THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Students' Perception of Campus Safety and Security at Accra Technical University, Ghana

Sarah Morrison

Senior Assistant Registrar, Department of Quality Assurance and Academic Planning,
Accra Technical University, Ghana

Dr. Alice Constance Mensah

Senior Lecturer, Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics,
Accra Technical University, Ghana

Abstract:

To promote quality teaching and learning, higher educational institutions are working tirelessly towards achieving safe and secured environment. However not enough is known of students' experiences and perception on safety and security on campus. The paper studied students' perception of campus safety and security at the Accra Technical University (ATU). It actually aimed at assessing students' perception about campus safety and security and the extent to which students are satisfied with campus safety and security. The study adopted a descriptive research design involving both qualitative and quantitative research approaches. Questionnaires were used to collect the data from the 432 students who were conveniently sampled. Deploying descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, the study found out that students were generally dissatisfied with campus safety and security at ATU. The study proposed measures such as recruiting well-trained security personnel who conduct rigorous checks at campus entry points, adequate lighting systems in the lecture rooms and on the compound, installation of Close Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras at school entrances with constant patrol. The schools' hostel had to be refurbished with new facilities and kept clean at all times.

Keywords: Campus safety, campus security, students' perception

1. Introduction

University grounds are regularly viewed as a safe house, ensured environments where younger people explore incredible thoughts in a collegial environment and make deep rooted fellowships (Giblin et al., 2013). Globally, colleges have executed structures to get ready for the unthinkable and keep students and employees safe on campus (Gnage, Dziagwa, & White, 2009). A safe school is described by the presence of certain physical aspects such as a secure wall, fencing and gates, doors, buildings that are in a decent condition of fix and well-maintained school grounds (Xaba, 2006). Incorporated into these pointers of school well-being are great control, a culture helpful for educating and learning, proficient educator lead, and great administration and management practices. It should be noted that violence on University campuses had always existed as documented by Schackner (as cited in Pezza, 1995). History has it that the situation about safety on campuses of higher educational institutions existed way back in the fifteenth century.

Jennings, Goverand Pudrzynska (2007) argued that the college campus is no longer seen as a place with an exceptional, educated atmosphere protected from worldly happenings such as sexual assault, robbery among others. With regards to sexual violence on college campuses, approximately one in five women do experience sexual assault or attempted sexual assault while 11% of college women experience rape (Wiersma-Mosley, Jozkowski, & Martinez, 2017). According to Matthew, Kajs and Matthew (2017), most campus environments are sometimes disrupted by deadly activities such as shooting, hence threatening the safety of students. Crime and violence have therefore become prevalent in higher learning campuses (Chekwa, Thomas, & Jones, 2016). Almost 20% campuses nationwide experience at least one violent crime on their campus resulting in an increase in campus violence in the last decade (Veil & Mitchell, 2010).

In Ghana, students of some universities including the University of Ghana, petitioned the Vice-Chancellor on their safety on campus due to high robbery attacks (Owusu, Akoto, & Abnory, 2016). The issue of campus violence could likewise be because of the expansion in enlistment of students in colleges which is not commensurate with the quantity of the security workforce provided by college experts on our grounds. Adolf (2012) asserted that the increase in campus security-related threats or hazards result in physical harm to students, visitors and faculty, and should be treated with the highest priority. Campus crime is indeed a serious issue of concern for contemporary university students, parents of prospective students and the campus community as a whole. Campus crime can also be seen as an issue that destabilizes the core principles of higher education which according to Tseng et al, (2004) these activities do not only undermine the quality of the learning environment but also reduce the positive activities of people associated with the campus.

Higher education institutions are faced with the challenges of providing a campus environment which is safe and secure. It is therefore prudent with all these incidents and comments to assess how students perceive security and safety on campus, using ATU as context of the study.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

University campuses are most often portrayed as safe places for students for obtaining education, but have played host to students who have experienced some sort of criminal activity. Most campuses comprised of young adult students who are experiencing freedom from their parents for the first time in their lives and as such need some protection. Students of ATU are no exception. ATU covers an amazing zone of land of inhabitants of surrounding communities, some of who have suspicious character which irritates students' tranquility and security. In recent years, the university and encompassing territories have become a visiting place of hoodlums because of where it is situated. These individuals utilize the University's entryways as exit and entry points. The circumstance has nearly empowered 'terrible mannered' individuals to get themselves wherever on campus. Past occurrences of robbery and different appalling wrongdoings have been sustained generally by these individuals. However, many students and workers heedlessly leave entryways opened and assets unprotected. The school's hostel has also been hit with several robbery attacks which put most residents into fear. Lecturers and other administrative officers cannot be left out. This has led to insecurity among students who discover it incredibly hard to go about their normal academic duties particularly during examinations. There is inadequate research evidence in the literature on this important subject and it is therefore imperative to undertake this small-scale investigation into the issue to offer solutions to students' perception on safety and security on ATU campus since perceptions of students shape their concerns of safety.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study was to find students' perceptions on their safety and security on ATU campus. The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Assess students' perception about campus safety and security at ATU.
- Determine the extent to which students are satisfied with campus safety and security at ATU
- Suggest measures that can be put in place to improve campus safety and security at ATU

1.3. Research Questions

- What are students' perceptions on campus safety and security at ATU?
- To what extent are students satisfied with campus safety and security at ATU?
- What measures can be put in place to improve campus safety and security at ATU?

1.4. Significance of the Study

This paper centers on students' perception of safety and security at the ATU. By concentrating on students' perceptions, the study intends to uncover the sorts of well-being issues students are worried about and how student perspectives shape their concern about campus safety and security. Researching students' perceptions of safety and security is exceptionally valuable as the results will help the University Management to address the safety and security issues on campus. This research effort will also contribute to expanding the tenets of academic knowledge on the issue of campus safety and security.

2. Literature Review

Research indicates that lack of safety in schools affect learning (Cornnel and Mayer, 2010) Brown and Andy (2007) define safety as a situation relatively without danger and an assurance of freedom from danger, risk or threat of harm, injury or loss to personnel and/or property, whether caused deliberately or by accident. Thus, a safe school is one that is free of danger and possible harm for students, a place in which non-educators' educators and all learners work, teach and learn without fear of ridicule, intimidation and humiliation or violence (Prinsloo, 2006). Chen and Weikart (2008) posited that if students believe they are unsafe, it affects their attendance and do not perform academically. On the other hand, security, a related concept to safety, according to Fishcer and Green (2004, p. 21), implies *"a stable, relatively predictable environment in which an individual or group may pursue its ends without disruption or harm and without fear of such disturbance or injury"*. Safety and security as applied to campuses will therefore mean campuses without the risk of harm or danger. Craighead (2003) indicates that security may also be perceived as *"the provision of private services in the protection of people, information and assets for individual safety or community wellness"*. Such private services, in the opinion of the researcher, may include deployment of security systems, security technology and security personnel with the aim of preventing crime, loss and risk. On campus safety and security, university campuses are fairly safe learning environments and Flannery and Quinn-Leering (2000) observe that many university students during their stay on campus experience threatening behaviours as victims, perpetrators or both (as cited in Owusu et al., 2016).

Campus safety and security can be considered in terms of specific factors such as the physical and social environments. According to Owusu et al. (2016), both physical and social environments are invariably related to one another and it is important to consider both when studying campus safety. Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink (2009) explored the campus physical environment, stating that certain environmental factors in public settings and their immediate neighbourhoods are generally associated with greater perceptions of fear. Currie (1994) mentions better lighting as one means of alleviating concerns if only the physical environment of a campus is considered (as cited in Owusu et al., 2016). Flethcer and Bryden (2007) found that most people in their study were aware of campus security and foot patrols. The most effective way, according to Franzosa (2009), is to encourage communication between students and campus security services. He further argues that students are more likely to be informed and participate in campus safety measures. Also,

resources ought to be available, awareness ought to be raised that threats exist, and open lines of communication ought to be maintained.

Oluwajana (2017) posits that the perceptions of students shape their concerns about campus safety. According to McDonald (2011), perception is a unique way of understanding phenomena by interpreting sensory information based on experience, processing information, and forming mental models. Perception utilizes sensory and cognitive processes to appreciate the world around us. Perception, a uniquely individualized experience, involves the way one sees the world and it is a key component of several theoretical frameworks. Owusu et al. (2016) observed that in the past decades, a number of studies have focused on issues regarding perceptions of students about their safety (Bohmer, & Parrot, 1993; Brown, & Andy, 2007; Crawford, O'Dougherty & Birchmeier, 2008). Ratti (2010), on the other hand, observed that in recent times, the focus of research has been on how students perceive safety on their various campuses. However, Chekwa, Thomas and Jones (2013) hint that there are still gaps in the literature since the field of campus safety is still growing in countries. For instance, few studies have been conducted to gauge student perceptions of campus safety and security on university campuses in Ghana. A random internet search of empirical studies on student perceptions of campus safety and security in Ghanaian universities yielded a fewer than ten results. Despite the scantiness of empirical literature on the topic, a few empirical findings highlight the recurrence of the problem of campus safety and security and the general dissatisfaction of current safety provisions in institutions of higher learning.

Amoatema, Kyeremeh and Arthur (2017) studied students' perception of campus safety at the College of Technology Education of University of Education, Winneba, Ghana. The study used convenience sampling techniques to select two hundred and fifty (250) students from distance, sandwich and regular sessions out of which two hundred and twenty-four (224) responded to the questionnaires. The results revealed that 87.5% of the respondents were most concerned about safety on campus. It also identified that, places or routes which were relatively poorly lit, isolated and not well travelled, were found to be unsafe on campus. Again, students felt safer on campus during the day as compared to the night, especially for female students. Lastly, bushy areas, lack of CCTV, absence of police patrols and emergency phones to call the security were the major factors contributing to students feeling insecure on campus.

Owusu et al. (2016) also studied the perceptions of students about safety and security issues in University of Cape Coast (UCC) using a sample of 500 undergraduate students offering various academic programmes. The study adopted a descriptive case study design to obtain a comprehensive picture of students' perceptions about their safety and security on campus. The study revealed that students were not satisfied with the overall safety and security on campus particularly in the evenings. The study suggested that building more halls of residence, improving the lighting system on campus and installing emergency phones across campus, intensifying security presence on campus as well as controlling the number of people that enter the campus are sure ways of ensuring that UCC was safer.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive research design since the objectives of the study were descriptive in nature. The study also adopted a mixed method approach with both open-ended and closed-ended questions in the questionnaire. Some of the items were put on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 signifying strongly disagree and 5 representing strongly agree. The questionnaire was pilot-tested and self-administered to students of ATU to obtain primary data to answer the research questions. Students were selected using a non-probability sampling technique called convenience sampling, where elements for the sample are selected handily by the researcher. Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table of sample size selection, 432 students were selected. Reliability tests on the constructs of the instrument (campus safety, sense of community, campus environment, campus lightening, campus hostel, attitudes and behaviours, campus security, campus crime and overall student perceptions) yielded a Cronbach alpha of 0.788, indicating that the items on the research instrument achieved internal consistency. Thus, the reliability measures are above the recommended (0.70) of Hair et al. (2010) and this can therefore be relied upon for further analyses.

3.1. Statistical Analyses

Content analysis is an analytical technique that codes and categorizes qualitative data in order to analyse them quantitatively (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). The means and standard deviations of each safety and security indicator were utilized. In the study of Ikediashi et al. (2012), a mean value of 3 was established as a yardstick where factors are classified when the mean values are greater than or equal to the yardstick. This benchmark has been adopted in this study. In addition, one-sample t-test was used to test the significance of relevant statistics.

4. Results and Discussion

Congruent with the methodology for the study, the thematic approach to the analysis of quantitative data were employed. The qualitative data generated were analysed using content analysis approach. Appendix A also contains the one-sample t-test statistics on the students' perception of campus safety and security.

4.1 Demography of students

Out of the 432 questionnaires distributed, 375 were filled and returned giving a response rate of 86.80%. In relation to the demography of respondents, six (6) levels of bio data of respondents were examined, namely gender, age, marital status, international status, residence and current student status.

Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	219	58.4
Female	156	41.6
<i>Age Distribution</i>		
16-20 years	74	19.7
21-25 years	223	59.5
26-30 years	65	17.3
Above 30 years	13	3.5
<i>Marital status</i>		
Single	324	86.4
Married	51	13.6
<i>Type of Student</i>		
Ghanaian Student	275	73.3
Foreign Student	100	26.7
<i>Residence</i>		
School Residence	216	57.6
Commuter	159	42.4
<i>Current student</i>		
Full-Time	263	70.4
Part-Time	112	29.6

Table 1: Demography of Students

Source: Author (2020)

From Table 1 majority of the students 219 (58.4%) were males and the remaining proportion (41.6%) were females. It is therefore expected that the perceptions of male students will be a dominant factor in profiling the campus safety and security situation at ATU. However, Owusu et al. (2016) observed that campus safety and security issues have been analyzed from the perspective that increases in female enrolment levels are a factor since women are normally perceived as vulnerable when it comes to safety and security issues. Regarding the age distribution of students, 223(59.5%) were between the ages of 21 to 25 years whilst 74 (19.7%), 65(17.3%) and 13(3.5%) of the students were between the ages of 16 to 20 years, 26 to 30 years and above 30 years respectively. Concerning the marital status of students, 324 (86.4%) of them were single while only 51 (13.6%) were married. Furthermore, 275 (73.3%) of the respondents were Ghanaian students while 100 (26.7%) were international students. With respect to residential status, 216 (57.6%) of the respondents were in the school's hostel and 159 (42.4%) were commuters. Finally, 263 (70.4%) of them were full-time whereas 112 (29.6%) were part-time students. Since most students are full-time students, they are more likely to be exposed to campus safety and security issues than part-timers.

4.1.1. Research Question 1: What Are Students' Perceptions About Campus Safety and Security?

The researcher sought to examine the perception of students on campus safety and security. The students were provided with statement on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The means, standard deviations, overall means as well as the test of significance of the statistics were presented.

Campus Safety	Mean Rating	SD
I feel safe and secure on campus.	2.98	1.42
The presence of campus security is adequate.	2.79	1.45
I am satisfied with my campus environment.	2.47	1.36
I would recommend this University to a friend, it is safe.	2.77	1.40
Overall Mean Ratings	2.75	

Table 2: Students' Perceptions of Campus Safety

Source: Author (2020)

Table 2 summarizes responses about students' perceptions of campus safety. Mean ratings on campus safety ranged between 2.47 and 2.98 inclusive, with an overall mean rating of 2.75. Since the individual means, as well as the overall mean is less than 3, which is the benchmark set for a construct to be within an acceptable level, we conclude that students are by and large unhappy with the level of campus safety and will not recommend the university to friends. Their perception on campus safety is insignificant indicating it is not of importance to them. Findings from this study is similar to that of Ethel (2013) which pointed out that students are not much concerned about their own safety and security issues on campus. Another study conducted in tertiary institutions in Ghana by Nimako and Bondinuba (2013), differ from the current study. It revealed that students ranked security as the fourth most important factor with respect to hostels.

Sense of Community	Mean Rating	SD
I feel comfortable walking around campus at night without fear of being accosted by strangers.	2.71	1.42
I feel comfortable being myself on campus.	2.77	1.43
I get disturbed by the passing vehicles around the school campus.	2.86	1.50
I get disturbed by the surrounding community.	3.21	1.00
Overall Mean Rating	2.89	

Table 3: Students' Sense of Community

Source: Author (2020)

Table 3 presents responses on students' "sense of community". Mean ratings on sense of community ranged from 2.71 to 3.21 with an overall mean rating of 2.89, suggesting that students characteristically have a poor perception as far as surrounding community safety is concerned. The lower socioeconomic status of the area surrounding ATU campus creates an additional threat for crimes such as theft, access to valuable property and ease of trespassing. Also, there is lack of safety measures, inadequate access control at some external areas on campus, pedestrian entrances require no identification to gain access and in effect any person is able to access the campus. With the increase in student numbers over the past few years, there has been unnecessary competition between pedestrians and motorists for space. This creates obstructions near pedestrian crossings and reduces roadway visibility.

Campus Environment	Mean Rating	SD
University keeps me notified about potential safety issues on campus.	2.68	1.42
The University has taken necessary steps to make campus safe.	2.61	1.40
I can easily access assistance from the University security or Emergency Personnel, if needed.	2.56	1.39
The University provided a comfortable and safe environment within the campus community.	2.57	1.34
ATU has adequate and clean washrooms.	2.27	1.35
Overall Mean Rating	2.54	

Table 4: Students' Perception of Campus Environment

Source: Author (2020)

Table 4 reveals, mean ratings on campus environment ranging from 2.27 to 2.68, with an overall mean rating of 2.54 ($p < 0.05$). The overall mean is less than 3 hence, the conclusion is students are largely displeased with the level of information on safety as far as campus environment is concerned. Higher education institutions are required to issue timely warnings regarding any crime which is considered as a serious threat to campus community of students and employees. Internal and external communication has been shown as an essential part of how safe a student feels on campus and as such a controlled release of information in order to portray a safe campus community could result in a decreased level of awareness for campus crime (Hollis, 2010)

Campus Lightening	Mean Rating	SD
The University has adequate lighting systems on campus.	2.70	1.37
I can walk freely during the night on campus without fear.	2.41	1.30
There are adequate lights in each lecture room.	2.53	1.36
I can connect my laptop to a switch and use it in every lecture room.	2.36	1.29
I feel secured learning in the lecture rooms at night.	2.50	1.30
Overall Mean Rating	2.50	

Table 5: Students' Perception of Campus Lightening

Source: Author (2020)

Table 5 summarizes responses about students' perceptions of lighting on campus. Mean ratings on campus safety ranges from 2.36 to 2.70 with an overall mean rating of 2.50 ($p < 0.05$). Again, the overall mean is less than 3, which is the benchmark set for a construct to be within an acceptable level, it is resolved that students are fundamentally dissatisfied with the level of campus lightening at ATU and this is highly significant. Previous researches confirmed that students feel safer during the day on campus as compared to after dark, (Ratti, 2010; Sloan et al, 2000).

Campus Hostel	Mean Rating	SD
There is adequate hotel facility for students.	2.38	1.33
The rooms in the hostel are spacious.	2.33	1.25
My items (property) in the hostel are safe.	2.34	1.23
There is adequate lighting system in each room.	2.54	1.34
I easily get assistance from the hostel security.	2.46	1.29
At night, the hostel is well lit.	2.53	1.23
Overall Mean Rating	2.43	

Table 6: Students' Perception of Campus Hostel

Source: Authors (2020)

With respect to the perception of student's safety and security on the campus hostel, mean ratings on items ranges between 2.33 to 2.54, with their corresponding SDs. An overall mean rating of 2.43 ($p < 0.05$), suggests that students are significantly disgruntled with the safety and security at the campus hostel at ATU. Respondents are dissatisfied with availability of hostel facility on campus, how spacious are the rooms, lighting systems and getting the needed assistance from security personnel. A study by Owusu et al. (2016) revealed that students were not satisfied with the overall safety and security on campus and suggested that there is the need to build more halls of residence, improve the lighting system on campus and install emergency phones across campus and also intensify security presence on campus.

Attitudes and Behaviour of Campus Security	Mean Rating	SD
The campus security guards are well-trained and professional.	2.49	1.30
The campus security guards need more training.	3.01	1.50
Overall Mean Rating	2.75	

Table 7: Students' Perceptions of Attitudes and Behaviours of Campus Security

Source: Author (2020)

Table 7 shows the responses on attitudes and behaviours of campus security. The two statements had an overall mean rating of 2.75 ($p < 0.05$). Once more, an indication that students are profoundly displeased with the attitudes and behaviours of security operatives at ATU campus. Students knowing that there are people well trained and in charge to help everyone stay safe is of importance and they will share admiration with them about the great work they are doing (Patschke, 2017).

Overall Perceptions	Mean Rating	SD
Theft	3.03	1.49
Assault	2.77	1.46
Sexual Assault	2.66	1.45
Harassment	2.76	1.41
Robbery	2.91	1.49
I am not worried about crime on campus.	2.69	1.34
Overall Mean Rating	2.80	

Table 8: Student Perceptions on Campus Crime

Source: Author (2020)

Table 8 presents information from students on their perceptions on campus crime. Sexual assault received the lowest rating of disagreement whilst respondents moderately agreed to theft on campus. The overall mean rating of 2.80 ($p < 0.05$) indicates respondents' general disagreement to the level of campus crime which is a significant factor. According to Cantalupo (2009), many campus sexual assaults go unreported due to the victim's fear they will not be believed or will experience lack of support.

In summary, students had poor perception about campus safety and security and were generally dissatisfied. This finding is not congruent to the findings of the study of Flannery and Quinn-Leering (2000) who observed that university campuses are fairly safe learning environments. However, the findings of the current study are consistent with the works of Amoatema, Kyeremeh and Arthur (2017), and Owusu et al. (2016).

4.1.2. Research Question 2: To What Extent Are Students Satisfied with Campus Safety and Security?

To answer this question, respondents were to rate six (6) statements on a Likert scale ranging from strongly dissatisfied (1) to strongly satisfied (5). The result is presented in Table 9.

Overall Satisfaction	Mean Rating	SD
Lit walkways	3.14	1.24
Security guards	3.17	1.12
Campus police	3.32	1.03
Emergency phone lines	3.38	1.03
Self-defense classes	3.21	1.11
Hostel safety	3.29	1.26
Overall Mean Rating	3.25	

Table 9: Extent of Students' Satisfaction on Campus Safety and Security

Source: Author (2020)

The result revealed that, the extent of students' satisfaction on campus safety and security has an average mean of 3.25 from the six statements with the individual statements mean ratings being a little above 3.0. This shows that students are just or moderately satisfied with campus safety and security. All these are significant factors to campus security and safety.

4.1.3. Research Question 3: What Measures Can Be Put in Place to Improve Safety and Security on Campus?

Students were asked to provide suggestions to help make ATU a safer campus community. Open-ended responses provided by students were analyzed thematically using content analysis. This qualitative approach yielded themes on improving campus environment, hostel, safety, security and curbing campus crime. These are summarized below.

4.1.3.1. Campus Security

Students had a lot to complain about the security systems in place and the security personnel. Comments provided generally suggested that security systems are inadequate and security guards lacked proper training, emphasizing the need for an effective recruitment policy on the number and qualification of security guards as well as proper training.

The respondents suggested that

"Young and energetic men should be employed as security men".

"Security guards ought to be well-trained and properly equipped;

"There should be enough security men deployed at vantage points on campus including the hostels."

"Effective student checkups ought to be done at entry and exit points using student ID cards"

"Constant security patrol and monitoring on campus".

"Attitudinal change among security guards, to be able to perform their assigned duties vigilantly to prevent robbery or theft".

"The installation of CCTV cameras on the hostel corridor to minimize theft as well as secret CCTV cameras at the entrance/exit of the school compound and in classrooms

"Students had to be trained to combat crime and seminars could be organized to help students deal with crime on campus.

On Environmental and Hostel safety, the respondents suggested:

"Continuous and sustainable supply of water to help maintain the washrooms "

"Rooms in the hostels be spacious for enough or adequate ventilation"

"Refurbishment of existing facilities and continuous cleaning and maintenance culture

On campus safety, students had these to say:

"Emergency phone lines should be made available for students to access in case of emergency".

"The university should keep the students notified on potential safety issues concerning the school at all times."

In view of the lightening situation on campus, students indicated that,

"More street lights had to be provided at obscure places to improve illumination at night to reduce tension and fear that students have been experiencing"

"Again, enough light had to be provided in the lecture rooms and every place where students can sit around to learn or prepare for their work and assignments."

The comments above show that the existing campus lacks safety tools and equipment and hardly has an effective safety management policy, if any. Communication between the university and students on safety issues had to be made a priority. This communication could be enhanced through feedback systems and safety programs organized to increase safety awareness on campus.

5. Conclusion

University campuses are fairly safe learning environments; it is to no surprise that students keep expressing their displeasure on campus safety and security. This paper studied students' perception of campus safety and security at ATU. The study concludes that there are safety and security lapses on ATU campus. The extent of students' satisfaction on safety and security on campus is just satisfactory. The current study is a wakeup call for University authorities to prioritize safety and security concerns and to make concerted efforts to make university grounds safe and secure for education. ATU should recruit competent and professional security staff, train and well-equip them to fight crime on campus and to ensure safety. In the end, safety and security is everyone's responsibility; staff, students, parents/guardians, strategic partners and the public have respective roles to play in ensuring a safe and secure campus environment.

. On the other hand, it is not enough to identify or diagnose safety and security concerns but the extent to which actionable insights on problem areas are implemented through systematic and corrective initiatives. The management of ATU should make operational any, existing safety and security policies and provide the required resources to support implementations. As regards that, stakeholders and the government may be involved in improving the safety and security situation on campus. ATU prides itself on its strategic location in the central business district of the capital city, Accra and yet this advantage is fraught with safety and security problems. It is time for ATU to beef up its security systems in place such as the installation of CCTV cameras at vantage points, proper training of security guards and adequate lighting on campus and hostels. Students and staff alike ought to be abreast with safety measures in times of emergencies and during normal working hours. These measures are expected to boost confidence in the school system, making it well-equipped for teaching, learning and nurturing long-lasting relations.

6. References

- i. Adolf, D. (2012). Legal issues with security on higher education campuses: rethinking campus security liability. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 7(2), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2012.656258>
- ii. Amoatema, A. S., Kyeremeh, D. D., & Arthur, Y. D. (2017). *Students' perception of campus safety: A case of Kumasi campus of University of Education, Winneba, Ghana*. (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). University of Education, Winneba, Ghana.
- iii. Bohmer, C. & Andrea P. (1993). *Sexual assault on campus: The problem and the solution*. New York: Lexington Books.
- iv. Brown, S. L. & Andy, M. M. (2007). Risk perception, fuzzy representations and comparative optimism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 575–578. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000712606X169020>.
- v. Cantalupo, N. C. (2009). Campus violence: Understanding the extraordinary through the ordinary. Georgetown Public Law and Legal theory Research Paper No. 1457343. Retrieved May 16, 2015 from <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1427&context=facpub>
- vi. Chen, G. & Weikart (2008). Student background, school climate, school disorder, and student achievement: An empirical study of New York City's middle schools. *Journal of School Violence*, 7, 3–20.
- vii. Chekwa, C., Thomas, J. E., & Jones, V. J. (2016). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER)*, 6(3), 325–332. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v6i3.7903>
- viii. Cornell, D. G. & Mayer, M. J. (2010). Why do school order and safety matter? *Educational Researcher*, 39, 7–15.
- ix. Craighead, G. (2003). *High-rise security and fire life safety*. Woburn: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- x. Crawford, E. W., O'Dougherty, M., & Birchmeier, Z., (2008). Drug-facilitated sexual assault: College women's risk perception and behavioral choices. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(3), 261–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JACH.57.3.261-272>.
- xi. Currie, D. H. (1994). Women's safety on campus: Challenging the University as gendered space. *Humanity & Society*, 18(3), 24–47.
- xii. Ethel T. Nduka tasks FG on ASUU crises. *Educational Development Uniport Weekly*; 2013
- xiii. Fischer, R. J. & Green, G. (2004). *Introduction to security*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- xiv. Flannery, D. J., & Quinn-Leering, K. (2000). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 24(10), 78 – 92.
- xv. Fletcher, P. C., & Bryden, P. J. (2007). Preliminary examination of safety issues on a university campus: Personal safety practices, beliefs, and attitudes of female faculty and staff. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 1149–1162.
- xvi. Franzosa, A. (2009). Insecure? Keeping New England college campuses safe from violence. *New England Journal of Higher Education*, 20–21.
- xvii. Gnage, F. M., Dziagwa, C., & White, D. (2009). Safety on a rural community college campus via integrated communications. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(11), 948–950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920903153105>
- xviii. Giblin, M. J., Haynes, M. R., Burruss, G. W., & Schafer, J. A. (2013). Agree to disagree? Discordance in agency responses regarding campus safety. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 36(3), 374–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2012.701100>.
- xix. Jennings, W. G., Gover, A. R., & Pudrznyska, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(2), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511250701383327>.
- xx. Hollis, Michael. J. (2010). An exploratory analysis of university safety through an examination of students' self-perceptions of campus and community violence levels and student learning influences. EDT Collection from Texas State University-San Marcos. ERIC Number ED512572. Retrieved December 13, 2014, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.
- xxi. Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational Psychology Measurement*, 607–610.
- xxii. Loukaitou-Sideris, A. & Fink, C. (2009). Addressing women's fear of victimization in transportation settings. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(4), 554–587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1078087408322874>
- xxiii. Matthew, K. I., Kajs, L., & Matthew, M. E. (2017). Balancing disruptive students' rights with campus safety. The clearing house. *Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 90(5–6), 203–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1366793>

- xxiv. McDonald, S. M. (2011). *Perception: A concept analysis*. (Doctoral Thesis). College of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Texas, USA.
- xxv. Nimako S, Bondinuba F. Relative importance of student accommodation quality in higher education. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*. 2013;5(4):134-142
- xxvi. Oluwajana, T. (2017). *Student perception of safety in campus vis-a-vis crime and violence - A case study of ECU*. (Masters' Thesis). East Carolina University, USA.
- xxvii. Owusu, G. A., Akoto, J. S., & Abnory, M. M. (2016). Is Our Safety and Security Guaranteed on University of Cape Coast Campus? Undergraduates Students' Perceptions. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(4), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n4p75>
- xxviii. Patschke, M. (2017). National Association of Elementary School Principals – NAESP, Alexandria, VA. [
- xxix. Pezza, P. E., & Bellotti, A. (1995). College campus violence: Origins, impacts, and responses. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7(1), 49 – 62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02214209>
- xxx. Prinsloo, S. (2006). Sexual harassment and violence in South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 26, 305-318.
- xxxi. Ratti, C. L. (2010). *Student perceptions of campus safety at the University of Mary Washington*. (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Marty Washington.
- xxxii. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th ed.). Italy: Pearson Education.
- xxxiii. Sloan JJ, Lanier MM, Beer DL. Policing the contemporary university campus: Challenging traditional organizational models. *Journal of Security Administration*. 2000; 23:1–20
- xxxiv. Tseng, C. H., J. Duane, and F. Hadipriono. 2004. "Performance of Campus Parking Garages in Preventing Crime." *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities* 18: 21–28.
- xxxv. Veil, S., & Mitchell, K. (2010). Terror management theory: Promoting tolerance in campus safety campaigns. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 4(4), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2010.515541>
- xxxvi. Wiersma-Mosley, J. D., Jozkowski, K. N., & Martinez, T. (2017). An empirical investigation of campus demographics and reported rapes. *Journal of American College Health*, 65(7), 482–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2017.1343829>
- xxxvii. Xaba, M. (2006). An investigation into the basic safety and security status of schools' physical environments. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(4), 565–580. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=24807503&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Appendix A

Constructs	Test Value = 3					
	t-ratio	df	p-value	Mean Difference	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Campus Safety	-2.35	3	0.10	-0.25	-0.58	0.09
Sense of community	-1.01	3	0.39	-0.11	-0.47	0.24
Campus Environment	-6.58*	4	0.00	-0.46	-0.66	-0.27
Campus Lightening	-8.54*	4	0.00	-0.50	-0.66	-0.34
Campus Hostel	-14.95*	5	0.00	-0.57	-0.67	-0.47
Attitudes and Behaviour of Campus Security	-0.96	1	0.51	-0.25	-3.55	3.05
Campus Crime	-3.42*	5	0.02	-0.20	-0.34	-0.05
Overall Satisfaction	6.61*	5	0.00	0.25	0.15	0.35

Table 10: Test of Significance of Means

Source: Author (2020)

* Indicates Statistical Significant At 5%