does your school currently have in the following categories?

PLEASE PROVIDE RESPONSES IN COLUMN (1) FOR STAFF MEMBERS WHO WORK FULL TIME AT YOUR SCHOOL AND IN COLUMN (2) FOR STAFF WHO WORK PART TIME AT YOUR SCHOOL. PLACE EACH STAFF MEMBER IN ONLY ONE STAFF CATEGORY. IF THERE ARE NO STAFF IN YOUR SCHOOL IN A CATEGORY, WRITE ZERO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff category</th>
<th>(1) Number who work full time in the school</th>
<th>(2) Number who work part time in the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular classroom teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gym, drama, music or art teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Special education and related service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ESL/Bilingual education teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reading teachers/specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Teachers of gifted/talented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. School nurses or health professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. School psychologists or social workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Paraprofessionals (e.g., classroom aides)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Library media specialists/librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. If a person other than the school principal or head master has answered the previous questions, please provide the following information: PLEASE PRINT.

IF YOU ARE THE PRINCIPAL, CHECK HERE _________ GO TO Q40.
VI. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLIMATE

40. How much emphasis do you place on the following goals and objectives for your teachers? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No or Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Assisting all children to achieve high standards</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Using curricula aligned with high standards</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maintaining a quiet and orderly class environment</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Providing challenging tasks for higher-achieving children</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Using instructional strategies (e.g., hands-on activities, cooperative learning) aligned with high standards</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Communicating well with parents</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Working well with other staff</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Openness to new ideas and methods</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Participation in professional development activities</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the school’s climate. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parents are actively involved in this school’s programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teacher absenteeism is a problem at this school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teacher turnover is a problem at this school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Child absenteeism is a problem at this school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The community served by this school is supportive of its goals and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. There is a consensus among administrators and teachers on goals and expectations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Order and discipline are maintained satisfactorily in the building(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Overcrowding is a problem at this school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Parents of children in this school are welcome to observe classes any time they are in session</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS

42. What is your gender? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. Male ................................................................. 1
   b. Female ............................................................... 2

43. In what year were you born? WRITE IN YEAR BELOW.
   19________

44. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. Yes ........................................................................ 1
   b. No ........................................................................... 2

45. Which best describes your race? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.
   1=Yes 2=No
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native ............................. 1  2
   b. Asian ....................................................................... 1  2
   c. Black or African American ........................................ 1  2
   d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ................ 1  2
   e. White ........................................................................ 1  2

46. How many years of experience do you have in each of the following positions? WRITE IN THE YEARS BELOW.

   Number of years
   a. Years as a teacher before becoming a principal ..........
   b. Total number of years as a principal ............................
   c. Number of years as principal at this school ............

47. What is the highest level of education you have completed? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. High school diploma ................................................. 1
   b. Associate’s degree ....................................................... 2
   c. Bachelor’s degree ......................................................... 3
   d. At least one year of course work beyond a Bachelor’s
degree but not a graduate degree ............................... 4
   e. Master’s degree .......................................................... 5
   f. Education specialist or professional diploma based
   on at least one year of course work past a Master’s
degree level ................................................................. 6
   g. Doctorate ................................................................. 7

48. What was your major field of study in the highest degree you completed? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER.
   a. Early childhood education .......................................... 1
   b. Elementary education .................................................. 2
   c. Special education ......................................................... 3
   d. English as a Second Language (ESL) ............................ 4
   e. Child development ....................................................... 5
   f. Methods of teaching reading ....................................... 6
   g. Methods of teaching mathematics ............................... 7
   h. Methods of teaching science ..................................... 8
   i. School administration/management ............................ 9
   j. Other (Please specify) ............................................... 10

49. Date questionnaire completed: ___________

50. Questionnaire Completed By:
   Last Name First Name M.I.
   Title

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
This questionnaire is an important part of a research study on the facilitation of safe schools. This questionnaire is directed to the school principal in schools in the local convenience area attended in 2006-2007 by fifth-grade students. Please answer directly on the questionnaire by circling the appropriate number. Your participation is completely voluntary and anonymous. Thank you very much for your help.

32. Does your school take any of the following measures to ensure the safety of children? CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Yes=1</th>
<th>No=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Security guards?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Metal detectors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Locked exterior doors during the day?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A requirement that visitors sign in?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. A requirement that school staff escort visitors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Teachers assigned to supervise the hallways?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Hall passes required to leave class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Intercoms or telephones in classrooms?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Surveillance cameras used to supervise the campus?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the school’s climate. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parents are actively involved in this school’s programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Order and discipline are maintained satisfactorily in the building(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
CONSENT FORM
AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

Consent is hereby given to participate in the study titled: FACILITATION OF SAFE SCHOOLS

1. Purpose: The purpose of this study will be to determine the effectiveness of school security measures in establishing the satisfactory maintenance of order and discipline in school buildings. This research will contribute to existing literature on the topic of safe schools. It may potentially impact the lives of stakeholders and should be useful to practitioners.

2. Description of Study: The School Administrator Questionnaire will be submitted to the principals of the 53 public schools housing fifth-grade students in the specified school districts. Descriptive comparisons of the similarities and differences of school security measures between a nationally representative sample of principals and the local convenience sample will be made. The amount of time required of the subjects is approximately 10 minutes. There will be no invasive techniques involved or restrictions on normal activities.

3. Benefits: The conclusions derived as a result of descriptive comparisons of the national and regional samples should be useful and timely to practitioners and stakeholders. Participation in this study may result in a sense of helping the public at large.

4. Risks: There are no known physical, psychological, social, or financial research-related risks, inconveniences, or side effects to the subjects that can be expected. Any new information that develops during the study will be provided to the participants, if that information might affect their willingness to participate in the project.

5. Confidentiality: All personally identifiable private information will be held in confidence. No names will ever be associated with the Survey of the regional sample. Confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained. Campuses will never be identified or publicly disclosed. The researcher will keep the regional sample data secured in a lock file cabinet. At the end of five years, the regional surveys and data files will be maintained/converted into electronic format and any paper documents will be shredded.

6. Alternative Procedures: Participation in the study is completely voluntary and anonymous. Any subject who does not wish to complete the regional sample Administrator Questionnaire may discard it. There will be no penalties involved as a result of not participating or withdrawing at any time.

7. Subject's Assurance: Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and the subjects may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Margaret Pepper at (228) 872-6210. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to Betty Ann Morgan, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
8. **Signatures:** In conformance with the federal guidelines, the signature of the subject must appear on all written consent documents. The University also requires that the date and the signature of the person explaining the study to the subject appear on the consent form.

Signature of the Research Subject ___________________________ Date ____________

Signature of the Person Explaining the Study ___________________________ Date ____________
The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the “Adverse Effect Report Form”.
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.
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