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ABSTRACT

Recent research in the United Kingdom has indicated that many students experience high levels of fear of crime and victimisation on university campuses. Furthermore, research has recognised that positive feelings of safety can be engendered through changes to the physical environment of the campus. However, existing campus safety research focuses predominantly on student vulnerability and relies typically on quantitative methodologies.

This thesis explores a variety of campus users' perceptions of personal safety in relation to the campus environment of two universities. In order to delineate the scope of the project it was necessary to define the term 'personal safety' since no rigorous, academically useful definition was found in the literature. The definition was formulated using the Delphi Method, which sought the views of expert respondents through three successive rounds of questionnaires until a consensus of opinion was attained. Further analysis led to the development of a conceptual framework which indicated that personal safety can be constructed objectively and subjectively. In response to criticisms of objective methodologies, this research adopted a predominantly subjective approach by exploring campus users’ perceptions of personal safety in relation to university campus environments. The University of Glamorgan was used for a primary study, and Loughborough University was used as a secondary study. Questionnaires were sent to a sample of staff, students and visitors at Glamorgan to determine the most commonly used pedestrian routes around the campus. These were then filmed using the Virtual Reality Panorama Tool, which uses QuickTime software to create standardised virtual-reality representations of the routes. These were presented as an environmental
stimulus to a range of focus groups. Common routes were also identified and filmed at Loughborough.

The focus group discussions highlighted areas of the campuses which engendered perceptions of vulnerability and led to the development of appropriate user-led strategies to promote personal safety on university campuses. Feelings of vulnerability were particularly acute in relation to low levels of street lighting, a sparse social presence and in locations of the campus that were perceived to be poorly maintained, remote or enclosed. In response to these areas of concern, possible solutions included improved street lighting in certain locations, the re-design of the campus landscape to eradicate tall and dense vegetation and a clearly identifiable security personnel presence.

This thesis contributes to existing literature in the fields of campus crime and student victimisation by presenting one of the first known academically attained definitions of the term 'personal safety', and communicating the benefits of qualitative data collection methods to provide a more thorough understanding of why fears for personal safety exist. Furthermore, the research led to the development of a comprehensive methodology to explore multi-user perspectives in the promotion of safer campus environments. This can be used in any campus environment to explore perceptions of personal safety but it also forms a versatile, insightful and transferable research tool that can be used to explore the impact of facilities and their design, management and maintenance in other contexts, leading to solutions and recommendations to improve environments based directly on the needs and perceptions of space users.
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Chapter One

Introduction, background, philosophy and relevance of research
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The focus of this research is an assessment of personal safety on university campuses. This chapter presents the basis of the argument for why personal safety is important in modern society and on university campuses, followed by a précis of the literature available on the subject, and how this shaped the methodology and focus of the research. In particular, evidence is presented for why the research consisted of two distinct elements: a unique study to define personal safety and a further study assessing personal safety in a university campus context, with a particular emphasis on how campus users perceive the campus environment.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Personal safety is a significant issue in present society because of the risk, perceived and real, of suffering violence, aggression and threatening or intimidating behaviour. According to Nicholas et al. (2005) interviews for a recent British Crime Survey revealed that there were an estimated 2,412,000 violent crimes committed in 2004/5, highlighting the extent of the problem. If perceived or actual personal safety is threatened to any degree then it can greatly affect an individual's quality of life. Personal safety awareness has therefore become increasingly important, as have identifying tools that are proven to be practical and effective in reducing crime and promoting personal safety.

Within a university campus context, studies have revealed that students are a high risk-group, more at risk of experiencing crime than members of the general population. For example, a recent Home Office study by Barberet et al. (2004, p.15) found that one in three students had been victimised in the previous year. This is compared to a one in four risk of victimisation in the general population (Clegg et al. 2005). As well as the moral obligations to protect staff, students and visitors it should also be noted, as did Nasar et al. (1993, p.162), that “fear of crime may also damage the public image and support for an institution and reduce demand for enrolments,” which is an additional negative by-product of a campus which does not actively promote personal safety. Personal safety is clearly a socially relevant subject and there is a growing need to investigate ways of improving and promoting personal safety in a university campus environment.

Legislation demands that employers adhere to a policy on Health and Safety to safeguard the safety of its employees. In accordance with the Health and Safety at
Work Act 1974, all employers have a legal obligation to "ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare at work of all his employees." (1976, p.2). This was explicated in more detail with the 1992 amendments (Health and Safety Executive 1992), which mandated that, in order to ensure safety was maximised, employers should carry out risk assessments to identify problem areas. Up until around 20 years ago the emphasis on safety at work typically focused on guidance for more 'traditional' workplace hazards, such as chemical spills, fire hazards and preventing accidents. This mentality was intrinsically linked to the preceding industrial age of our country. Inevitably, cultural and political changes over the last half-century have had an impact on the nature of health and safety at work and, with shifting societal trends, safety at work now brings with it different but considerable risks. More employers have recognised that employees' personal safety, particularly in terms of risks or threats of violence or aggression, are significant and need to be addressed. In recognition of this many workplaces have drawn up guidelines for dealing with potential incidents, although the issue is fraught with ambiguity. While this applies more to university staff, students are particularly vulnerable. With universities no longer adopting the role of in loco parentis, i.e. acting as 'guardians' for students, there is considerable uncertainty over the extent to which a university should go to take responsibility for students' behaviour and welfare (Bickel and Lake 1999). However, universities have a clear duty of care to all campus users, at the very least from a moral perspective, and this should extend to the promotion of personal safety.

1.2 ORIGINS OF THE PROJECT

The Suzy Lamplugh Trust (SLT) was established in 1986 following the disappearance of estate agent Suzy Lamplugh. A registered charity, the Suzy Lamplugh Trust is the leading authority on personal safety and has been a powerful force in increasing awareness of personal safety and influencing policy makers. The Trust works alongside government, the police, public bodies and the business sector to encourage personal safety awareness. The Trust also has extensive experience in campaigning, training and education. The Suzy Lamplugh Trust was powered for nearly 20 years by its well-known figurehead, Diana Lamplugh. It was her close links to Wales coupled with the need to supplement the Trust's existing work with empirically based research that sealed the genesis of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute (SLTRI) in 1999. The Mission of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute was to establish an organisation that pursued academic research
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that could be usefully applied to enhancing knowledge of personal safety issues to underpin the work of the Trust, and to facilitate positive social change in the field of personal safety. Following the origin of the Institute it became apparent that a specific study into personal safety on university campuses was essential. This was because the SLTRI, as a centre for personal safety, should by designation, be located within a relatively 'safe' environment and therefore its environment should be audited, evaluated and modified to maximise personal safety in its vicinity and to provide a benchmark for how to create safer environments. Surprisingly, this successful and high profile campaigning charity had no formal definition of its central purpose: 'personal safety'.

1.3 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

Having identified the necessity for the study, a review of the literature revealed that the issue of personal safety on university campuses is very important. However, the research was typically concerned with campus crime and student victimisation, rather than personal safety per se. The studies implicitly implied a correlation between crime and personal safety yet nowhere was the concept of 'personal safety' explicitly defined. This not only signalled a requirement to define the term 'personal safety' but also to draw cautiously from the literature because of their focus on crime and fear of crime rather than personal safety.

Many campuses in the United States (US) have severe crime problems and there is a long research precedent that stemmed from this social phenomenon. Campus crime and student victimisation has become more prolific over the last 50 years and there has been recognition that this can be counterproductive: "Campuses need to be safe. Campuses are places to learn and grow. A community of violence is incompatible with these requirements." (Hoffman et al. 1998, p.xv). This view is the basis of why campus safety research is so crucial. Research in the United Kingdom (UK) is less forthcoming but the US research provides some insight into safety and crime concerns and incidences on university campuses. This research is significant because university students are substantially 'at risk' of being victimised. The reason why students experience increased risk appears to be two-fold: demographic factors and the inherent and unique physical environment that characterises university campuses.
Demographic qualities of students can be explained as possible causes for increased risk of being a victim of crime. In support of this, Barberet et al. (2003) claims that one-third of students are victims of crime each year in the UK. This is in addition to the heightened risks to young people generally of experiencing violence; the 16-24 age group, who form a large segment of campus users, are more at risk of being victimised than any other. For historical, cultural, political and social reasons, the nature of risks to students in the US is different to those in the UK, in part due to the legal right of gun ownership. Figures for the US indicate that there were 45 murders, 8,214 aggravated assaults and 41,651 burglaries reported on or near university campuses in 2003 (US Department of Education 2005). This is supported by research studies which have explored the prevalence and nature of victimisation risk to students. Fisher and Wilkes (2003) discussed how demographic factors such as age can be a key indicator of victimisation risk.

Furthermore, the design and layout of many university campuses and facilities can lead to an increased propensity for crime and victimisation. Campuses often lack strict restrictions of access which means that potential offenders can penetrate the university and blend in to the student body without drawing attention to themselves. Indeed, Nasar et al. (1993, p.162) assert that “the open, park-like nature of so many campuses gives offenders easy access, and the diverse student populations reduce the risk that offenders will be noticed.”

Of equal pertinence, students also experience high levels of fear of crime, something which Nasar et al. (1993, p.161) claim is “a serious problem on university and college campuses”. All people have a basic human right to be as safe as possible and to live life free of fear. If people have experienced crime or live in fear of crime then this may limit their lifestyle and therefore impact on their emotional well-being. Nasar et al. (1993, p.162) claim that a “climate of fear can have devastating effects on quality of life. Fear has shown to constrain use of the environment, limit territory, disrupt neighbourhood cohesion, reduce the sense of community, increase social disorder and make residents feel like prisoners in their own homes and neighbourhoods”. People who feel safe within an environment are more likely to exhibit the opposite of these characteristics and fully integrate and participate in their community. Nasar et al. (1993, p.164) asserts that “although fear does not always reflect actual occurrences of crime, certain cues to fear (such as dark hiding places) may be fearful because they provide opportunities for crime”. People who use a campus should not feel constrained from using parts of it and should gain the maximum benefit and
enjoyment out of their time spent at university by having the freedom to access all the services and facilities available to them.

Research has shown that risk of crime and fear of crime on university campuses can be exacerbated by different features of the built and natural environment. Nasar et al. (1993) highlight the role the environment has in shaping people's concerns by claiming that people detect and interpret signals from their environment which can increase or decrease their feelings of fear. Research provides example of such signals that increased vulnerability, including areas with dense foliage (Nasar et al. 1993) and areas that are secluded (Robinson and Mullen 2001). Fisher and Nasar (1992) explored this in a campus environment and found that students felt significantly less safe in areas with 'high concealment, limited prospect and blocked escape'. In other words, the physical design of the university impinged significantly on student's perceptions of safety. However, Nasar et al. (1993, p.162) found that "the social and physical characteristics of campuses can also influence fear of crime." These studies were significant because they reflect the importance of the static (built and natural) and transient (social) features of a campus environment as a relevant research topic.

Recently in the UK there are signs that the higher education (HE) sector has recognised the importance of personal safety in higher education institutions (HEIs). In addition to some recent reports (Campbell and Bryceland 1998; HeFCE report Management of Security Services in Higher Education 2002) that drew attention to the issue, some studies by the Home Office (Barberet et al. 2003, 2004) were a positive step in drawing attention to the problem of student safety.

1.4 WEAKNESSES IN THE LITERATURE

What was most apparent in a review of the literature was that no definition of personal safety existed. The campus crime and victimisation literature provided an intuitive link between crime and personal safety but ambiguity remained. It was thus necessary to define the concept of personal safety in order to delineate the campus study and to establish its distinct relationship and interrelation to crime. Furthermore, there was a distinct paucity of studies which focused specifically on personal safety on university campuses from the campus users' perspective. Not enough empirical research has been conducted into the complex factors that affect personal safety and contribute to its definition. Key criticisms levied at the approaches used in campus
crime and student victimisation research is that most of it uses recorded crime statistics or victimisation surveys as the main data source and such quantitative methodologies are flawed. Furthermore, Seng and Koehler (1993, p.104) highlighted how misleading official crime statistics can be when they are used as a benchmark for how safe a campus is, since "the number of crimes on campus cannot be properly interpreted without reference to the university setting and its characteristics." This has consequences for the relevance of crime statistics being used for the development of crime prevention strategies and personal safety responses.

This criticism can be explained by the accepted view that recorded crime statistics do not depict actual levels of crime. Maguire (2002, p.348) refers to this anomaly as the 'dark figure' of crime. This refers to unreported or unrecorded crimes which do not figure in official crime data. Furthermore, such data can be denigrated for failing to address social and situational contexts which may contribute to crime occurrences, or for the likelihood of some people to be more at risk of being victimised than others. Although crime surveys have the potential to provide more insight into crime and victimisation by providing an assessment of perceptions, they can be criticised for a number of reasons. Firstly, there can be a problem of people failing to record crimes committed against them and secondly they can fail to address more subtle affronts to personal safety, such as experiencing intimidation or aggressive behaviour. Thirdly, and more detrimentally, is that respondents are required to place their responses into oversimplified categories which are designed to allow ease of quantification but which do not give respondents the scope to explain why they feel a certain way. It is therefore arguable whether such sources of data provide a fully representational insight into crime and victimisation. These important issues have major implications for the specific focus of my research and the development of an appropriate methodology because they will determine the responses I attain and their appropriateness for focal points for campus improvements.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH

To put this study into context it is important to explain briefly how it originated. As discussed earlier, following the establishment of the SLTRI there was recognition that the Institute needed to be located in a safe environment. Therefore an initial study was required to ascertain how safe the University of Glamorgan was and, if needed, to identify practical means of making it safer. This led to me being employed as a Research Assistant at the University in 2001. My key remit was as follows:
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Conduct a review of personal safety on campus.

It was decided that I would also incorporate this study into a PhD thesis. After reviewing the literature in this field some central questions were identified:

1. What is personal safety?
2. How is personal safety constructed?
3. In what discipline should personal safety be anchored?
4. What influences personal safety on university campuses?
5. What can be done to improve personal safety on university campuses?

These questions conform to Creswell's (2003) description of the most apt way to word research questions in an exploratory research study. He suggests that questions which start with the words "what" or "how" convey the fundamental nature of a probing study, while "why" questions, in contrast, suggest a more structured attempt to determine cause/effect relationships which are characteristic of quantitative studies. In this case, because so little is known about personal safety, exploratory questions are the most appropriate.

Having identified these general key research questions, it followed that there were specific objectives that would have to be achieved in order to answer them, while also addressing the initial aim of the study. The research objectives (RO) are presented in Table 1.1 as follows:
Table 1.1 Research objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective number:</th>
<th>Objective:</th>
<th>Addresses research question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO1</td>
<td>To define and scope the term 'personal safety', with particular emphasis on the distinction between objective and subjective dimensions of the construct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO2</td>
<td>To identify an appropriate conceptualisation of perceptions of personal safety to facilitate its practical application</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO3</td>
<td>To ground personal safety in an appropriate discipline and establish it as a valid subject for academic research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO4</td>
<td>To apply this definition practically and conceptualise a review of personal safety on university campuses using a case study research method to probe the personal perceptions of campus users</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO5</td>
<td>To make recommendations of ways in which the two case study campuses can be improved to enhance users' perceptions of personal safety, and provide insights for designers, planners and architects of for the design and improvement of campuses.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO6</td>
<td>To ascertain how underlying philosophical and methodological issues of a perceptual approach can be reconciled with recommendations that focus on changing the physicality of university campuses</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO7</td>
<td>To contribute to the literature and knowledge-base of campus safety research</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO8</td>
<td>To identify areas of further research which can strengthen this body of knowledge and provide a focus for future work</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This highlights how the initial aim of the research developed into pertinent research questions and finally to the identification of eight central research objectives which formed a complex, meaningful and exciting study. It is these objectives that I have addressed and referred to throughout the thesis because they are not only more specific than the research questions but also implicitly answer them.

1.6 RESEARCH APPROACH AND DESIGN

Initially, the research approach was very much dictated by the lack of a coherent and robustly attained definition of personal safety in the literature. This meant that a specific study was necessary in order to scope the campus study: despite personal safety being an intuitively understood concept, inherently realised on a personal level, the ambiguity of the concept meant that the campus project would be inadequately demarcated if it was based on vague terminology and would not be methodologically sound. It was therefore fundamental to define 'personal safety' in order to identify the principal focus of the campus study, and to delineate the scope of the project. Although allied disciplines were helpful in establishing basic insights and supporting emerging data, the process of definition dictated that an exploratory approach was needed.
Consequently, the necessity to define the term personal safety meant that an inductive research approach was required. Inductive research is useful in determining emerging themes from the data collected from which conclusions can be drawn (Bryman 2001). The definition of 'personal safety' was formulated using the Delphi method, a well-established social science research methodology that uses expert views in an iterative and structured process to attain a consensus of opinion. This led to a definition that could be used in the study of personal safety on the university campus.

The Delphi study led to the conclusion that personal safety is concerned with intentionally motivated harm and is a highly subjective phenomenon that is constructed from a number of important components. In particular, the physical environment, social environment and individual personal factors shape perceived and actual personal safety at any given time. Because crime statistics provide only a limited insight into actual personal safety I identified a need to look beyond this limited data and conduct a campus study that supported a more detailed analysis of the core issues of personal safety. This determined that the consequent campus methodology was primarily qualitative in nature. In order to conduct more meaningful research, a perceptual approach was deemed to provide a more realistic portrayal of users' concerns than statistical approaches allowed for. This would lead to environmental improvements that more accurately reflected the needs of campus users. Skogan and Maxfield (1981) found that users' perceptions are a more accurate indicator of safety concerns than simply using objective crime data.

This research sought to translate both qualitative and quantitative data into tangible improvements that objective data on its own could not accurately provide. Exploring user's perceptions of personal safety allowed for an informative narrative of the nature and context of personal safety concerns to be constructed. This offered the most promising approach to the campus study, from which a more detailed and contextual illustration of campus safety emerged. Pain (1997, p.120) provides credence to this approach by suggesting that "qualitative and humanistic methods offer the most enlightening prospects of investigating the interactions between identity, social relations and place". Such an approach provided a clear understanding of the reasoning for why campus users feel a certain way about campus safety, leading to an informed and user-led framework of recommendations for personal safety improvements.
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As the home of the SLTRI, the University of Glamorgan was used as a primary case study for this research and a pilot study served as a preliminary examination of the phenomenon before a larger-scale study was undertaken. A questionnaire sought respondents' overall perceptions of security on campus, whether, where and when they fear for their safety on campus and whether they have experienced intentional harm on campus. Crucially, they were also asked to identify their common pedestrian routes across campus by drawing them on a campus map.

The interpretation of the environmental space on campus was a significant focus of the research. Gifford (1997, p.17) defines environmental perceptions as including "the ways and means by which we collect information through all our senses.....to include aspects of how we appraise and assess environments." This corresponds with the view of Nasar et al. (1993), who suggest that people scan the environment in such a way that contributes to their perceptions of safety. Furthermore, research has shown that various user groups decode the environment differently, and consequently exhibit different concerns for their personal safety (Boyle et al. 2004). Static photographs have often been utilised as a source of environmental stimuli, particularly in the field of environmental psychology and the study of environmental preferences (Schroeder and Anderson 1984). One of the weaknesses of such an approach is that the majority of these studies require respondents to rate their perceptions of a photograph of a particular environment against a narrow set of ratings scales, rather than a richer, more detailed qualitative response analysis (Hubbard 1996). These issues were particularly significant for the development of the methodology of this thesis.

How campus users' decoded and perceived the campus environment played a key part in exploring the meaning of personal safety and the interrelationship between people and their socio-physical surroundings. Using virtual reality (VR) technology, a standardised virtual representation of key pedestrian routes around the campus was used as an environmental stimulus to probe user perceptions of a selection of campus locations. This allowed the subjective viewpoint of campus users to be sought and provided an insight into how safe the campus was perceived to be. Furthermore, the identification of characteristic features of the campus environment that invoked perceptions of risk and feelings of fear were identified. Practical solutions that promulgated personal safety were discussed. Focus groups were identified as the most appropriate arena for fostering this subjective approach. According to Gibbs (1997) focus groups allow participants to talk freely and to choose
descriptive categories that are significant to them. The collection and analysis of subjective textual data from focus groups thus offered a more detailed awareness and insight into campus safety. Such an approach gave campus users the opportunity to clarify their key issues of concern, leading to an informed and user-led framework of recommendations for personal safety improvements. A comparative study was carried out at Loughborough University, which served to explore and verify the first study's findings.

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THESIS

I decided to divide this thesis into two distinct parts because the research consisted of two distinct projects, both inter-dependant, but unique in their approach. Therefore the thesis has been structured to account for this, as shown graphically in Figure 1.1.

PART 1 – Defining personal safety

Chapter 2 – A critical review and discussion of personal safety literature. This chapter charts the process of searching for available literature on personal safety and, on realising that little existed, the review and discussion of analogous literature that could purposefully enhance understanding of this elusive concept. It explores the intuitive and apparent link between safety and crime and demonstrates how the criminology literature enhances understanding of the term 'personal safety'. In particular, the differences between actual risk and perceived risk are broached as well as a thorough discussion on the nature and methodological approaches to fear of crime. Approaches to other safety related concepts such as 'community safety' and 'public safety' are discussed and the essential need for an academically attained and lucid definition of 'personal safety' is highlighted.

Chapter 3 – Defining and scoping the concept of 'personal safety'. This chapter focuses on the available methodologies available to define a construct and the difficulties involved. The Delphi method is then described and is critically assessed for its appropriateness in defining the term 'personal safety'. A summary of a pilot Delphi study is described and its key findings presented and discussed along with modification suggestions for a full-scale Delphi study. The personal safety triangle is introduced as an accessible depiction of the tri-partite nature of personal safety, consisting of physical, social and personal determinants. Then the 'building block' approach to developing a conceptual framework of personal safety is presented,
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along with an explanation of the main Delphi study sampling frame, structure and process.

Chapter 4 – Delphi study to define ‘personal safety’: Findings and discussion. This chapter provides a thorough portrayal of the Delphi study’s key findings. The findings are structured according to those of the pilot study; key building blocks of personal safety are reinforced and new ones emerged. The consensually agreed definition of personal safety is presented and some add-on statements supplement the definition to provide further insights. A detailed discussion leads to the pilot study’s findings that personal safety is a two dimensional issue, consisting of actual risk and perceived risk. The perceptual dimension of personal safety is highlighted as an appropriate conceptualisation of personal safety and the notion that personal safety is highly subjective, is transient and is dynamic according to our social and physical environments is expounded. Finally, the discussion and framework are critiqued and the implications for the campus study are discussed.

PART 2 – An assessment of personal safety on university campuses

Chapter 5 – A critical review and discussion of the campus crime and student victimisation literature. This chapter presents the wealth of literature from the US on campus safety and student victimisation and charts the 40 year history of such research in relation to a key period of social and political change. It explores how demographic and lifestyle factors influence victimisation and then goes on to explore how the physical environment impacts on criminality and draws on supporting criminological theory. There follows an investigation and appraisal of the approaches to campus crime data collection, from official statistics to crime surveys and criticises them for relying on reported crime (and failing to represent actuality) and condensed perceptions (and failing to account for rich contextual data). It discusses the lack of qualitative research studies in campus research and proclaims that although previous research is useful and necessary, a more illuminating qualitative research approach should be adopted in this thesis. This chapter also explores the lack of literature emanating from the UK and presents the few studies that have.

Chapter 6 – Methodology: exploring personal safety on university campuses. This chapter draws on the knowledge derived from all of the earlier chapters to arrive at an appropriate methodology for the campus study. The key elements of this consist of:
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- A subjective user-led approach to explore contextual, rich data in terms that are relevant to campus users (Delphi = personal safety = highly subjective and complex)
- Three user groups were identified and probed: staff, students and visitors
- A predominantly qualitative research approach: use of focus groups (amenable to exploration of subjective perspectives and because of lack of literature adopting this approach)
- Questionnaires used to supplement the primary qualitative data and determine which routes to film
- The exploration of the physical environment of the campus (Delphi study = physical environment = key determinant of personal safety, supported by criminological literature and US campus crime literature)
- The use of virtual reality (VR) as an environmental stimuli (ideal to present physical environment of campus to campus users, underpinned by environmental psychology approach to perceptual appraisals)

Chapter 7 – University campus case studies: findings and discussion. This chapter highlights the key findings from the two campus case studies. Firstly, the focus groups held at the University of Glamorgan are discussed and the key issues that campus users felt influenced their personal safety are explored. These were categorised according to the personal safety triangle devised from the literature and Delphi studies and this was translated into a framework of determinants that were found to affect users as they manoeuvred through the campus. The four focus groups in which Glamorgan Virtual Reality panoramas (VRs) were presented are discussed. A summary of the perceptions of each user group is explored in turn and compared and finally a composite diagram of all determinants is presented to represent how personal safety at the University of Glamorgan can be promoted. This chapter also highlights the key findings from the second campus case study at Loughborough University; the two focus groups in which a number of routes around Glamorgan University campus were presented to ‘potential visitors’ are presented and discussed. This was supplemented by the final two focus groups held at Glamorgan where staff and students were shown VRs of Loughborough campus. Key issues that campus users felt influenced their personal safety are explored and categorised according to the personal safety triangle. Again this was translated into a framework of determinants that were found to affect users as they manoeuvred through the campus. A composite diagram of all determinants is presented to represent a guide to campus management to promote personal safety.
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Chapter 8 – Recommendations: towards a framework for improving perceptions of personal safety on university campuses. A composite diagram of all personal safety determinants from all eight focus groups in the two campuses are presented to represent a guide to campus management to promote personal safety along with practical guidelines on how existing facilities can be modified and new builds can be designed with personal safety in mind. These recommendations are divided into the key physical and social determinants from the focus groups, which are critically appraised and assessed against the relevant literature. This chapter also discusses the implications of making recommendations for a perceivably safer campus and also presents a debate on the key philosophical issues that arise when making a case for changes to the physicality of the campus based on subjectively constructed perceptions.

Chapter 9 – Conclusions and recommendations for future research. The final chapter presents the conclusions, achievements, self-reflection, validity and limitations of the research and recommendations for future research that have been identified from this study. A synopsis of how the research objectives have been achieved is presented, along with a summary of the original contribution to knowledge.
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Figure 1.1 Structure of thesis

Chapter 1 – INTRODUCTION
General background to the thesis, significance of the topic, research questions, aims and objectives

Chapter 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW PERSONAL SAFETY
Theoretical foundations of personal safety and associated literature, criminological theory and concepts of crime and fear of crime

Chapter 3 – THE DELPHI STUDY METHODOLOGY
Research design, methodological approach, data collection and analytic approach

Chapter 4 – DELPHI FINDINGS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Definition of personal safety and conceptual framework of personal safety are discussed in context of literature, and implications for the campus study

Chapter 5 – LITERATURE REVIEW CAMPUS SAFETY
Theoretical background to campus research and review of campus safety and victimisation research is presented, as well as gaps in the literature and how they shaped my thesis.

Chapter 6 – CAMPUS STUDY METHODOLOGY
Research design, methodological approach, data collection and analytic approach

Chapter 7 – CASE STUDY FINDINGS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Key determinants of personal safety and features of physical environment explored, supported by focus group quotes. Findings discussed in context of both literature reviews and the Delphi study

Chapter 8 – RECOMMENDATIONS
Development and components of a framework of recommendations for personal safety promotion on university campuses, with caveats suggested.

Chapter 9 – CONCLUSIONS
The achievement of the research aims and objectives. Reflection on research, recommendations for future research and original contribution to knowledge
1.8 THE ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The study represents an original contribution to knowledge in that it presents an academic definition of personal safety and offers into the academic arena a tentative framework for how personal safety is constructed and what factors are influential in forming an individual's perception of personal safety at any given time. The research also serves to anchor personal safety in an appropriate academic field and establish it as a viable research theme (research objectives 1, 2 and 3).

Furthermore it explores the relatively untapped area of subjective responses to social and physical environments in terms of how people interpret university campus surroundings. This provides a valuable insight into what factors make a university campus perceivably unsafe and what steps can be taken to improve it, and allowed possible improvements to the campus to be grounded in meaningful and profound insights of how users perceive and experience the campus day-to-day and provided insights for campus managers, academics and practitioners (research objectives 4 and 5). This research contributes to the debate about crime and design as well as to the body of work that exists on environmental psychology. The research deviates from existing studies because it explores the experiences of a variety of campus users, and not just students and staff. I considered this an important element of the research because, although students comprise the majority proportion of campus users' and are indeed at a high risk of experiencing personal safety concerns, a thorough examination of campus safety should take into account the range of different campus users, including staff and visitors.

My research also eschewed the typically quantitative research approaches of the past and instead favoured a more subjective, experiential and perceptual approach. The resulting data went beyond that which can be gleaned from 'objective' analysis of official campus crime statistics and survey responses and I argue that the adopted approach allows a more comprehensive and informed understanding of the dynamics at play between campus users and their environment. By exploring perceptions of personal safety in a qualitative way, considerably more meaning and depth could be attributed to users' responses and the reasons behind their views on the relative safety of the campus. Furthermore, careful discussion of how such perceptions of personal safety can be reconciled on a philosophical basis with recommendations for physical change to the campus was also a key objective (research objective 6).
Due to the lack of theoretical or empirical knowledge available on personal safety on university campuses, it was not the aim of this research to test a specific hypothesis but rather to develop an informed, interpretative framework of understanding that would not only increase understanding of personal safety as a concept, but also the identification of some general insights on how campuses can be assessed and made safer. Blismas and Dainty (2003) support this view and advise that it is not possible to deduce a testable hypothesis in such circumstances. The study has been informed and contributes to the field of campus safety research (research objective 7) as well as providing insights for the environmental psychology, criminology and environmental design literature.

In essence, this thesis presents an assessment of personal safety on university campuses based on a carefully attained and scoped definition of the term 'personal safety' and the development of a sound methodology for assessing the perceptions of campus users, with a particular emphasis on the physical environment, leading to an informed, user-led framework of recommendations for promoting safer campuses and the identification of areas of important future research (research objective 8).
PART 1

Defining ‘personal safety’
Chapter Two

A critical review and discussion of personal safety literature
Chapter 2: A critical review and discussion of personal safety literature

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the absence of research studies that focus specifically on personal safety on university campuses. The most constructive approach to learning more about this phenomenon was deemed to be dividing up this proposition into two distinct entities: personal safety research and campus crime and student victimisation research. This led to a greater insight into the two elements of the research and provided a deeper clarity of how the two could usefully be coupled. This chapter consists of the first element; personal safety. The lack of research into personal safety meant that allied disciplines had to be explored, in particular the criminological literature. This provided insight into the concept but left many issues unresolved, not least because of the lack of systematic research linking the two and the reliance on the two issues being intuitively connected. The lack of a rigorous, academically useful definition of ‘personal safety’ meant that it was fundamental to define ‘personal safety’ in order to identify the principal focus of the campus study, and to delineate the scope of the project.

2.1 A HISTORY OF PERSONAL SAFETY

Personal safety has been an issue present throughout time, although the nature of risk to personal safety has changed substantially over the centuries. In this post-modern age we are faced with different risks to what we were in the past. Going back even a century, risks arose out of disease, illness and inadequate medical knowledge. The industrial age meanwhile ferried in risks related to accidents and atrocious working conditions. Today, however, we are faced with risks from crime and terrorism. Over recent years the synonymous issues of risk and safety have received prominence for a variety of reasons. The principle reason for this is that in the current social and cultural climate there has been a gradual recognition that safety and security are vital for a happy and fulfilled quality of life, as emphasised in the Human Rights Act 1998. The Human Rights Act 1998 (1998), Chapter 37, Article 5, states that “everyone has the right to liberty and security of person,” and this reflects the importance of safety to a fulfilling life. Of course, despite this ‘right’, modern society and its social ills mean that this cannot be guaranteed. Safety intuitively goes hand in hand with the issue of crime, something which permeates modern society, and the promotion of personal safety is an important issue which deserves thorough examination. Recent crime figures indicate, for example, that there were 1,184,702 violent crimes in England and Wales in 2004/5 (Nicholas et al. 2005). This gives
some portrait of the extent of the problem, although due to problems of under-reporting the figure may actually be higher.

2.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUZY LAMPLUGH TRUST

'Personal safety' was established as a viable agenda with the establishment of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust in 1986. The Trust's work laid the foundations for the issue of personal safety to be acknowledged and promoted in all walks of life (www.suzylamplugh.org). However, the Trust never sought to define the term personal safety; it is a term that was presupposed to be intuitively understood by everyone. This is true to an extent; most people have a fair grasp on what the term means, but everyone has their own subjective interpretation of what 'personal safety' means to them and in research terms it was imperative to scope its meaning. The Trust had a specific notion of personal safety which originated from the tragic disappearance of Suzy Lamplugh and fuelled their consequent campaigning but this ambiguity initially posed a problem to my research. However, I realised that this disparity actually provided an enormous and exciting opportunity because it was important to define the term 'personal safety' carefully and rigorously in order to carry out quality research and to legitimise the campus study. In addition, associated topics, such as the criminological literature, informed this new subject area and common themes were transferred to inform and enlighten the clarification of the term 'personal safety'.

2.3 PREVIOUS RESEARCH INTO PERSONAL SAFETY

There are no research studies into specifically personal safety on university campuses so alluding to relevant research served to inform the study. From a general literature assessment, talking to various academics, visiting the SLT and doing searches on the internet I found that there was a body of work that focussed upon safety on university campuses in the US, but that this was in the context of crime and student victimisation on campuses. Further reading into crime and criminology literature revealed that crime and safety appeared related but this link was never explicitly explored. Research into safety in other contexts, such as community safety and public safety, was more evident and provided some understanding as to what safety was, how we attribute meaning to it and how we can improve it. Thus while there were no specific studies into personal safety on university campuses, certain topics and research studies emerged as being
invaluable to informing my study and honing my understanding of the relevant broader academic milieu.

Very few research studies have been carried out with a direct reference to personal safety. Bilsky et al. (1993) go some way to providing an insight into personal safety by alluding to it as an aspect of quality of life, but there was no attempt made to define it. However, of significance is that they refer to personal safety being influenced by crime. Bilsky et al. suggest (1993, p.250) that "fear of crime is but a special case of feelings of personal safety." However an intuitive relationship is inferred and personal safety as a concept in its own right is only tenuously capitalised on as a phenomena of complexity and relevance. While this is only theoretically proposed it does bind the issues of crime and personal safety together and justifies the use of criminological literature to gain more insight into the concept. Bilsky and Wetzels (1992) asserted that personal safety was related to 'subjective well-being'. These tentative links provided some insight into how personal safety should be explored and what meaning it may have. Surprisingly, there are few research papers that expand on this research, so what could have been hailed as a defining moment in personal safety research was instead un-capitalised upon and the concept remained ambiguous. Burckhardt and Anderson (2003) usefully highlight the subjective nature of phenomena such as personal safety and quality of life which is pertinent to the development of a suitable methodology, as well as suggesting that interpretative approaches will be the most applicable to its exploration. Schroeder and Anderson (1984) explored perceptions of personal safety in outdoor spaces and attempted to quantify individual responses using a scale of perceived security. Although some attempt at measuring perceptions of personal safety is attempted, there is no clear picture of what personal safety is, or is not.

The most relevant study is research by Maurice et al. (2001, p.1) to define the terms 'safety' and 'safety promotion'; their definition of safety is "a state in which hazards and conditions leading to physical, psychological or material harm are controlled in order to preserve the health and well-being of individuals and the community." Whilst this is a very useful study, its limitation is that it is not specific enough for my research, because it does not explore the pertinent word 'personal'. However, it usefully referred to both intentional and unintentional injuries and acknowledged that safety has both an objective and a subjective component. However, their methodology is interesting and they also recognise the limitations of their definition as
"provisional, part of an ongoing process aimed at clarifying these concepts" (2001, p.2).

Of interest too is Balkin (1979, p.345), who defined 'safety' as "a probability of victimisation per exposure to risk". He devised a model to relate crime, safety and fear of crime. This is useful as it represents the way that safety and crime are used in conjunction throughout the criminological literature.

An alternative and literal insight can be garnered if the term 'personal safety' is broken down into its component parts and defined using the Concise Oxford Dictionary (Allen 1990):

- **Personal** - "One's own, individual", "directed to or concerning a person" p.889
- **Safety** - "The condition of being safe; freedom from danger or risks" p.1061

This literal translation is very useful. It demarcates personal safety as safety pertaining to the individual, while the safety element translates as freedom from danger or risk. This seems self-explanatory, but more elucidation is required to discern what exactly the nature of danger or risk is. It is this latter part that is the most ambiguous since the world is host to a plethora of dangers and risks of many different varieties so this requires conceptual clarity to distinguish what this actually refers to.

### 2.4 PREVIOUS RESEARCH INTO RELATED TOPICS

I realised that a disparity in the literature actually provided an enormous opportunity to begin the tentative first steps in developing an emerging new subject area. In addition, associated topics could shed light on this new subject area and common themes and theories could inform and enlighten the generation of a personal safety framework. According to Blismas and Dainty (2003, p.455), the lack of literature in a new field of study determines that literature from other disciplines should contribute substantially to the literature review. Considerable work has been undertaken into other safety research which can be used to inform and understand personal safety. The most significant of these is allied 'safety' terms from the criminological literature.

'Community safety' is defined by the Home Office report *Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention* (2004, p.8) as "an aspect of quality of life, in which
people, individually and collectively, are sufficiently free from or reassured about a range of real and perceived risks centering on crime and related misbehaviour." Thus, in a loose sense, community safety is the opposite of crime, or crime risk and again we see key themes emerging: 'risk', 'perceived', and 'crime'. 'Health and Safety' is concerned with reducing risks in workplaces that employees are exposed to. Current legislation requires employers to carry out assessments to determine evident risks and develop appropriate measures to reduce these risks, including the provision of adequate information and training. Thus the issue of 'risk' arises again, but here it does not refer explicitly to crime. 'Public Safety' is defined by Smith and Dickey (1999), as "a condition specific to places in which people and property are not at risk of attack or theft and are not perceived to be at risk." This is a very crime-specific definition, focusing on attacks and thefts, but again there is a tangible association between safety and crime. Powls and McDougall (2002) discuss 'public safety' and emphasise the importance of understanding fear of crime, perceptions of safety and actual safety. Again the inference between crime and safety is reiterated, as well as a separation between the concepts of fear, perceived risk and actual risk.

2.4.1 Relationship between safety and crime

What is apparent from my literature review is that although many academics make reference to personal safety or safety, there is distinct lack of clarity of what this phenomenon is or what it means. Paterson et al. (1999), Cozens et al. (2003a), Kenyon and Hawker (1999), Mulvey (2002), Jackson (2003), Leggat and Klein, (2001) Fazzone et al. (2000), Skillen et al. (2003), Lund and Hovden (2003) and Pain and Townshend (2002) are all examples of research that focussed upon issues of safety against crime and violence, fear of crime, safety against accident and injury and child sexual abuse. It became apparent that all of these were held to fall under the umbrella term of 'personal safety'. Despite all referring to this term, none of the studies explicitly defined what the term means or provided conceptual clarity. In this sense it is viewed a phenomenon that is intuitively and intrinsically understood and known. Of course, most people do have a loose understanding of their personal safety but this reluctance to define academically or scope the phenomena inevitably means that its exploration or measurement, if desired, is problematic because of the potential for different people to hold different interpretations of the term.
Certainly, in the criminology literature there is a proliferation of the word 'safety', sometimes 'personal safety' and often 'security'. This is never explicitly discussed; it is ostensibly seen as interchangeable with the notion of crime, and that crime and safety are inherently linked, although it is never expounded further. It is therefore useful to examine further how the notion of safety is embedded in the criminology literature to gain an insight into what context the term is used. Hindelang et al. (1978, p.35) refer to the "important collateral consequences of personal crime – such as mental anguish, fears for personal safety, and so forth." This indicates the damage that crime can do and highlights how personal safety is an important constituent of this. According to the report Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004), safety and security are fundamental to flourishing communities; "they are places where freedom from crime, and from the fear of crime, improves the quality of life." This suggests that safety is a state achievable through the lack of crime.

2.4.2 Explanations for crime

It is useful at this point to explore briefly some of the key arguments for why crimes occur. One of the most traditional and prevailing thesis for criminal occurrences is that certain people have propensities or traits that make them commit crimes (Clarke and Eck 2003). Other arguments claim that negative conditions in society can lead to criminality (Jary and Jary 1995). An alternative view, however, is that crime occurs because of opportunities presented to potential offenders by environments which are more 'conducive' to crime (Pease 2002). It is particularly pragmatic to explore how the environment can create opportunities for crime because this can be more readily addressed.

Routine activity theory (RAT) argues that for a crime to take place there must be present three critical elements: a motivated offender, a suitable target and the absence of capable guardians (Cohen and Felson 1979). This framework is useful in developing crime prevention strategies because in order to prevent a crime from occurring then interventions must be targeted at one of these causal parameters. The development of this theory led to an important tool in crime prevention, the problem analysis triangle (PAT) (Crime Reduction website). This holds that all crimes require victims, offenders and locations. The emphasis on the 'location' element highlights the role that the environment can play in reducing crime. Rational Choice theory argues that, rather than being under the influence of genetic or social factors,
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offenders make a conscious and considered decision when they undertake to commit a crime (Cornish and Clarke 1986). They propose that features of the environment can influence an offender's decision making process and therefore crime reduction techniques should focus on how opportunities created by the environment can be reduced. People's lifestyles can also lead to an increased propensity of victimisation which is supported by the view that people experience different risks of crime as a consequence of whether they intersect with potential offenders (Hindelang et al. 1978). People's lifestyles can determine where they go, when they go there and the people they come into contact with. This could make them more or less at risk of becoming a victim. This is expanded on by Fattah (1993) who put forward a theory of victimology, which suggests that offenders choose their victims based on an assessment of the ease with which a crime can be carried out coupled with a perceived low risk of being apprehended.

It follows that having an understanding of why crimes occur can contribute to possible ideas of how to prevent crime and increase safety. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is one of the most widely accepted approaches to crime prevention, which originated in the 1970s and diverged from existing paradigms that focused on deterring and punishing offenders, and instead sought to reduce opportunities for crime to occur by focusing on environmental and situational characteristics (Jeffery and Zahm 1993). Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design is based on the premise that "the proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear of crime and the incidence of crime, and to an improvement in the quality of life." (Crowe 2000, p1). It is essentially concerned with the design or redesign of an environment in order to reduce the opportunities that it presents for offending to occur. Its principles are based on Newman's theory of 'Defensible Space' (1973), which postulated that there was a correlation between urban design and crime and the ideas of Jefferey (1977) who believed that crime prevention efforts should focus on the environment. CPTED is based on the thesis that opportunities for crime can arise from the very design of the physical environment (Clarke 1992). As a result, the manipulation of the environment can reduce crime by reducing opportunities for crime. This can be achieved by adhering to some key principles: natural access control, natural surveillance and territorial reinforcement (Crowe 2000, p.36). As well as reducing actual crime, CPTED also aims to reduce fear of crime by fostering senses of spatial ownership by increasing social interaction which in turn promotes the principles of natural surveillance. Typical examples include better street lighting and removing
obstacles that inhibit visibility over public areas. The main criticism levied at such prevention measures is displacement of crime. In other words although crime in one area may be reduced, the process simply moves crime to another, less protected location (Mayhew et al. 1976; Fyfe and Bannister 1996). Such crime prevention strategies also fail to account for the variety of other causes of fear, such as the presence and behaviour of others (Pain and Townshend 2002).

2.4.3 Perceived risk

Having considered why crimes occur and what can be done to prevent or reduce them, it is also imperative to explore what impact crime has on an individual level. This has been the subject of extensive academic research. Perceived risk appears to be subjectively constructed based on a number of factors. It can be defined as "people's assessment of the crime rates and the probability of victimisation" (Ferraro, 1995, p.28). This was further endorsed by Chadee (2003, p.90), who surmised that "risk is a more realistic assessment of social reality whilst fear is influenced by both reality, as well as a perceptual (virtual) reality created by such forces as the rumour and the mass media". According to Kershaw et al. (2000) perceptions of risk are linked to feelings of safety. In the British Crime Survey around one fifth of those who considered it likely that they would be mugged or assaulted by a stranger said they felt 'very unsafe' walking alone in their area at night. Barker and Page (2002, p.15) explored perceptions of personal safety and this was explicitly seen as related to the perception of the likelihood of being as victim of crime. Austin et al. (2002) found in their study of neighbourhood conditions on perceptions of safety that although fear of crime and perceptions of safety were separate concepts, they had significant theoretical and empirical commonalities.

In the literature perceived risk was judged to be a much more rational process than fear of crime, which was viewed as being emotionally constructed and potentially more unstable. However, perceptions of safety were often found to be disproportionate to the actual level of risk. Fear of crime became an issue for researchers because of the disparity between statistics measuring individual risk of victimisation and people's responses to questions about their perceptions of safety and fear of crime borne out in crime surveys. Indeed the objective risk of crime based on actual crime data may be widely divergent from an individual's fear of crime. Hale (1996, p.106) found that "survey after survey has found many more people afraid than victimised," indicating that fear may be more irrational than
perceived risk. Some studies have found that in areas where actual crime is high, there is a low perceived risk and, in contrast, some environments where crime is low many people exhibit high levels of perceived risk (Taylor 1996; Covington and Taylor 1991). This discrepancy has fascinated criminology scholars who have sought to address it. What seems apparent is that anything experienced subjectively, be it fear or perceived risk, is a multifaceted phenomenon. For example, people living in high crime areas may not exhibit high levels of perceived risk or fear because they are familiar with the environment, while the opposite may be true for people who live in low crime areas but have experienced crime directly or vicariously. These can be explained by the infinite number of causal factors at play on an individual level when constructing perceptions and fears. Any overt attempts to reduce these into constrictive explanations do not do justice to the complexity that underpins such responses.

It would thus seem that the criminological literature and theoretical background can usefully enhance the understanding of personal safety by providing conceptual insight. Although the relationship between the terms is never explicitly dissected or exposed the constructs appear to be directly related. Indeed, freedom from crime and the 'state' of personal safety appear to be synonymous. My research serves to differentiate between the two terms as comparable but discrete phenomena. What is clear is that there is a distinct difference between an objective risk of crime and a perception of risk or fear of crime. This is crucial and provides an important insight into the potential multi-dimensional facets of personal safety.

2.4.4 Fear of crime

An understanding of fear of crime can be gained from the criminological literature. Fear of crime differs from actual crime risk because actual risk is concerned with the probability of becoming a victim, based on a number of characteristics such as age, socio-economic factors and behaviour etc. The concept is also different to perceived risk; fear is an emotional response, unique to the individual, and is dynamic and ever-changing as we manoeuvre through different environments throughout the course of our day. Ferraro (1995, p.24) defines fear of crime as "an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime". The emphasis on an emotional reaction is supported extensively in the literature; Hale (1996), Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002) and Garofalo (1981) all support the view that fear is an emotional response, unique to the individual which is transient as we
move through different environments. Interestingly, Baumer (1985) found that fear is a response to subjectively defined risk and personal vulnerability, so this suggests that fear is again constructed on an individual level. Gabriel and Greve (2003) usefully explored the psychology of the fear of crime and some useful parallels can be made with the fear of harm and fear for personal safety. They distinguish between a situational fear of crime where fear of crime is a transitory state in reaction to different environments and fear of crime as a trait, which some individuals may be more likely to exhibit. Such an explanation is further endorsed by (Fattah and Sacco 1989). The literature therefore appears to make a clear distinction between individuals' affective responses to the environment and their cognitive appraisals of risk in an environment. This had to be carefully considered in the development of the methodology for my study of personal safety on university campuses.

Fear of crime has received substantive academic attention after it became apparent that there was a disparity between statistics measuring individual's risk of victimisation and people's perceptions of safety (Smith 1989; McCoy et al. 1996; Chiricos et al. 1997; Ferraro 1995; Liska et al. 1988; Schweitzer et al. 1999). Most of these methodologies adopted a similar procedure for measuring respondents' fear of crime; usually by asking respondents how fearful they would be in a given situation; in other words, attitude responses were required that could be readily quantified. However, such approaches arguably oversimplify the multi-faceted processes that motivate fear and only provide a one-dimensional insight into what has emerged as a complex issue. Perceived risk and fear of crime are distinct concepts and it is important to distinguish between the two. In particular, the distinction is important when operationalising the terms for empirical study, where measurement of the concepts require different handling. The appropriateness of using quantitative methods to measure a complex and subjective emotional response such as fear is debatable because fear is such a complex reaction and empirical attempts to quantify fears may oversimplify the complexity of its interwoven components. Crucially, many studies have failed to differentiate between perceived risk and fear of crime, which are two distinct phenomena (Hale 1996). Boers (2003) and Weatherburn et al. (1996) classify fear of crime as an attitude which is an important distinction when considering empirical measures of fear of crime.
2.4.4.1 Effects of fear

Conklin (1975) suggests that victimisation can be said to have occurred if a person is fearful of becoming a victim, so it is not necessarily only after a person becomes a victim that negative effects are experienced. The impact of this can have serious implications on how people lead their lives. Living in fear of crime can also be debilitating and cause great distress; Kershaw et al. (2000) found in the British Crime Survey that "worry about crime can be regarded as problematic if it has a detrimental impact on people's quality of life". Fear can have a severe impact on the well-being of individuals and their consequent behaviour and social inclusion. A heightened fear of crime causes people to limit their personal and social activities (Keane 1998) and can lead to avoidance behaviours (Garofalo 1981). Concerns about crime are highly significant to many people and undoubtedly are connected to an individual's ability to live their life without fear and to their desire in their community. This again demonstrates the need to address personal safety concerns in an appropriate manner that leads to appropriate resolutions. Miethe (1995, p.14) explores how crime and fear of crime can result in a number of undesirable effects, such as "distrusting others, avoiding particular places, taking protective action, changing their daily activities". Exploring possible practical solutions to reduce fears is therefore a legitimate research concern.

2.4.4.2 Causes of fear

Research denotes that there are several causes of fear of crime, including environmental attributes, personal experience of crime and physical vulnerability (Hale 1996). Some broad explanations for why people may experience fear of crime are presented in Table 2.1 below:
### Table 2.1 Causes of fear of crime (not an exhaustive list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yin (1980; 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warr (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baumer (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor and Hale (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sundeen and Matthieu (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toseland (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferraro and LaGrange (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>Poor health and age, for example, can increase vulnerability.</td>
<td>Killias (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Killias and Clerici (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation experience</td>
<td>Direct or indirect experience of being a victim of crime e.g. media, relationship between fear and the potential for victimisation.</td>
<td>Hindelang et al. (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tyler (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maxfield (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferraro (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balkin (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawton and Yaffe (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oollenburger (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental clues and conditions</td>
<td>Perceptions of the local physical and social environment, neighbourhood and urban conditions such as housing and neighbourhood quality.</td>
<td>Baumer (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maxfield (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor and Hale (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simmons and Dodd (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher and Nasar (1992; 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nasar et al. (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferraro (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baba and Austin (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skogan (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Covington and Taylor (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austin et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in the police and CJS</td>
<td>People's attitude and respect for police's control over crime has an important bearing on perceptions of safety.</td>
<td>Baker et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential causes of fear are thus vast and certainly present a challenge for how best to direct efforts to constructively reduce fear of crime. Quantitative research forms the predominant approach to the study of fear of crime. However, most studies that probe the fear of crime utilise quantitative methods and arguably oversimplify the complex processes that shape people's fears. There are few example of qualitative research in the fear of crime literature. This is unfortunate because such approaches could provide a more detailed, contextual and personal understanding of what motivates fear and why people experience it, particularly because fear can correspond with situational features of an environment (Fattah and Sacco 1989, p.211). The few exceptions in the literature are Taylor et al. (1996), who used focus groups to probe fear of crime, Pain's (1997) study of older women's experiences of fear of crime, which she explored using unstructured interviews, Koskela and Pain's (2000) study of women and fear in relation to designing out crime, Pain and
Townshend's (2002) use of focus groups to explore perceptions of community safety, Cozens et al.'s (2003a) study of personal security and fear of crime at railway stations and Boyle et al. (2004) who used interviews in a study of fear and environmental design.

2.5 CRIME AND FEAR CAUSATION

By interpreting the literature, a tripartite framework can be developed that explains what issues broadly shape crime, perceived risk or fear of crime. Thus my interpretation of the literature suggests that crime, perceived risk or fear of crime can be broadly explained by looking at three key groups: physical, social and personal factors.

2.5.1 Physical factors

Physical factors can influence crime and fear of crime. Considerable research has shown that physical environments can influence an individual's sense of security and safety as well as the propensity for crime. Bilsky and Wetzels (1992, p.250) found that "time of day and local characteristics are important parameters with regard to the likelihood of being victimised". Newman's (1973) defensible space theory holds that crime and fear of crime are significantly related to the built environment and that certain design characteristics can lead to an increase in crime and fear. Meanwhile, Wilson and Kelling (1982) emphasised the relationship between environmental conditions and feelings of safety and security and signs of neglect can denote perceived or actual threats that generate anxiety and fear of crime (Garofalo, 1981; Warr 1984). How well the physical environment is lit, and the implications that this has on visibility of others and the surrounding environs, is another crucial determinant of crime. This has been explored from a criminological perspective: Garofalo (1979) found that people became much more fearful walking in their neighbourhood after dark. How open or enclosed a space is has also been identified as pertinent: Jorgensen et al. (2002) found that open woodland spaces were considered safer than closed ones. Similarly, Schroeder and Anderson (1984) found that fears were lessened in open areas where visibility was high and there was a sense that others were within reach. This is echoed in more urban settings by the work of Cozens et al. (2003a) who found that people's perceptions of safety improved at railway stations when they were visible to and from others, leading to the demolition of the old brick shelters and the installation of clear glass shelters. Nasar and Fisher (1993) also
found that areas which provided hiding places for potential offenders played a role in generating fear of crime.

2.5.2 Social factors

Social factors can be seen as a distinct causal group that influence crime and fear of crime. Hale (1996, p.113) suggests that "a sense of belonging to a community may reduce the perceived seriousness of victimisation and consequently fear." Hunter and Baumer (1982) found that people felt safer when there evidence of social integration and community spirit, which provided mutual support and neighbourhood cohesion. Hale (1996, p.115) suggests that neighbourhood watch schemes boost community interaction and consequently provide reassurance and reduce fears. Social factors are also intrinsically associated with the physical environment: they affect each other and, individually or together, can influence fear. Nasar et al. (1993, p.164) assert that "social and physical fears in the proximate environment can effect feelings of personal safety." The number of people in a given physical environment can directly impact on fears, but there are not necessarily strict decisive factors that can be said to prescribe maximum conditions of safety and reduced fears. For example, crowds can be safe or unsafe depending on the social make-up of the people within the crowd, while being on one's own can be safe or unsafe depending on the physical environment. This is clearly a complex issue which needs further elucidation.

2.5.3 Personal factors

The impact of demographic factors, such as gender and age, on crime and fear of crime has been well documented and discussed earlier in this chapter. According to Walklate (1997, p.41) young men perceive risks quite differently to other age groups, while gender (Chadee 2003), family income, race, age, and marital status (Hindelang et al. 1978) and social status and sense of identity (Pain and Townshend 2002) have all been found to impact on risk and fear of crime. Thus how people construct fear of crime is far from easy to operationalise: existing empirical research can be criticised for failing to account for these complex elements in attempts to oversimplify the construct for the purpose of quantification. Pain (2000, p.367) also asserts that fear of crime research should acknowledge the roles played by class, ethnicity and sexuality relate to fear of crime construction.
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2.6 CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE

The main problem with the literature is that no definition of personal safety exists. This poses a problem because it is difficult to carry out a well-defined and systematic study of personal safety on university campuses without explicitly knowing what the concept means or what it constitutes. It is thus imperative to define the term myself. The methodology will be informed by what is known about crime and fear of crime, but caution will guide the study because of the uncertain and inexact relationship between the two phenomenon. There is a wealth of literature about crime and fear of crime, and these serve to address a serious issue and provide clarity and distinction between objective risk, feelings of fear and perceived risk. There appears to be a strong link between safety and crime but nowhere is this rigorously explained or explored. This needs to be addressed. Furthermore, the predominant approach in the literature is quantitative methodologies which rely on objective crime data or oversimplified survey responses and there is a distinct lack of research which utilises qualitative methods. This concern is echoed by Cozens et al. (2003a, p.189) who claim that “a more subjective approach that utilises the perceptions of various users (and potential victims) within the environmental setting offers potentially rich insights into design, facilities management and personal security issues.” Qualitative research enables a more thorough appraisal of safety concerns and emphasises important contextual details that are meaningful to respondents.

2.7 CONCLUSIONS

A thorough review of the literature demonstrated that there is no clear definition of the term ‘personal safety’ which means that a specific study is necessary to define the concept. Although some studies refer to personal safety it is a somewhat elusive construct because nowhere is it explicitly deconstructed or defined. However, a review of parallel disciplines such as criminology proved to be extremely fruitful and enhanced learning about the term. This is because throughout the literature, in both theoretical frameworks and empirical studies, there is an abundance of the terminology of this concept. This logically suggests that personal safety and crime are inherently linked and consequently it is valid to make certain inferences about personal safety based on the crime literature. Some key insights have emerged from the literature; personal safety has an ostensible relationship with freedom from crime, perceptions of risk, quality of life, personal crime, fear of crime and perceived risk of being a victim of crime. I have interpreted the literature as indicating that crime and
fear are influenced by three broad categories: physical, social and personal factors and this will guide the methodology to define 'personal safety'.

What was clear was that in order to delineate the study of personal safety on university campuses, further investigation was needed to pin down and explore the concept of personal safety which promoted a specific focus for the fieldwork and methodology. This chapter has presented the genesis of the argument for why safety and crime research can be more thoroughly probed by utilising qualitative methods, which serve to facilitate the exploration of personal safety as a complex, multifaceted and dynamic phenomenon.
Chapter Three

Methodology - defining and scoping the concept of 'personal safety'
3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the need for a definition of 'personal safety', an appraisal of the different approaches available for attaining a definition and the argument for using the Delphi method to define and scope the concept of 'personal safety'. The background of the Delphi method is presented, along with a summary of its strengths and weaknesses. The pilot study is then discussed along with its key findings, in particular the development of key themes or building blocks associated with personal safety. The design of the main Delphi study is presented, the findings and discussion of which are presented in Chapter 4.

3.1 THE NEED FOR A DEFINITION OF 'PERSONAL SAFETY'

The lack of a rigorously attained and sound academic definition of 'personal safety' within the reviewed literature and the wider public domain meant that a specific study was necessary to attribute precise meaning to the concept. According to Vercic et al. (2001, p.381) "all the disciplines and professions we know struggle with the multiplicity of often contradicting definitions." This is particularly true of 'personal safety', a term which has been used in a variety of different contexts and whose meaning is ambiguous. In addition, a definition served to generally underpin and clarify the work of The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute (SLTRI) in providing a systematic and empirical research base to underpin the important work of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust. The research also enabled the construct of 'personal safety' to be 'pinned down' and anchored within a relevant academic field as well as providing a benchmark term for use and reference within the wider practice and research communities too. No known academic research robustly defines personal safety and arriving at an acceptable definition based on a sound systematic data collection method was vital for four reasons:

- A definition contributes to the personal safety awareness resources currently available, underpinning future research that feeds into such materials
- Personal safety is a relatively new academic topic, so an attempt needs to be made to define key terms. This is conducive for debate and further research in the subject area.
- In order for me to carry out a valid research study into personal safety on university campuses, a definition had to be reached so that the boundaries of the study were defined and a benchmark term was used throughout the course of my thesis.
• The definition is useful in scoping the future research work of the SLTRI.

3.2 DEFINING A CONSTRUCT SUCH AS ‘PERSONAL SAFETY’

The key conceptual issue concerned with personal safety is that it is a term whose meaning is often unclear and this lack of a lucid, succinct and widely understood definition can lead to much confusion. Consequently, it is imperative that any definition has the ability to effectively scope the term in a lucid and precise way. According to Fitzgerald (1990), who discusses the issue of defining ‘sexual harassment’, there are a two ways of defining a construct:

• Theoretical definitions which are derived from theoretical propositions and
• Empirical definitions which are based on inductive, data-based research.

Both would provide a universally understood meaning of ‘personal safety’ for academia, the practice community and the public alike but an empirical definition was deemed to be more robust, useful and sound. The definition could not be based on theory because the literature did not provide enough clarity for deducing a definition. Instead the definition was derived from practical research.

There are a number of research methods that could be used to attain a definition of the term personal safety. An empirical process was the most robust way of defining the concept of ‘personal safety,’ but an interpretative research approach was deemed the most appropriate based on the insights drawn from the literature review in Chapter 2, which suggested that personal safety has a subjective dimension and is complex. I considered using closed-question questionnaires or focus groups but these have their own disadvantages; closed-question questionnaires would impose my own knowledge and preconceptions on the respondents, perhaps biasing the responses from the outset and certainly constraining its scope, while focus groups would be difficult to structure and manage in terms of allowing equal participant contribution.

3.3 THE DELPHI METHOD – AN INTRODUCTION

An established research technique, the Delphi method, was identified as the most robust and rigorous method to reach a definition. This was to ensure that the definition was not based on abstract theory but was derived from an empirically
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based process. Beyond this, a conceptual framework for ascertaining the complex and dynamic facets of personal safety was developed that provided a broader insight into understanding how people attribute meaning to personal safety; particularly important if it has commonalities with crime which emerged as a complex phenomenon in Chapter 2. This would scope the campus project and in turn shape appropriate interventions to be minimise personal safety concerns. The Delphi method has been used in a comparable study to define the term ‘safety’ (Maurice et al. 2001). The following summary has been used to explain the method:

"Delphi may be characterised as a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem."

(Linstone and Turoff 1975, p.3)

Crucially a number of expert perspectives are sought in an iterative process whereby opinions are sought and repeatedly fed back to the group for re-evaluation. A subjective approach such as this provided a more meaningful insight into the concept.

3.3.1 Background

The Delphi method is a well-established systematic research technique that is well recognised as a robust and methodological approach to data collection. It is based on the ordered exchange of expert views about a specific issue with the overall aim of seeking a consensus of opinion, which serves to provide clarity on a given issue. This is typically undertaken by the use of successive rounds of questionnaires. The Delphi method had its origins in the US in the 1950s when it was used for forecasting the possibility of future warfare by Helmer and Dalkey of the RAND Corporation. A succession of questionnaires were distributed, "interspersed with controlled opinion feedback", with the aim of achieving a consensus of opinion of military experts’ views (Linstone and Turoff 1975, p.10). Details of the first Delphi Method were published in the US in 1964 (Gordon and Helmer 1964). The Delphi method has subsequently been used for a variety of applications and in a variety of contexts, from policy making to the social sciences.

Typically in a Delphi study, the first questionnaire often starts with open-ended questions about the issue that serves to generate broad ideas by deconstructing
issues relevant to the research topic. The group's responses are then reiterated back to the respondents in a successive questionnaire for further reflection. This continues over further questionnaires, each building on the results of the previous one, as the responses are condensed and a convergence of opinion typically emerges.

3.3.2 Philosophical background

The research is interpretative in orientation because the subjective meaning of a phenomenon is explored. The study is also inductive in nature because it is not based on any existing theory due to the lack of literature in the area of personal safety. Linstone and Turoff (1975) suggest that the Delphi method is useful for research studies that call for subjective responses, particularly when it is undesirable to reduce the phenomenon under study to numerical data. This is particularly relevant to the discussion and definition of personal safety, which the literature review has shown to be a construct that is not congruent with the over-simplification that overt quantification and statistical analysis would achieve.

3.3.3 Delphi strengths and weaknesses

The Delphi method has a number of inherent strengths, some which are particularly relevant to defining 'personal safety', as well as some weaknesses. I will critically explore these in some detail below.

The Delphi method is known for seeking the views of a number of expert respondents, which arguably allows for a more informed input than using only one expert or a group of non-experts. The use of a group over individuals is crystallised by Dalkey (1972, p.4) who suggests that "when faced with an issue where the best information obtainable is the judgement of knowledgeable individuals, and where the most knowledgeable group reports a wide diversity of answers, the old rule that two heads are better than one, or more practically, several heads are better than one, turns out to be well founded." Using a number of experts therefore allows a more informed and well-rounded contribution of viewpoints that together are based on a broad knowledge base from which to derive, in this case, a definition of personal safety.

One of the most compelling strengths of the Delphi method is that it assures the anonymity of the experts taking part. This provides an environment conducive for
experts to consider their own views in light of what other experts have contributed. Moreover, this anonymity removes any embarrassment that respondents may feel if they wish to change their original views in successive rounds. This makes it a more attractive method than focus groups where respondents are brought together physically and the equal participation of respondents is very difficult to achieve and the opportunity for changing viewpoints is less comfortable. This key feature of the Delphi method also serves to avoid the subtle pressures of such discussions whereby experts may be swayed unduly by the “persuasively stated opinion of others.” (Helmer 1983, p. 135).

However, the Delphi method is frequently criticised for seeking subjective viewpoints to produce clarity on a given phenomenon (Linstone and Turoff 1975). This argument is based on accusations that the method is unscientific and therefore produces flimsy and unreliable results. However, the focus on seeking intuitively-led responses is precisely what gives the method its purposefulness and strength. Linstone and Turoff (1975, p. 229) respond by claiming that the “Delphi is no means unordered and systematic.” The justification for using the Delphi is that it is a structured process and despite its reliance on experts’ opinions, it is still a valid technique that produces a meaningful result. Despite the Delphi method not being producing generalisable findings this does not make it inherently weak. Indeed, in order that meaningful research takes place into a complex issue such as personal safety, the subjective interpretations of individual respondents should be promoted since over-simplifying the complex processes that shape such a phenomenon will not do justice to the concept or achieve a truly valuable definition. As Bryman (2001) highlights, qualitative research seeks to promote insight into the complexities of the social world. To seek narrowly defined responses or objective data would fail to accomplish this end. Fitzgerald (1990, p. 37) argues that “perceptions alone are not adequate for a valid definition.” I would disagree with this however because although the definition may be the result of the views of a specific group, it still follows systematic and methodological procedures and produces a valid definition.

Ironically, perhaps, in light of the previous criticism, the Delphi method is also denounced for failing to allow experts the proper opportunity to rigorously discuss and dissect issues as would perhaps occur in face-to-face discussions! Linstone and Turoff (1975, p. 580) claim that “an individual asked to list his preferences on a sheet of paper may well develop responses significantly different from those he would actually give in a real-life/real-time setting.” So, as well as being criticised for being
too dependant on subjective views, which are inherently bound with emotions and feelings, it is suggested that some of this subjective meaning can be lost in the communication process. Intuitive and subjective data can be very useful and offer an intriguing insight into a subject. It would seem that the Delphi method is criticised from both sides of the quantitative/qualitative debate. My response to this criticism is two-fold. Firstly, subjective viewpoints are dependent on idiosyncrasies that are not only dependent on an individual, but on a temporal and spatial basis too. Subjective opinion is not a static constant, but is subject to subtle and palpable changes. Secondly, the Delphi method recognises this and provided that caveats are attached to the consensus that it is a depiction of subjective realities at a given time, then these criticisms have no basis.

As such, it is true that the findings of a Delphi study are limited in that they represent only one representation of reality. According to Keeney et al. (1999, p.198), "the existence of consensus from a Delphi process does not mean that the correct answer has been found." Therefore it is vital to accept the group consensus for what it is—not a 'perfect' or 'definitive' answer; it is reflective of the group's response at the time the study was carried out. Scheele (1975, p.37), states that "one important product of each Delphi panel is the reality that is defined through its interaction." Caution is thus advisable when using the Delphi outcome since there is no guarantee that the same responses would be attained if the study was repeated. However this criticism can be levied at all subjective and qualitative research yet they are valued precisely because of their ability to generate rich social data. In this case, the reality that the group opinion provides will offer a unique insight into personal safety yet it will still provide a valid definition of personal safety that can be used for the purposes of this research into personal safety on university campuses. Thus I do not contend that the resulting definition of 'personal safety' should be the ultimate, decisive or solitary definition: it is one version of reality, based on the views of a group of experts at a given time.

The success of the Delphi method can be marred by uncommitted expert respondents which can dramatically shape the outcome (Linstone and Turoff 1975). It is important to identify experts who will have the commitment to participate for the duration of the process. Furthermore, the role of the researcher leading the study is also crucial. Lang (1998) expands on this issue when he states that respondent bias can be a weakness of the method, which he argues can arise from 'loaded' questions. It is thus imperative that open and impartial questions are formulated
which do not direct the experts' responses down a predetermined path. Linstone and Turoff (1975, p.6), claim that one of the common reasons for failure of a Delphi study is "imposing monitor views and preconceptions of a problem upon the respondent group." On my part, therefore, substantial attention was applied to remaining self-reflective by, for example, the careful wording of questions and the unbiased analysis of the results.

3.4 APPLICABILITY OF THE DELPHI METHOD

The primary reason for using the Delphi method to reach an acceptable definition of personal safety is that no other systematic methodology is suitable. Its definition cannot be reached by a more objective methodological approach because only by rigorously deconstructing, probing and debating the nature of personal safety can a well-founded definition be arrived at. An accepted definition will be useful as a benchmark for any future research in this area and reaching a definition of personal safety is a process that can be greatly enhanced by the combined contribution of a group of experts. Using a version of the Delphi process to first elicit and then rate different interpretations of personal safety, ensured that the meaning of personal safety was explored in a robust way, with the aim of reaching a consensus definition. Although the Delphi method has been traditionally used as a forecasting tool for government, business and industry, the basic methodology of a structured communications process is highly versatile and can be applied to reaching an acceptable definition of personal safety. Indeed, the Delphi method has been used in a previous study which sought a definition of the term 'Public Relations'. (Vercic et al. 2001).

The process of successive rounds of questionnaires, which provide the experts with feedback and opportunities for constant re-evaluation of their subjectively held views, will provide an intellectually stimulating forum for a definition to emerge. Although the resulting definition will of course be dependent on the views of the experts chosen and will offer only one facet of the personal safety debate, the Delphi method is a strong method to use as a foundation for such a definition. On a practical level, using the Delphi method can be assisted by modern technology in that questionnaires can be distributed by e-mail. This allows expert respondents to be recruited from across the country or even the globe, thus allowing experts to be chosen on merit rather than geographical proximity.
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Experts will express their professional views on what personal safety means to them but intrinsically linked to this will be their own view and experience of personal safety. This can only enhance the study by ensuring that the topic is robustly probed from a wide range of perspectives and will contribute to the conceptualisation of personal safety. Anonymity will be assured due to the sensitive nature of the topic and ethical considerations will be paramount because the debate may lead the panellists to recount sensitive experiences. Delbecq et al. (1975) indicate that the Delphi method should only be used when there is adequate time available for a full Delphi ‘cycle’ to take place. Furthermore, expert respondents must be able to commit to the entire process. Most of these criteria can be met but some thought will be given to the experts because, in the case of personal safety, few true experts exist because of its fledgling academic status.

3.5 THE DELPHI PILOT STUDY

3.5.1 Introduction

Because I had never used the Delphi method before it was decided that a pilot study would be beneficial for a number of reasons. This was not least because it was a considerable responsibility to be the first, that is known of, to seek to define personal safety in a robust and academic way. It was vital that I carried the process out appropriately and professionally. A pilot study was thus beneficial on a number of levels. It:

- Allowed me the opportunity to test the practical application of the questions and how respondents related to and understood them.
- Allowed me to practice using the Delphi method as a whole and understand what is needed to produce results.
- Provided me with an opportunity to understand the various rounds of the Delphi method and how they relate to one another, as well as how to ensure the rounds flowed neatly and that the respondents were clear of their involvement in the Delphi process.
- Provided me with an opportunity for self-development. This was particularly important because I had no recent practical experience of carrying out a study of this nature and scale. It was imperative, therefore, that I could practice and develop my question-writing skills in a safe and un-pressurised environment.
Provided data that would contribute to the overall understanding of personal safety.

After consulting my supervisors I decided that, for the pilot study, instead of using four rounds of questionnaires, I would begin with a semi-structured interview. The study was designed to identify what factors contributed to personal safety and probe tentative definitions of personal safety. The purpose of the initial interview was as an opportunity to generate rich and in-depth data on the various constructs and concepts of personal safety. According to Bryman (2001) qualitative research is concerned with producing subjective data which emerges from respondents' viewpoints. The benefits of using such an approach include the richness of data attained and a substantial insight into the phenomenon under study. The literature in Chapter 2 and intuition tells me that personal safety is a broad subject that can be experienced on a subjective level and is dependant on numerous factors. A semi-structured interview therefore gave me the flexibility to probe interesting and pertinent issues as they arose, allowing more scope for personal safety to be deconstructed. The pilot study also exposed whether an interview would be impractical for the main study.

3.5.2 Sampling procedure

3.5.2.1 Panel qualifications
For the pilot study I identified three participants, two of which worked in the University of Glamorgan (R1 and R3) and the other in the commercial sector (R2). They were chosen to represent a broad perspective on personal safety issues.

3.5.2.2 Panel size
The appropriate number of respondents for a Delphi study is between ten and fifty experts (Linstone and Turoff 1975, p.86). However, for the purpose of the pilot study, three was deemed an appropriate number. The study was anonymous in that names were not known by other participants.
3.5.3 Data collection

3.5.3.1 Interview design

I set about designing the questions that I would use in the initial, first round semi-structured interview. This was a difficult task because it was difficult to anticipate what questions would provide the appropriate amount of data while ensuring that the questions were direct and concise. After meeting with my supervisors I decided on three broad questions and a final general question that asked the professional connections the respondent had with personal safety. Of course it was impossible to design any further rounds of questionnaires because their design depends on the outcome of the first round.

Round One: Initial Interview

Helmer (1983) suggests that it is useful to begin a Delphi study with an open-ended question designed to help identify issues for discussion to be included in subsequent questions. Open-ended questions were useful because of their potential to allow respondents to deconstruct personal safety from their own perspective in a relatively free manner. This could be criticised because open ended questions may be too ambiguous or too wide, serving to cast the net too wide over a topic. However, the very ambiguous nature of personal safety meant that this was the best option. The alternative approach would be to start with a broad definition of personal safety and get respondents' comments or examples for interpretation, but I felt that this would negatively inflict my own interpretation of personal safety on the group from the outset. The four questions were thus designed to allow the respondent a high degree of flexibility to discuss issues relevant to them and provided a wealth of rich data for subsequent rounds, as well as a rich foundation for the entire study. In addition, further questions could be asked as and when the respondents raised interesting points. These issues were then probed further and illuminative data pursued to enrich the overall findings. The interviews typically lasted around 30 minutes and were successful in generating a wealth of detailed and insightful data which provided a fascinating and broad insight into personal safety. The semi-structured interviews consisted of four key questions but allowed for pertinent points to be followed up in more detail as they arose:
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1. Please list up to ten phrases, concepts or sentences that sum up what the term 'personal safety' means to you.
2. What factors influence a person's personal safety? You may like to consider the roles of personal experience and the physical and the social environment. Please list in any order of importance.
3. Please suggest a possible definition of personal safety on which my research could be based.
4. What connection do you have with personal safety in your work?

Please note that question 2 specified personal, social and physical factors as these were interpreted from the literature review as distinctive causal groups of crime and fear of crime and were thus transferred to the exploration of personal safety in order to ease and improve clarity of responses and provide some guidance for respondents.

The interviews were taped and then transcribed.

3.5.4 Transcript analysis

The transcripts provided a wealth of in-depth qualitative data from which novel knowledge about personal safety emerged. The analytic process commenced by reading through the transcripts. Initially, the large volume of textual data seemed intimidating, but on reading the transcripts a number of times, certain themes emerged immediately about the nature of personal safety. The interviews were then manually coded according to these significant themes, with key words and phrases that were perceived to be the 'building blocks' of personal safety' highlighted. This was in accordance with the essence of Boyatzis' (1998) principles of thematic analysis. In my case, the approach I have taken to my data is mainly interpretative which acknowledges that qualitative data is not amenable to rigid analysis that characterises quantitative data, but by its very nature needs the subjective judgement of the researcher to identify the salient issues (Wolcott 2001, p.34).

The bulk of the data were not amenable to measurement because of the depth of the data and to try and quantify it would be counter-productive as meaning would be lost when trying to describe and understand the phenomenon. Critical determinants of personal safety were grouped together according to whether they were personal, physical or social factors and themes were formulated to contribute to a rudimentary
framework of personal safety. The process of interpretation of the textual data therefore formed part of an overall inductive approach whereby key themes emerged from the data. These key themes or building blocks served to construct a preliminary framework of personal safety. The highlighted words and themes from the transcripts were then written into a new document and narrowed down to exclude repetition of phrases (see Appendix One for a sample transcript and Appendices Two and Three for details of the analysis).

3.5.4.1 A note on Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)

At this stage it is worth noting that I could have adopted a different tool for the analysis of the transcripts; software such as NVivo, whose aim is to assist in the analysis and management of qualitative data. According to (Bryman 2001, p.408), NVivo is supposed to assist in coding and linking qualitative data while providing transparency into the researcher’s analytical process. I attempted to become skilled at using NVivo after I had transcribed the interviews for my Delphi pilot study. However I found that NVivo does not actually do anything for you; it does not assist in the analytical or interpretative process. You have to decide how themes are interlinked before you command the software to link relevant documents. Blismas and Dainty (2003, p. 458) assert that such computer programs can’t substitute the researcher’s intuitive processes and this underpins my rejection of it as an analytic tool. I simply preferred more direct methods, such as coding by highlighting words and terms and incorporating them into more everyday word processing software, such as Microsoft Word. I certainly felt that the investment in time spent familiarising myself with NVivo was incompatible with the benefits of using it; after all, NVivo merely provides a means of storing and organising your data after the data have been analysed so it was ultimately my personal preference not use it.

3.5.5 Delphi Pilot Study findings

It is my aim at this point to discuss briefly the key themes or building blocks of personal safety and the critical determinants of personal safety that arose in the interpretation of the pilot study data. Some issues have emerged as being critical to personal safety and these will be highlighted. However, a thorough interpretation and discussion of the data, as well as any explicit linkages with existing theory from parallel disciplines will occur only after the main Delphi findings have been reported
and further evidence of these themes has been found. However the following key themes emerged as being salient because they each refer to a facet of personal safety that together provide a deeper understanding of what personal safety is and how it is constructed.

3.5.5.1 Key building blocks of personal safety

The categorisation of the key themes has provided a great insight into the different components of personal safety and has assisted in clarifying this complex issue. These are presented in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Themes contributing to a holistic understanding of personal safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building block of personal safety</th>
<th>What does it mean?</th>
<th>Issues for clarification in the main Delphi study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perceptions of personal safety</td>
<td>This was of particular salience because it was a common issue in all three interviews; that perceptions of personal safety, i.e. how you view your personal safety, is significant because it can contribute to your actual safety. It can also determine how you behave, as well as not always providing a realistic assessment of your actual safety.</td>
<td>These all contribute to different aspects of our personal safety - they are centred around the individual – the 'personal' element of 'personal safety'. These aspects of personal safety must be separated out and critically examined; what is the best measure of personal safety and what is the best focus for my research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feelings of personal safety</td>
<td>The emotional response of fear, or feelings of personal safety, was also identified as impacting on personal safety, although it was distinguished as a discreet theme to perceptions of personal safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actual personal safety</td>
<td>This was categorised as distinct from perceptions and feelings of personal safety because it related to the actual, objective risk of suffering an affront to your personal safety as opposed to your perceived risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>This was another key theme as it went hand-in-hand with personal safety. Quite simply, risk refers to the likelihood of coming to harm. Risk changes according to who we are and what we do. There is a difference between actual risk and perceived risk. Risk is the likelihood of coming to harm. This follows from the concept of individual responsibility.</td>
<td>Risk suggests probability and this suggests a quantitative approach. How does risk tie in with the critical determinants of personal safety and how best is this explored on campus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>This was a word often used to describe what makes someone feel or be unsafe. Two out of the three respondents claimed that personal safety was related to harm within 30 seconds of their interview commencing. All three used the word harm in their definitions of personal safety. Harm is of course an all-encompassing word but the respondents were asked to clarify what constituted an affront to personal safety and the responses were wide ranging. Harm, it would seem, can manifest itself in different ways. It also emerged that there were different types of harm according to whether the action that caused harm or causes fear of harm was intentional or accidental.</td>
<td>This needs to be explored in more detail – elucidate whether harm in the personal safety sense is indeed intentional and accidental. Also clarify issue of crime. A number of contradictions were made about the motivation or intent that lies behind the harmful behaviour – is it accidental or intentional?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The effects of harm</td>
<td>This was viewed as wide ranging and having a considerable impact on the individual. Harm can have detrimental effects on an individual, both evident and concealed.</td>
<td>This will be clearer when the above point is clarified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 Themes contributing to a holistic understanding of personal safety (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building block of personal safety</th>
<th>What does it mean?</th>
<th>Issues for clarification in the main Delphi study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal safety is transient</td>
<td>This was because the level of risk changes throughout the day according to where we are, our surroundings etc. Our risk changes constantly according to our environment and behaviour</td>
<td>Explore in more detail exactly what this involves and what impact this may have on measures to improve personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ways of increasing safety</td>
<td>What emerged in the interviews was that there were certain measures that people can take to improve personal safety. The key concepts here were that personal safety is something that can be influenced by an individual's own actions and behaviour. However, all three respondents claimed that it was impossible to ever be completely safe because of the unpredictable element of other people's behaviour. There are steps we can take to promote our personal safety although harm is always perpetrated by others</td>
<td>This will directly feed into the campus study as, once clarified, it will be possible to identify what measures can be taken to promote personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Actions of others</td>
<td>Harm was viewed as typically being caused by other people, although it was acknowledged that our own actions and behaviour can place us more or less at risk. However, perpetrators of harm were always 'other people,' an unknown entity, although we could injure ourselves. However, it seems it is not possible to ever be completely safe.</td>
<td>Although we cannot predict other people, our actions can reduce risks, but how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td>This was an issue that arose in the three interviews. Overall, health and safety was viewed as distinct from personal safety although there are common elements to both. Health and safety was seen as a well-defined area that lays down regulations for accidental harm or injury in the workplace. Although health and safety also deals with harm, is it distinct from personal safety as it concerns a more legally prescribed approach to risk assessments, particularly in the workplace?</td>
<td>Should personal safety encompass Health and safety or are they discreet and separate phenomena?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Critical determinants of personal safety</td>
<td>There are three groups of critical determinants of personal safety: physical, social and personal, as well as a further two more vague issues classified under 'other determinants': Health and Safety and accidents. This needs clarification in the main study since this is a pivotal defining issue.</td>
<td>Is this grouping appropriate and what other factors influence personal safety?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.5.2 Critical determinants of personal safety

Question Two sought to identify what factors the respondents believed had an impact on someone's personal safety. These were coded according to whether they could be classified as features of the physical environment, the social environment or the person, i.e. the unique profile and mind-set that an individual brings to their own interpretation of personal safety and their behaviour. They were classified into these three distinct groups because of ease of classification and as a way of potentially identifying themes with common characteristics, informed by intuition and an interpretation of the literature review. These were varied and insightful. It appears that at any given time there are three facets of personal safety at play: actual safety, perceived safety and feelings of personal safety, and they are intrinsically linked.
Although the probability of being a victim can be empirically discovered, from a practical point of view, the reality is that for each individual, in every spatial and temporal location, personal safety cannot be truly determined because of the unknown and unpredictable behaviour of other people. There are so many variables at play, some un-quantifiable, that it is impossible to determine precise measures of actual risk for individuals; the closest we can get is the probability of crime risk, whereby crime statistics are extrapolated to specific populations or demographics.

Personal safety (both perceived, actual and feelings of) can be influenced by a complex of interrelated factors that can be usefully categorised into three groups: physical, social and personal factors. These can be represented in a basic personal safety triangle, as see below in Figure 3.1. At any given time the three factors influence perceived, actual and feelings of personal safety.

**Figure 3.1 The personal safety triangle**

This basic triangle can be expanded to provide a more detailed insight into what influences personal safety at any given time. The listed determinants under each causal group in Figure 3.2 are the responses of the respondents as to what influenced an individual's personal safety. A further category of 'other factors' required further exploration in the main Delphi study.
There appears to exist a complex and transient tripartite relationship between these three omnipresent causal factors. This required more study in order to establish the exact impact and relationship of these determinants, and how exactly they impact on perceived, actual and feelings of personal safety. For example, clarification was required on whether our perception of risk stems from the dynamic tripartite relationship between transient social, physical and personal factors and therefore whether all three are capable of being influenced to improve personal safety. In this scenario, perceptions of safety are influenced by a range of (some changeable) personal factors that dictate how we perceive and interact with the physical and social environment. It is a unique response, which determines how we behave and view the world. We then bring these perceptions to our assessment of perceived personal safety in any spatial and temporal location. They are based on a complex of virtually immeasurable facets of personality construction, including personal life experience and previous exposure to crime, demographic profile (age, gender etc),
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lifestyle activities and upbringing. The main Delphi study sought to clarify such issues and ascertain the best way to take the study of personal safety forward.

3.5.5.3 Definitions of personal safety

Question Three sought a definition of ‘personal safety’ and all three definitions referred to the notion of harm against the individual. Harm could be delivered in a number of different formats, from verbal abuse to physical harm. They referred to measures that individuals can take to reduce the risk of being a victim of harm and also cited ‘freedom’ as a key component of personal safety that would be explored further in the main Delphi study (see Appendix Four for pilot study definitions of personal safety).

3.6 THE DELPHI MAIN STUDY

3.6.1 Introduction

The pilot study revealed that individual interviews would be too time-consuming and demanding to undertake in the main Delphi study. Instead, I would use the more traditional method of questionnaires. Although these provided less scope for in-depth discussion, I felt that they would still provide considerable data. In addition, the findings from the pilot study would serve to feed into and strengthen the emerging definition of personal safety and conceptual framework. Although they are a quantitative method, the open ended questions provided an opportunity for the presentation of pertinent issues. Furthermore, this stage fosters meaning and precedes any attempt at quantification so my previous criticisms still stand. After this analytical stage I was satisfied that the questions were suitable for inclusion in the main study. The main Delphi study sought to expand on the pilot study and draw together relevant concepts, whilst discarding unrelated ones, in order to contribute to the definition and conceptual framework for understanding personal safety. A carefully selected range of experts were invited to participate. The processes of the study are discussed below and the findings and discussion are presented separately in Chapter 4.
3.6.2 Sampling procedure

3.6.2.1 Selection of participants

Because Delphi studies use expert respondents to enhance the research findings it was considered that a methodical approach to identifying who, exactly, would be the most suitable experts to participate in a study to define personal safety would be paramount. The sample that I needed for the Delphi study was not intended to be a representative sample reflective of the wider population; sampling was based on expertise. When considering potential respondents for the main study, it immediately struck me that a paradox existed: experts were needed to define personal safety, a field in its academic infancy, yet due to its very infancy there was an apparent deficit in experts! Lateral thinking resulted in a rigorous procedure being devised to identify the expert respondents for the main study. The pilot study findings revealed 45 critical determinants of personal safety; things that could impact on perceived and actual personal safety, for example ‘crime’, ‘security devices’, personal experiences’ and ‘socio-economic factors’, to name but a few. A sampling frame of experts was methodically drawn up by cross-linking these subject areas with experts because this represented a broad perspective on personal safety issues (see Appendix Five for sampling frame). The key criterion was that the respondents were eminent and experienced in their particular subject and could therefore provide an ‘expert’ contribution to the study. They were subsequently identified from the internet, literature reviews, personal contacts and recommendations from colleagues. This multi-disciplinary approach was viewed as providing a wide insight into personal safety, a phenomenon that the pilot study revealed was complex and dependent on a number of factors.

3.6.2.2 Panel size

Eighty-five expert participants were identified from subject areas that were cross-linked with the various and exhaustive list of determinants of personal safety elicited in the pilot study. This was a high number of experts to contact, exceeding the number usually stipulated. However, due to the eminence of the experts it was felt that it was important to compensate for the potential lack of responses; some were particularly renowned so it was likely that they would not have time to participate. It was hoped, therefore, that by contacting many respondents the actual number participating would fall somewhere between the guidelines recommended for
successful Delphi studies of between 10 and 50 participants (Linstone and Turoff 1975).

3.6.3 Data collection

Three rounds of questionnaires took place. The experts were contacted by letter and given information on the study (see Appendices Six and Seven). Of the 85 experts contacted, nine participated in the first round, six in the second round and three in the third and final round of the Delphi process. The response rate was poor but anticipated due to the prominence of the experts and the constraints on their time to afford the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. The nine experts who responded initially represented a wide variety of occupations and knowledge; a community safety officer, a home office civil servant, a criminologist, two sociologists, an anthropologist, a lecturer in urban studies, a property management consultant and a former royal protection officer. Their responses were insightful and well considered. The respondents' notions of determinants of personal safety were very similar to those given in the pilot study, giving greater weight to the findings.

3.6.3.1 Questionnaire design

The first questionnaire consisted of four open-ended questions, the second questionnaire of two closed questions and one open question and the third questionnaire comprised two closed and two open questions. I will now describe each of the rounds of the Delphi process, before going on to discuss the findings and interpretation.

Round 1 – Initial questionnaire

A covering letter was sent by e-mail or post to the experts, along with a copy of the first round questionnaire, which consisted of the same open-ended questions asked in the pilot study (see Appendix Eight). Anonymity of participants was maintained by identifying them only by a number at the top of their questionnaire, which referred to their number in the sampling frame, the identity of whom was only known by me and my supervisors. The responses to question one were useful to obtain interpretations and concepts of what it is and is not to be safe. The diverse range of respondents ensured that an assortment of perceptions was elicited.
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Round 2 – Second questionnaire

Based on their answers to the first questionnaire, a second round questionnaire was devised (see Appendix Nine). This summarised the group’s responses to the initial questions and was returned to them for their evaluation; they were asked to grade the definitions that each member of the group had provided for personal safety in terms of their preference. The nine definitions of personal safety were tabulated, including the most succinct definition from the pilot study, and respondents were asked to rate them against each other on a scale from one to ten (with one being their most favoured and ten being their least favourite). In this way the group’s opinion of the definitions could be rated and the three most popular definitions could be reiterated to the respondents in the third round, so continuing the distillation process. This was deemed to be a fair way of allowing the respondents to review their own and the group’s responses and a methodologically sound way of moving towards a group consensus opinion, without removing any of the ‘depth’ that was elicited in Round 1. This seemed faithful to the Delphi doctrine. The total number of points for each definition was then calculated, with the three most favoured definitions being presented in the next round.

In the second question they were presented with a series of statements and asked whether they agreed or disagreed with them to gauge their opinions. These statements were based on issues that had arisen in the pilot study, so ensuring sound methodological continuity. The purpose of seeking responses to these statements was in order to contribute further to the conceptual framework of personal safety. The statements were based on questions and answers from the pilot study that had proved to be particularly revealing but inconclusive. These statements were supplementary to the definition and would serve to be ‘add-on’ statements, forging a clearer understanding of personal safety, for example, regarding actual risk and perceived risk, and the role of health and safety. The modal value was taken as the closest to consensus; i.e. “the value that occurs most frequently.” (Bryman 2001, p225). This was in keeping with the central aim of seeking a consensus of perspectives in a Delphi study and did not betray the depth of the data that had been collected.

In the third question, panellists were asked to add features of personal safety or comments that they thought were important but not included elsewhere.
Round 3 — third questionnaire

Based on the group's responses, a third round questionnaire (see Appendix Ten) was devised that sought to further refine and develop their responses. This aim of this questionnaire was for a consensus of opinion to be reached and a definition of personal safety attained. Respondents were asked to rate the three most favoured definitions from Round 2 of this study, indicating their favoured definition. They were then asked to compare it with a refined composite of the three favoured definitions from Round 2 and indicate which one they preferred. The purpose of including this was to provide a more coherent and sharper definition for the respondents to assess, whilst maintaining methodological integrity by utilising their own words. The number of points received for each item was tallied up, the one with the lowest number of points taken as the group consensus. This was used as the definition of personal safety for the purpose of this research. They were then asked to give their views on one word that has recurred throughout the main study and the pilot study; the notion of harm. This seems to be a central concept of personal safety and the question sought to explore this in more detail by requesting a description of what harm meant to the respondents in the context of personal safety, for example the notions of accidental and intentional harm. They were also given a space to add any additional comments.

3.6.4 Data analysis

The data were interpreted and coded as themes emerged using the process described previously, and using the Delphi pilot study as a template. The findings are presented in Chapter 4.

3.7 SUMMARY

The Delphi pilot study served to test the methodology, hone my research skills, provide an insight into the complexities of personal safety and refined the preliminary data and understanding of the literature review. The three definitions that the Delphi pilot study produced are of the depth and standard which was anticipated, are empirically sound and contain key commonalities. The pilot Delphi study not only served to begin the process of scoping the meaning of personal safety but it provided the foundations for a framework for understanding the complex factors that shape it. The discussion was, however, deliberately inconclusive because of the recognition of
the limitations of the pilot study. Specifically, it was recognised that only three participants took part and that only one round took place.

The Delphi method is a suitable method for defining a concept, as the pilot study and previous applications have demonstrated. The very essence of the Delphi study and its aim to seek subjective, intuitive responses is entirely in keeping with the subjective nature of personal safety that was revealed from the literature review in Chapter 2. In addition, the pilot study revealed that it was suitable as a method. The themes that arose from the pilot will contribute to a broader understanding of personal safety. What is particularly prominent is that some of the key themes that arose in Chapter 2 regarding the nature of crime and fear of crime have been reiterated here. Feelings and perceptions of personal safety were particularly useful themes because of their ability to be influenced by our emotions and their often conflicting relationship with 'actual' personal safety. Fear of coming to harm could have a detrimental impact on quality of life. In this sense, there are commonalities with fear and the impact and perception of crime, as discussed in Chapter 2. This suggests that there are substantial commonalities between crime and personal safety. This will be further explored in Chapter 4, where the results of the main Delphi study are presented and discussed.
Chapter Four

Delphi study to define ‘personal safety’: Findings and discussion
4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings from the main Delphi study. Building on the themes that arose in the pilot study, key themes emerged as being salient from the main study questionnaires. The key building blocks of personal safety are presented, referring to a facet of personal safety that provides a deep understanding of what personal safety is and how it is constructed. The themes were cited a number of times by the respondents and were therefore considered important when constructing a framework of personal safety. This chapter presents the consensus opinion of a definition of personal safety, followed by a rudimentary conceptual framework for explaining how it is constructed, that usefully serves to further scope and delineate the concept and discusses what important implications they have for shaping the campus study. These are critically explored, particularly in reference to the key issues of crime and fear of crime that emerged in Chapter 2.

4.1 KEY FINDINGS FROM THE MAIN STUDY

The data were analysed, interpreted and organised using the same system as the pilot study. The data were approached with the themes from the pilot study in mind, although I was receptive to new themes and the re-development of themes if conflicting ideas surfaced. The responses were as follows:

4.1.1 The key building blocks of personal safety

Following on from the question “Please list up to ten phrases, concepts or sentences that sum up what the term ‘personal safety’ means to you”, the key building blocks of personal safety are presented in a tabulated format below in Table 4.1. The key findings and analysis from the questionnaires are presented in Appendix Eleven. It is important to note that these themes are broad building blocks that refer to different aspects of personal safety. For example, some categories, such as ‘actual’ and ‘perceived’ personal safety, refer to different components of personal safety; how it is constructed from an individual point of view. Other categories, such as ‘harm’ tell us the consequences of infringements to personal safety, while ‘actions of others’ and ‘individual responsibility’ provide detail on how personal safety is influenced. Like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, this chapter will explore how they fit together. Collectively they
provide a great insight into the different components of personal safety and have assisted in clarifying this complex issue. Significantly, of the eleven building blocks or categories of personal safety that emerged from the pilot study, ten were found in the analysis of the data from the main study, while two new themes emerged. These can be amalgamated and summarised as below:

Table 4.1 The key building blocks of personal safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building block of personal safety</th>
<th>What does it mean?</th>
<th>Synopsis:</th>
<th>Raised in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perceptions of personal safety</td>
<td>These all contribute to different aspects of our personal safety - they are centred around the individual - the 'personal' element of 'personal safety' and are experienced subjectively.</td>
<td>Personal safety is multi-dimensional issue that encompasses all of these facets. They are constructed differently, dependant on whether they are subjectively or objectively constructed, and there are different approaches to probing each of them</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feelings of personal safety</td>
<td>Risk is the likelihood of coming to harm.</td>
<td>Risk can be objectively or subjectively constructed, and the two may be widely divergent.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actual personal safety</td>
<td>Harm can be physical, verbal, psychological etc</td>
<td>Harm is different to crime because it is less well defined. Although harm in relation to personal safety is intentionally motivated, crime is operationalised by law, where as harm is more ambiguous and the two may not be equivalent.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Harm can have detrimental effects on an individual.</td>
<td>Harm, like crime, can have devastating effects.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>Our risk changes constantly according to our environment and behaviour</td>
<td>This was not found in the main study but is still an interesting building block of personal safety</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The effects of harm</td>
<td>There are steps we can take to promote our personal safety although harm is always perpetrated by others</td>
<td>This will form a major component of the campus study. Attention will be given to the personal safety triangle and the literature to ascertain how best to reduce harm on campus.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal safety is transient</td>
<td>It is not possible to ever be completely safe.</td>
<td>Although we cannot predict other people's behaviour, and 'others' are always the perpetrators of harm, there are measures that can be taken that reduce the risk.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ways of increasing safety</td>
<td>Is distinct from personal safety</td>
<td>This was clarified in the main study and personal safety was scoped as referring to intentional, rather than accidental, harm. This bounds it and recognises that health and safety for example is legislated against.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Actions of others</td>
<td>There are three groups of critical determinants of personal safety: physical, social and personal.</td>
<td>This was an effective way of grouping the determinants of personal safety and will serve to define responses to personal safety concerns accordingly.</td>
<td>Pilot and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Critical determinants of personal safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 The key building blocks of personal safety (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building block of personal safety</th>
<th>What does it mean?</th>
<th>Synopsis:</th>
<th>Raised in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Individual responsibility</td>
<td>This concerns behaving responsibly and taking precautionary behaviour to reduce risks</td>
<td>This falls into the 'personal' aspect of the personal safety triangle and thus interventions can be targeted accordingly</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Crime and personal safety are linked</td>
<td>Although the two concepts are not the same, they share common themes and this emerged strongly when reflection on the literature review</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above determinants of personal safety served to highlight the complex nature of personal safety and how myriad factors can impact on one's actual and perceived safety. The responses reiterated certain factors asserted by the pilot study's respondents, reinforcing their significance and giving greater weight to the findings.

4.1.2 The personal safety triangle

The critical determinants of personal safety were grouped together into the same three causal groups as in the pilot study; physical, social and personal factors. Once again the personal safety triangle of influencing factors of personal safety can be depicted as shown in Figure 4.1, with the experts' responses listed according to the key causal group they are allied with. These factors shape both the actual risk to one's personal safety and the perceived risk to one's personal safety.
4.1.3 Definition of personal safety

The preferred definition was the composite. This was agreed by all respondents indicating a complete group consensus. Therefore, this will be used as the definition of personal safety for the purpose of my research:

*Personal safety is an individual’s ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others.*
This study also revealed the following "add-on" statements that enhance the understanding of personal safety:

Harm is intentionally motivated, and includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person. Personal safety is about a combination of perceived risk and actual risk, where risk is the likelihood of coming to harm. Personal safety is not always dependent on another person and their behaviour. Personal safety is distinct from health and safety.

4.2 DISCUSSION

4.2.1 Critical evaluation of the definition

Prior to this research study, personal safety was an ambiguous term with a multitude of different interpretations that served only to confound and complicate matters. There was a clear need to deconstruct, explore and interpret personal safety in order to identify basic conceptual themes that constitute the phenomenon; development of a definition and a personal safety framework enables the phenomenon to be viewed with more clarity and incisiveness than currently exists, resulting not only in clearer comprehension of what personal safety is, and is not, but also providing a platform from which other research can be based.

The definition is a sound and clear explanation of what personal safety is. Certain words are pertinent and reach to the core of the phenomenon. For example, the study illuminates how personal safety is experienced by the individual; it denotes freedom of the individual to be free from threat of fear of harm. Further interpretation of the language reveals that threat or fear can be likened to risk and that the freedom element of personal safety refers to a state or position of safety where there are no risks. Perhaps this is too idealistic, as the respondents from the main study and the pilot study revealed that you can never be completely safe. Indeed, at the heart of personal safety is the notion of risk, which is the likelihood of coming to harm. Safety and risk could be viewed as opposite terms or 'states'. The term 'personal safety' could be interchanged with the more protracted 'personal risk of intentional harm'. Risk fluctuates throughout the course of our day as we change location and our physical and social environment.
changes. This places it in a spatial and temporal context because our lives are not lived in a vacuum, emphasised by the comments from the pilot study on the transient nature of personal safety.

4.2.2 Critical evaluation of the conceptual framework

The Delphi pilot and main study also revealed some key additional statements that enhance the understanding of personal safety. These statements provide further lucidity of the phenomenon. The pilot study indicated that personal safety may be concerned with intentional harm, but the respondents indicated in questionnaire 2, round 2 of the main study that accidental harm can also pose a threat to personal safety. However, when this was probed in more detail in the third questionnaire, personal safety seemed concerned only with intentional harm. This is an explicit understanding of the motivations behind the harmful act or behaviour – if it is intentional there is a more sinister edge because it is motivated by a calculated act of causing injury, distress or damage to another person or their property. Another useful statement was the notion of harm against personal effects and property; this is realistic because if one’s home is burgled then there is a real feeling of intrusion and vulnerability that constitutes personal harm on an emotional level. Crucially, personal safety can exist objectively or subjectively, and which can be ‘high’ or ‘low’ depending on the environment we are in.

Most saliently was the distinction between actual risk, perceived risk, and fear. The data revealed that there are three facets of personal safety experienced by an individual at any one time – perceived personal safety, feelings of personal safety and actual personal safety. Threats or risks can be real or perceived and this has similar elements to the definition of ‘community safety’ defined by the Home Office report Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004, p.8) as “an aspect of quality of life, in which people, individually and collectively, are sufficiently free from or reassured about a range of real and perceived risks centering on crime and related misbehaviour,” and the definition of ‘public safety’ (Smith and Dickey 1999), as “a condition specific to places in which people and property are not at risk of attack or theft and are not perceived to be at risk.”

In the Delphi analysis, risk is further explicated as the likelihood of coming to harm; the threat of harm can be actual or perceived and will be further explored below. The
opposite of risk was perceived to be a state of 'safety'. This is concurred by Bowles (2002, p.3), who claims that "safety (or security) is viewed as the opposite of 'risk'." This was directly echoed in the pilot study: "the opposite of safety is a situation where you were at risk or a very significant risk of something happening to you." (R3)

Finally, personal safety was agreed to be a distinct phenomenon from Health and Safety. This reiterates the findings from the pilot study, where it was felt that Health and Safety was a predominantly institutional capability (although there is emphasis on individual responsibility) with clearly defined parameters, legislation and legally prescribed systems of risk assessment that cannot be realistically applied and translated to an individual's everyday living and circumstances.

4.2.3 Key themes of personal safety

The above statements and definition provide clarity to the phenomenon of personal safety but it is necessary to try and align them with a relevant theoretical foundation in order to provide further clarity and credence to this emerging subject. This will enhance comprehension by anchoring personal safety in a suitable academic discipline. Throughout the literature review, pilot study and main Delphi study, the most conspicuous and relevant academic discipline that appeared allied to personal safety was criminology and the crime and fear of crime literature. There are a number of reasons that support this linkage, reflecting on the Delphi findings and the literature review in Chapter 2. Crucially, both crime and personal safety are multi-dimensional and can be experienced objectively or subjectively. Crime is mentioned a number of times as being a key component of personal safety, in both the pilot and main Delphi study and the literature indicated that the two constructs appear to be directly related. Indeed, freedom from crime and personal safety appear to be synonymous.

It would seem that this literature and theoretical background could usefully enhance the understanding of personal safety by providing conceptual insight. I will now explore the key building blocks of personal safety as derived from the main Delphi study in order to provide an enhanced understanding of this phenomenon. Although my study will not lead to a 'Theory' being proposed, as Wolcott (2001, p.75) suggests, there are nonetheless theoretical implications for any such research work, in particular how my research relates to existing theories and research. The categorisation of the key themes
has provided a great insight into the different components of personal safety and has assisted in clarifying this complex issue. Following on from the main Delphi study, the key building blocks of personal safety can be demonstrated as follows:

4.2.3.1 Perceptions of personal safety

Perceptions of personal safety, or perceived risk of intentional harm, in contrast to actual risk of harm, are constructed by the individual. Drawing from the criminological literature, perceptions of personal safety are the product of assessments of the likelihood of suffering intentional harm and are subjectively experienced by the individual. Ferraro (1995, p.28) defined perceived risk as "people's assessment of the crime rates and the probability of victimisation", and distinguished perceived risk to fear. This is a complex issue because perceptions are inherently connected to the psychological and individual profile of the person and are very difficult to measure; each individual has their own unique and complex interpretation of their own personal safety. Like actual risk, perceptions of risk can be dependent on a variety of determinants, as emphasised in the personal safety triangle. From a personal safety perspective, it is not just the social and physical environment that we respond to in order to judge our risks. Instead, our risk perceptions are bound in our psychological make up. Valentine (1990), for example, found that women's perceptions of safety in local environments are related to their local knowledge, familiarity and comfort with the area. Pain (1997, p.122) found that life experiences and histories can have a significant influence on an individual's present day perceptions, as well as that ageing affects perceived and actual vulnerability. Schroeder and Anderson (1984) found that perceptions of safety are influenced by characteristics of the environment. Like actual risk, our perceived risk changes according to the environment and mind-set that we are in. However, perceptions arguably offer more accurate representations of the real impact of social and environmental factors have on an individual's personal safety, if explored appropriately within the social and environmental context. Although they sometimes do not correspond with actual risk status, perceptions are a fundamental element of human behaviour and indicate how personal safety can be affected on a day-to-day basis, particularly if explored in a qualitative framework.
4.2.3.2 Feelings of personal safety

Feelings of personal safety are based on emotional responses and fear of harm can be likened to fear of crime. An understanding of fear of harm can be gained from the fear of crime literature, despite fear of crime offering a more specific focus than fear of harm. Fear is an emotional response, unique to the individual, and is dynamic and ever-changing as we manoeuvre through different environments throughout the course of our day. Ferraro (1995, p.24) defined fear of crime as “an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime”. Fear is defined by the individual and we all have our own triggers for generating fear. These insights into the classification of aspects of personal responses to personal safety are valuable for devising a research methodology for exploring personal safety on university campuses since it clarifies the differences between these approaches and underpins exactly which of these categories is best in order to gain an in-depth understanding of personal safety. Fear is undoubtedly a complex phenomenon and it is difficult to analyse. While the criminological literature is over-run by quantitative studies, it is arguable that a more precise understanding can be obtained by using methods that exploit a multitude of perspectives. As the critical determinants of personal safety demonstrate, individuals subjectively construct their personal safety based on a multitude of factors and this should inform the development of an appropriate methodology.

4.2.3.3 Actual personal safety

Actual risk in terms of personal safety is an objective measure based on the actual likelihood of being intentionally harmed. Determining an individual’s actual risk of experiencing harm depends on so many factors that two people in the same social and physical environment could be at different levels of risk because of their different personal factors, e.g. age, personality or behaviour etc. This complexity is echoed in the criminological literature by Gottfredson (1984, p.1), who asserts that “most people have no accurate idea what the chances of criminal victimisation are and how these chances might be expected to vary according to their own circumstances.”

However, attempts have been made to quantify individual risk which can be derived from official crime statistics and victimisation surveys. However, measuring crime by using recorded crime data is contentious because they typically underestimate true levels of
crime. Inherent in the procedure of using reported crime rates as an indicator of the level of crime is the problem of underreporting of crime (Maguire 2002). Crime surveys can also be criticised for failing to provide an accurate representation of reality; they typically condense responses into quantifiable data which removes the substance from such perceptions. So although official statistics and crime surveys give an indication of actual risk they are, arguably, unrepresentative of true criminal occurrences and risk of victimisation. Remarkably, Kershaw et al. (2000, p.992) suggest that British Crime Survey (BCS) data indicates that about 40% of crimes known to victims and reported to the police do not end up in the official statistics, indicating the extent to which they cannot be held to truly represent actual victimisation. In addition, a major criticism of official statistics is that they only portray one facet of victimisation; that is they do not give a clear picture of social or situational factors which may contribute to crime or explain why some people are more at risk than others (Maguire, 2002, p.342). From a personal safety perspective, actual risk of intentional harm can be underpinned by theories of criminal behaviour that explore offender characteristics, environmental features and victim characteristics, which can loosely be likened to three causal groups of personal safety; social, physical and personal. If we wished to determine actual risks of harm then we could identify what behaviour constituted intentional harm and then record incidences of intentional harm and so develop theoretical models relating various risk determinants. What the research on actual risk of criminal victimisation suggests is that a more holistic approach to personal safety is beneficial, i.e. one that does not rely solely on statistics of crime surveys, and instead focuses on a more detailed exploration of perceptions and feelings of risk.

Although the subjectivity of personal safety has been explored in relation to perceptions and feelings of risk (above), it is important to note that throughout the empirical studies exploring these concerns, the in-depth subjective perspective of people through qualitative methods such as focus groups and interviews has remained largely untapped. Although personal safety can be determined objectively, i.e. in terms of risk status and objective data, it is best understood as the subjective complex relationship between people and their environments. However, by understanding this we can identify factors that we can influence and target to improve personal safety. How people construct their perceptions and emotions is complex because people use a variety of different sources to assess their personal risk; this is emphasised by the host of ‘personal’ factors identified as critical determinants of personal safety.
4.2.3.4 Risk

This is the likelihood of being harmed and can be actual or perceived. The concept of risk is particularly relevant in modern society with an increasing emphasis placed on identifying, assessing and managing risk in all aspects of our lives. A cursory look at mass media outlets depict evermore ludicrous examples of ways that the State intervenes to reduce risks; from taking down hanging baskets, in case they fall on to passers by, to banning conkers in playgrounds because of the potential risks to pupils. These refer to non-intentional harm but they highlight examples of how risk assessments are a dominant presence in modern living. The issue of risk from a personal safety perspective has three implications; the actual risk of being harmed, the perceived risk of being harmed and the fear of being harmed. These are three distinct positions and are constructed in different ways. Risk of crime is traditionally calculated by official crime statistics and crime surveys with a more objective research approach, while perceived risk of crime and fear of crime is best achieved by exploring individual perceptions. From the results of the pilot study and main Delphi study, personal safety can be influenced by a host of factors as displayed in the personal safety triangle. Because of the close relationship between risk and safety we can therefore assume that these determinants also influence risk too.

4.2.3.5 Harm

A central aspect of personal safety is freedom from intentional harm. Harm is analogous to crime in a number of ways. Crime, arguably, in all its configurations, causes or constitutes harm to someone or something. Of course, not all harm constitutes a crime or a criminal act, although many harmful acts are criminal, such as violent attacks, theft or vandalism. Harmful acts may be more general, and could constitute more subtle and insidious acts such as bullying which is not necessarily criminal but is nonetheless harmful because of the potential to cause psychological or emotional distress. It thus seems reasonable to draw comparisons and similarities between the two. From a personal safety perspective harm is intentional in nature and may be psychological, emotional or physical. There is a close link here with crime but the two are not mutually exclusive. Bilsky et al. (1993, p.256) highlights this disparity by claiming that "behaviour classed as criminal in terms of law may not be perceived as either an injury or an injustice by the victim. On the other hand, people may quite well interpret a personal
experience as criminal victimisation although it does not fit legal criteria". So clearly, if comparisons can be drawn, actual harm or the threat or fear of harm can have equally devastating affects. Harm is a general term that could be researched in more detail, for example, to distinguish between different levels of harm. This could make harm more quantifiable, if this was a desired research aim. Comparisons and similarities can be drawn with the crime literature because they are similar entities.

4.2.3.6 Effects of harm

Harm can be damaging in much the way that crime can cause much distress. The Delphi study revealed that harm can be experienced physically, psychologically and emotionally. It is perhaps the 'intentional harm' element of personal safety that is the crux of the issue: although accidental harm can be traumatising, the fact that harm is intentionally motivated means that the person who perpetrates the harmful behaviour has made a decision to harm another person, which is anathema to law-abiding and respectful people. Furthermore, it not just actual harm that can be damaging but also fear of harm. The fear of harm can be likened to the fear of crime, which can be highly significant to some people. Garofalo (1981, p.856) found that fear of crime can lead to modification in behaviour, such as the avoidance of fearful places. Ollenburger (1981) found that high degrees of fear can cause stress and anxiety and Lawton and Yaffe (1980) found that fear of crime was associated with restriction of behaviour and decreased morale. This illustrates the degree to which the consequence of actual or fear of harm can inhibit a person's life and welfare.

4.2.3.7 Personal safety is transient

This issue was raised in the pilot study but is still an important building block of personal safety. Not only is our personal safety constantly changing during the course of our day as our physical and social environments change and we react to them, but our individual emotional responses to these environments can change according to such trivial things as what mood we are in or due to more dramatic life-changing events, for example a brush with death could make us inclined to take more or less risks. Actual and perceived risk changes according to our surroundings, as does fear based on how we decode the
environment. Such an explanation is further endorsed by (Fattah and Sacco 1989), who highlight the transitory nature of fear.

4.2.3.8 Ways of increasing safety

This came up as discrete building block of personal safety but it has commonalities with the issue of personal responsibility. Without being specifically prompted, the main Delphi study responses pertained to certain measures that could be taken to promote personal safety. These would be useful when exploring methods for promoting personal safety. Most personal safety advice and guidance today is based on a number of actions that one can take to achieve maximum freedom from harm. Although this advice is mainly anecdotal and based on common-sense rather than being rooted in a sound research base, the emphasis is clear – although threats and risks of harm exist from other people, there are actions that the individual can take to reduce the risk of being harmed. Crucially one response referred to individual and institutional responsibility, which demonstrates that, for example, employers can actively play a role in promoting the safety of staff; in other words a collective effort can be helpful in reducing the risk of harm. However, individuals can take responsibility for their own actions too by avoiding, as far as possible, potentially risky situations.

4.2.3.9 Actions of others

This building block relates to the issues of personal responsibility and ways of increasing safety because by taking steps to protect yourself from risk, you are arming yourself against the actions of others who perpetrate intentional harm.

4.2.3.10 Health and Safety

This was raised in the pilot study and the main study sought to clarify whether personal safety encompassed ‘Health and Safety’. The questionnaires probed the issue and the resultant conceptual framework of personal safety revealed that they are distinct. ‘Health and Safety’ was seen as a discrete, legally prescribed framework for reducing risks in the workplace, often related to accidental harm. ‘Personal safety’ is concentrated on intentional harm. Thus ‘Health and Safety’ should not be viewed as a building block of
personal safety *per se*, rather it is presented in this section because it was an important part of the Delphi process and analysis to determine whether health and safety should be encompassed by the term ‘personal safety’. Now that the analysis has taken place it is clear that ‘Health and Safety’ is quite distinct from personal safety and therefore the terms should not be confused. This is particularly important for the campus study because participants can be presented with a clear definition of what personal safety is, and what it is not.

4.2.3.11 Critical determinants of personal safety

These will be dealt with below in Section 4.2.4.

4.2.3.12 Individual responsibility

There is an element of personal responsibility inherent in personal safety in that the individual can and should take some measures to improve their personal safety by, for example, avoiding risky situations. The Delphi studies showed that a key aspect of personal safety is taking responsibility for one’s actions and taking steps to reduce risks, thereby trying to make yourself as safe as possible. Individual’s can, to some degree, control their risk of harm by adapting their behaviour to minimise risk exposure e.g. not walking down a dark alley at night, although it is impossible to account for the unpredictable behaviour of others. However, individuals vary in their approach to risk-taking behaviour; young people may think they are invincible and act irresponsibly, for example. Indeed, age has been found to play a key role in personal responsibility, with the tendency for people to become more responsible for their own behaviour and actions as they get older (Blair *et al.* 2003). Interestingly, Seaward (2002) discovered that behaviour is the most easily modifiable factor to improve one’s safety and it is reasonable to suggest that this is a useful insight that may be relevant to the promotion of personal safety.
4.2.3.13 Crime

One definition of personal safety described personal safety as ‘freedom from crime and fear of crime’ (R10). Although the questionnaires led to the scope of personal safety being wider than crime, it has nonetheless emerged as an issue intuitively related to personal safety. This validates the way that personal safety and crime have been presented as comparable phenomenon from the review of the literature in Chapter 2.

4.2.4 Critical determinants of personal safety

As determined from both Delphi studies, a number of determinants influence a person's personal safety. These can be grouped together into three key classifications: physical factors, social factors and personal factors. These three categories were identified in the literature review but were verified in the pilot Delphi study and there appeared to be a complex tripartite relationship between these three causal groups. This categorisation was upheld in the main Delphi study. These have been shown to influence actual risk and perceived risk of crime so parallels will be made with the emerging framework of personal safety and harm. At this stage it seems that a more precise understanding of personal safety can be obtained by adopting a holistic perspective to these determinants. Although they have been listed individually, no attempt has been made to identify empirically based causal-relationships between them. The three critical groups appear to be constantly present in any assessment of personal safety. They are also supported from the literature presented in Chapter 2 so only a brief description will detail their relevance to personal safety to avoid repetition. It is a unique relationship that changes constantly but the three essential ingredients are always there; there is always a situational or physical element, an individual element and a social element. I will explore each causal group in more detail:

4.2.4.1 Physical determinants

Physical factors were seen as a distinct causal group that influence personal safety and risk and fear of harm, including the impact of the time of day and the built and the natural environment. The impact of features such as the design of the built environment, lighting and CCTV on crime have been well documented in criminological research and have
been explored in relation to risks, perceptions and fear of crime. Humans respond to the environment they are in and this affects their feelings of safety. Therefore some insight can be gained from this literature to explore how the physical environment can impact on personal safety. In particular, the effect of the built environment on crime and fear of crime is well recognized. Fisher and Nasar (1992) discussed how certain physical characteristics of an environment can increase vulnerability and feelings of fear. This is supported by Austin et al. (2002) who assert that a sense of place and its characteristics influence perceptions of safety. A number of studies have correlated darkness with feelings of fear (Killias 1990; Vrij and Winkel 1991), while Semmens et al. (2002) found that the seasons can affect actual victimisation and feelings of safety. Furthermore, well maintained environments can be associated with increased perceptions of safety (Wilson and Kelling 1982).

4.2.4.2 Social determinants

The term 'social' refers to other people and their actions and behaviour, socio-economic factors, such as poverty, unemployment and crime, and community facilities etc. These are highly influential on an individual's actual and perceived, as well as fear for, personal safety. The presence, or lack of, other people in a certain space and time can significantly affect our actual and perceived risk of harm, as well as contributing to fear: Pain and Townshend (2000) found that fear can be generated by the behaviour of other people in the vicinity. This ties in neatly with one of the key building blocks of personal safety: that of the 'actions of others.' This, however, is hard to control in a free society. The social makeup and interactions of a community can also impact on personal safety (LaGrange et al. 1992; Hale et al. 1994; McPherson 1978; Austin et al. 2002). This can be explained by how well a community is integrated, its socio-economic features, crime levels etc. Kinsey (1986), Barker and Page (2002) and Baumer (1985) suggest that visible authoritative figures, such as police or security agents, reduce fears by providing social reassurance. These issues provide a valuable insight into how social factors can impact upon personal safety. By comparing them with the crime literature some key themes emerge about exactly what modifications influence this aspect of the personal safety triangle, such as patrolling policemen/women to reduce crime and fear.
4.2.4.3 Personal determinants

Personal factors were seen as a distinct causal group that influence personal safety and risk and fear of harm, and included gender, religious beliefs, ethnicity, agility and health, age, social class, employment and affluence. This is undoubtedly the most complex of the three causal groups and underpins the 'personal' element of personal safety. We all have our own self-identities, personalities and concepts of self and this determines how we interact with and interpret the physical and social environments that we engage with throughout our day. Although demographic factors such as age, gender and race are often classified under the general heading of 'social' characteristics in much of the sociological literature, I have preferred to incorporate them under the 'personal' group of determinants of personal safety because each individual and their unique interpretation of their personal safety is characterised by what is personal to them, and this includes specific features such as experience and upbringing as well as demographic characteristics such as age, sex and ethnicity that are common to many groups of people. The more complex issue of person-specific characteristics (such as self-identity and personality) have been largely ignored in the literature. Undoubtedly this is due in part to the fact that such complex characteristics are impossible to operationalise and measure from person to person in a manageable way. However, a number of authors have recognised that such complex personal factors play a key role in generating fear. For example Pain (1997), in her qualitative research on fear and crime amongst the elderly, found that life experiences and personalities can determine individual's perceptions of crime. Kenyon and Hawker (1999), meanwhile, considered the very personal characteristic of intuition in determining personal safety. This was an issue that was raised in the Delphi studies and should not be overlooked, despite its elusiveness as a tangible or measurable entity. These issues also relate to the victimology theories of crime presented in Chapter 2 which argue that certain characteristics make some people more vulnerable to crime.

What can be derived from the above literature is that individuals, with their unique identities, emotions and perceptions, should not be ignored when understanding and exploring personal safety in a particular social or physical context.
4.2.5 The discussion so far

This has centred on:

- The discussion of key building blocks of the phenomenon of personal safety that serve to provide a deeper understanding of the various facets of personal safety and
- A framework of determinants of personal safety based on three causal groups. These indicate the complex characteristics that influence an individual's personal safety at anyone time.

The next stage will be to bring these together as a cohesive whole as a means of identifying how best to apply this knowledge to a practical study of personal safety.

4.3 AN INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING PERSONAL SAFETY

I will now explore what the above discussion can tell us about personal safety and how it can be usefully incorporated into an interpretative framework of personal safety. This will be divided into two sections:

1. Exploring personal safety from an holistic perspective and
2. How this framework is best taken forward into the study of personal safety on university campuses.

4.3.1 Exploring personal safety from an holistic perspective

The discussion above has provided a solid grounding for identifying a clearer understanding of personal safety. The personal safety triangle of critical determinants of personal safety was developed loosely from the literature and confirmed in the pilot study and reiterated in the main Delphi study. In the context of the available literature, this appears to provide a clear understanding of how people construct their own personal safety. The actual, perceived and fear for personal safety of an individual can therefore be explained using the personal safety triangle. This framework has similarities to the theoretical model presented by Killias and Clerici (2000) to explore fear of crime. This identified personal, social and situational characteristics as contributors to vulnerability and the personal safety triangle possesses similar categories that are identified as
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contributing to personal safety, or risk of intentional harm, based on commonalities between vulnerability and risk. However, such a model has been criticised, based on the validity of empirical measures of personal, social and situational vulnerability and its complexity (Hale 1996, p.95). However, neither such criticisms are appropriate for the personal safety triangle because it is intended as a framework for furthering comprehension of personal safety rather than as a theoretical model of personal safety that makes any attempt to operationalise what constitutes 'intentionally motivated harm'. Babbie (2004, p.45) contends that operationalisation means "specifying the exact operations involved in measuring a variable." In other words although I have broadly defined personal safety I have not specified further what intentional harm consists of. However, this is not of particular significance to this study because I am not measuring specified variables pertaining to test a hypothesis of intentional harm. As further evidence of the appropriateness of the framework to represent personal safety, Pain (1997) highlighted the tripartite relationship between individual identity, social interactions and the environment as a way of fostering a clearer insight into causal determinants of fear. There are therefore parallels to be made between personal safety and the fear and risk of intentional harm and the fear and risk of crime. The methodology for the campus study should acknowledge such complexities.

4.3.2 How this framework is best taken forward into the study of personal safety on university campuses

In the next section I explore how best to make sense of and utilise this knowledge for the purpose of the campus study. Now that a more lucid definition and explanation of personal safety exists and a framework has established the central issues, this knowledge can be utilised to appropriately inform and mould the methodology of the campus study. A predominantly qualitative research approach allowed personal safety to be explored from a more comprehensive perspective, allowing respondents the opportunity to explain their key issues of concern. Focus groups or interviews were favourable over surveys or questionnaires, which tend to over-simplify issues. According to Pain (1997, p.120) there are recurrent problems in the criminological literature because of the methods used to explore fear of crime; "much of the difficulty is created by the use of an objective methodology to deal with a subjective phenomenon. Fear of crime is a complex synthesis of perceptions and feelings, and it is also dynamic." The majority of studies which have explored perceptions of safety have typically used
quantitative methods than inevitably result in a loss of meaning and context when responses are condensed into narrow categories. The campus research was underpinned by the notion that personal safety and perceptions and fear of intentional harm are subjective and complex issues, and the methodology was specifically designed to probe these concepts in appropriate detail by exploring the meaning of personal safety to respondents, the nature of their reactions and how their concerns are situated in space and time on campus.

4.3.2.1 The value of a perceptual approach to personal safety

The Delphi study revealed that personal safety is a two-dimensional issue that encompasses two distinct elements: actual and perceived risk of intentional harm. This crucial point indicated how the direction of the campus research should proceed because the exploration of the subjective dimension focusing on the perceptions element is particularly relevant and insightful. The methodology will therefore deliberately focus on exploring the subjective perspective of campus users rather than a purely statistical approach to actual personal safety. To record and analyse purely incidences of harm or affronts to personal safety on campus would tell us very little about the causes or environmental contexts of such acts. Pain (1997, p.126) claims that the predominant techniques for exploring fear of crime are based on positivist methodologies, which "can undermine the meaning behind the collected data since the context or situation of the phenomenon under examination is rendered insignificant". An alternative to using official crime statistics and quantitative methods of analysing perceptions is to adopt a more qualitative approach that fosters a wider and more detailed exploration of campus safety. Exploring user's experiences and perceptions of crime and personal safety gives campus users the opportunity to clarify their key issues of concern, leading to an informed and user-led framework of recommendations for personal safety improvements. This has helped to conceptualise personal safety to facilitate its practical application on campus by focusing on a subjective perceptual approach rather than exploring the actuality of personal safety in terms of objective data such as crime statistics.
4.4 CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE PERSONAL SAFETY FRAMEWORK

It is necessary to recognise the limitations of the proposed framework of personal safety. Most evident is that the personal safety triangle of determinants of personal safety is highly simplistic because although it acknowledges the complex interaction of determinants it does not indicate any causal links between the individual determinants or account for the more profound social, political and historical contexts of personal safety at any given time. It is therefore important to value it for what it is: a framework rather than a theoretical model of personal safety. It offers no guidance for how one would operationalise or segregate measures of each of the critical determinants; the human psyche is far too complex an entity to consider extracting and measuring the impact of 'upbringing', for example. So what meaning does it have? The Delphi studies have usefully identified key building blocks of personal safety that together provide clarity and insight into this complex phenomenon. Thus I have determined different facets of personal safety (actual, perceived and fear for risk) and different determinants of personal safety (the personal safety triangle) that have been simplified in order to overcome its innate complexity. This may give the impression that the findings are not focussed enough, but they have served the purpose to lay suitable foundations to guide the study of personal safety on university campuses. The study also finds some common issues to that of Maurice et al. (2001): the recognition that personal safety has an objective dimension and a subjective dimension. Both are constructed differently and require different research approaches.

4.5 RELEVANCE TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature provided insight into possible commonalities between crime and personal safety and the Delphi study has cemented shared themes between the two concepts. What is most evident is that it is the 'intentionally motivated harm' element of personal safety that is comparable with 'crime' and the two share common features. The risk of both concepts can be constructed objectively and subjectively. It is reasonable then, on the basis of criticisms levied at the objective assessment of risk, and the more narrow quantified assessments of subjective risk, that the campus methodology should offer a new tangent to the issue and, on the evidence presented in this chapter, draw on qualitative perspectives to offer the most insight into campus safety.
Chapter 4: Delphi study to define 'personal safety': Findings and discussion

Crime and personal safety appear to have many commonalities and there were recurring themes in the literature review and the Delphi findings; most notably the notions of perceptions of harm/crime; fear of harm/crime; the impact of harm/crime on quality of life and the subjective dimension of harm/crime. The notion of personal safety as dependent on physical, social and personal factors is also given support by the literature. In particular, the relevance of the physical environment is highlighted; as Garofalo (1981, p.840) asserts, fear of crime is generated by perceived cues in the environment. This is particularly appropriate to personal safety because the Delphi study revealed that perceptions of intentionally motivated harm can be derived from the social and physical environment. The literature review highlighted empirical studies that attempted to measure perceptions of crime and fear of crime, but there is a deficiency in the bulk of the methodologies employed. As Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002) suggest, although exploring perceptions provides an insight into people's assessments of risk, individuals' emotional responses can be much more revealing. Such responses emphasise the complexities involved when interpreting an environment. Therefore, personal safety risk assessments should ideally promote the exploration of the contextual minutiae to ascertain why fears exist in certain environments; quantification of responses may be counterproductive.

4.6 CRITIQUE OF METHODOLOGY

It is important to consider the exact efficacy of the Delphi method, and the relevance of the resulting consensus of opinion that was achieved. This was an inductive study because it was not concerned with testing a hypothesis because there was inadequate theory of personal safety available in the literature. Each expert respondent brought with them to the overall process and their responses their own construction of reality, based upon their own unique and personal life experiences. This can be critically construed as being loaded with subjectivity and therefore failing to offer any generalisable definition because it refers to a particular expert group at a particular time. However, although the findings cannot be generalised and another group may produce different results, the findings are valid in their own way because I followed a systematic process. The respondents brought with them a diverse range of thoughts and views to the process and the group opinion was constructed methodically. The respondents all received the same questionnaires and information that clarified the demands on them and ensured an effective flow of questionnaires. I did not know any of the respondents so there was no
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subtle manipulation of responses. Although the results of the Delphi are based on responses in a specific space/time and have limited generalisability, the Delphi definition is still valid and meaningful and it served to scope the campus project. Furthermore, it provided clarity pertaining to a previously ambiguous phenomenon based on rigorous and insightful deconstruction. Providing these limitations are acknowledged, the consensus opinion can be utilised accordingly.

4.7 CONCLUSIONS

The Delphi study produced a definition that is of practical use to the exploration of personal safety on university campuses, which can also be used in other academic and practice communities. The findings reveal that, in support of the literature and pilot study, there are different facets of personal safety: actual safety, perceived safety and feelings of personal safety, and they are intrinsically linked yet discrete dimensions. Although the probability of being a victim of intentional harm could be empirically determined using crime or incident data, from a practical point of view, the reality is that for each individual, in every space/time location, the actuality of personal safety cannot be truly determined because there are too many unknown forces. Measures of actual personal safety could be predicted using incident data but this provides only a very limited insight into safety on campus. However, exploring the perceptual element of personal safety, i.e. the subjective meaning of how people interact with their environment, offered revealing insights that were translated into positive practical solutions. Indeed there is a general lack of such approaches in the criminological literature. This is surprising given the potential illumination that such studies can provide.

Personal safety is undoubtedly transient as the threat or risk of harm can occur instantly in a previously safe or perceived 'safe zone'. At the heart of personal safety is the notion of risk, which is the likelihood of coming to intentional harm. The term 'personal safety' could be interchanged with the more protracted 'personal risk of harm'. Personal safety was found to be a state rather than an action or event like crime. Risk fluctuates throughout the course of our day and the transience of personal safety is complex because our personal safety constantly changes as our physical and social environments change. The Delphi studies and the literature thus point to an exploration of the proximate environment to establish how specific characteristics of social and
physical surroundings can impact on perceptions of personal safety in a campus environment as the most meaningful way to assess personal safety.

The definition that the Delphi study produced is empirically sound and can be usefully applied in a variety of contexts; it is succinct and functional and is appropriate for application to the campus study as well as for the wider academic, practice and public communities too. The Delphi study not only scoped the meaning of personal safety but it provided an interpretative framework for understanding the complex factors that shape it. The building blocks of personal safety, in addition to the critical determinants of personal safety, have provided refined lucidity on what initially appeared an incoherent, vague and ambiguous phenomenon and so the Delphi studies have provides a solid foundation for further research into personal safety. This will be invaluable for application to the campus study. The study demonstrated that personal safety is a highly subjective and complex experience and exploring the subjective perspective of campus users provided a more thorough insight into how the very design, maintenance and management of the campus environment is interpreted and how this affected behaviour, perceptions of risk and safety. Crucially, what this chapter demonstrated is the commonalities between personal safety and crime, since many of the key themes were reiterated from Chapter 2. This gives credence to my findings and strengthens my position on personal safety.

Furthermore, what Chapters 2, 3, and 4 have demonstrated however is the major salience of four crucial and interrelated issues that have major significance for the shaping of the campus methodology:

- The importance and value of perceptions of personal safety to an individual and their quality of life
- The failure of crime data and objective measures of risk in portraying contextual details of why concerns or fears exist in a given location
- The importance of the physical environment in determining perceptions of personal safety
- The lack of in-depth qualitative research that explores perceptions of risk

The Delphi study has clearly scoped the definition of personal safety that allows me to proceed to the campus study. This chapter, along with the contributions from Chapters 2 and 3, have addressed the first three objectives of my research:
Chapter 4: Delphi study to define 'personal safety': Findings and discussion

RO1: To define and scope the term 'personal safety', with particular emphasis on the distinction between objective and subjective dimensions of the construct

RO2: To identify an appropriate conceptualisation of perceptions of personal safety to facilitate its practical application

RO3: To ground personal safety in an appropriate discipline and establish it as a valid subject for academic research

These issues will be assimilated with the literature review of campus safety presented in Chapter 5 to inform the development of the campus methodology and address the other research objectives.
PART 2
An assessment of personal safety on university campuses
Chapter Five
A critical review and discussion of the campus crime and student victimisation literature
Chapter 5: A critical review and discussion of the campus crime and student victimisation literature

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a thorough review of the literature into student safety, campus crime and student victimisation in order to contextualise, inform and develop the focus of my research. There are no specific studies into personal safety on university campuses so allied areas were explored in a similar way to comparable literature to personal safety being explored in Chapter 2. It emerged that there was a considerable history of such research in the US, while in the UK the research topic is one that has only recently been addressed (for the purpose of the thesis I focused only on American and British universities). I will explore the historical and social contexts of the US and the UK to help understand how these have played a crucial role in shaping the extent and nature of campus crime in both countries, and the discrete legal frameworks within which higher education (HE) in both countries operate. This is followed by the detail and appraisal of the prevailing approaches to campus safety research and an exploration of the effects and possible solutions to campus crime. I conclude with a critical appraisal of the literature, detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the prevailing research approaches, and the consequences it had for my research in terms of how it shaped my research focus, design and methodological approach.

5.1 ORIGINS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Universities are places of learning, research and higher education. The word university is derived from the word universitas which is the Latin word for community or corporation (Room 2003, p.1220). The very notion of such a university had its origins in the Greek Academy, where the Athenian scholar Plato would teach his students in the fourth century BC (www.wikipedia.org). The oldest university in the UK is Oxford University, which had its origins in the 12th century, while in the US Harvard University can be traced back to the 17th century. From their inception universities were the domain of predominantly male students, drawing their clientele from wealthy or well-connected families. Universities were also traditionally very much self-contained communities, where learning was conducted in a sanitised environment without interference from the perceived distractions of the outside world, an ethos which earned universities the moniker of 'Ivory Tower.' (Smith 1989). These characteristics prevailed in part until the mid 20th century, when important political and social events heralded a radical period of change that altered university life and recruitment for good (Smith and Fossey 1995). The result was a more diverse student body, where the typically overlooked educational needs of women,
ethnic minorities and mature students were accepted and encouraged, and a new era of accessibility and opportunity was fostered (Smith 1989). However, the essence of universities as places for acquiring education and knowledge has endured. Despite this, campus crime and student victimisation has become more prolific over the last 50 years and there has been a gradual recognition that an environment where crime and victimisation exist can be damaging to a fulfilling educational experience.

5.2 NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES AND STUDENTS IN THE UK AND US

In the UK universities are regulated and funded predominantly by the government, although they can seek revenue by other means such as commercial services and consultancy. In the US colleges and universities are not regulated by the government in the same way as in the UK, and HEIs range from small non-profit making institutions to lucrative, commercially oriented institutions and they can be privately owned or publicly funded. Over the last 50 years the numbers of universities and the students they attract have grown exponentially. In 1992 polytechnics were granted university status in the UK and the advent of increased access and part-time study has allowed more students to access higher education in a flexible, modern way than ever before. There are now over 320 universities and colleges in the UK (www.ucas.ac.uk), with recent figures showing that there are 1,947,380 full and part-time UK students enrolled on their courses (Universities UK 2005). In the US there are an estimated 3,587 universities and colleges, which enrol over 12 million students annually (Dober 1992).

5.3 HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND TO CAMPUS CRIME

In the context of the cultural differences and the number of universities and students in the US and the UK, it is unsurprising that the extent and nature of campus crime varies considerably between the two counties. First of all, it is important to consider the political and cultural changes in recent times and how this associates with an increase in campus crime and student victimisation. Smith (1989) and Smith and Fossey (1995), for example, attribute an increase in violence on campuses in the 1960s to two key social campaigns of this period: the American civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam war protests. Young students acquired a new self-confidence and palpably challenged social conditions which they did not agree with, unafraid to voice their opinion and protest if necessary. In some instances, this led to episodes of violence and rioting which escalated to the killing of students and staff. Patently,
the notion of *In Loco Parentis*, defined by Smith and Fossey (1995) as a system by which "education authorities acted in the stead of parents," whereby universities held a degree of responsibility for the students in their 'care', was destroyed (Nichols 1987). This created a new era of student freedom which changed the dynamics significantly between universities and the student body. Boyer (1990) claims that this created difficulties for universities as it blurred the line between what universities and their students could be each held accountable for and this, coupled with a general increase in violent crimes generally, was a contributing factor to the escalation of campus crime.

The issue of crime on campus and the safety of students is something that is intertwined with the level and nature of societal problems. Referring back to Chapter 2 and the literature review which put personal safety in the context of contemporary society, an interesting perspective was put forward by Rund (2002) about how creating safer environments for students has become increasingly complex in a world of increased risk and terrorism. He argues that "a safe campus is one that provides students the opportunity to pursue their academic potential in an environment free of discrimination, intimidation, or threat to physical or emotional well-being." (2002, p.8). This echoes the Delphi definition of personal safety. However in a world when the threat of many risks is unforeseeable and random, this is hard to attain.

5.4 EXTENT AND NATURE OF CAMPUS CRIME

Research into campus safety and student victimisation in US higher education establishments is a valid research concern and a body of work exists in the US that has spanned over three decades. The importance of academic inquiry into this area is crucial. While there have been changes in the recording and collating of campus crime statistics, there does seem to have been an increase in campus crime over the latter part of the last century. This is given credence by Lunden's (1983) report of a study that details an 89% increase in crimes reported on campus between 1971 and 1980, which tallies with the political unrest described above. More recent figures claim that nearly 40% of students have experienced a crime in the previous six months." (Fisher *et al.* 1995) What perhaps differentiates the US to the UK is their political, cultural and social heritage. In particular their legislation on gun ownership creates a different backdrop for societal violence, with a recent study estimating that nearly one million students carried a weapon to university (Summers and Hoffman 1998, p.43). This creates a different background within which to carry out research.
because it is illegal to carry such a weapon in the UK. Certainly, crime prevention efforts and campus safety programs appear well co-ordinated and prioritised in the US, with universities having designated campus police and well integrated safety measures such as Buddy Schemes and Blue Lights that link students on campus to security personnel.

However, it is important to look at the issue of campus crime in context. The mass media is often accused of over dramatising campus crime; Spitzberg and Thorndike (1992, p.93) suggest that “alarmist headlines, justified outrage, overgeneralizations, and grossly incomplete data combine to cloud observers' views. As yet no one has succeeded in presenting an adequate and accurate picture of the reality of campus crime.” While the media typically focuses on the more high profile and violent crimes, it is important to consider that other crimes can be just as distressing for students on university campuses. Palmer (1996, p.268) observed that “hatred and intolerance expressed in graffiti, vandalism of personal or institutional property, anonymous telephone calls that are obscene or threatening, and other non-violent incidents may jeopardise a student's sense of safety and security and may adversely affect his or her emotional health, academic performance, and retention in college.” This is a revealing comment because it suggests that other, more subtle forms of harm can be detrimental to students and this ties in to the Delphi study which stipulates that personal safety is not just about crime but about other, perhaps more subtle but just as damaging, forms of intentionally motivated harm.

A recent survey by the Home Office attempted to quantify the incidences of student victimisation in the UK and indicated that 1/3 of students had been victimised, the majority of which had experienced theft (Barberet et al. 2003). Barberet et al. (2004) provide a detailed follow-on report to the study and found support that burglary and theft were the most common crimes committed against students. A recent conference run by the Home Office in 2003 into student safety also drew attention to the issue. Most universities in the UK are beginning to address the issue, with common-sense personal safety advice to students posted on websites. However, the need for further systematic research into campus safety in the UK is urgently needed to underpin appropriate preventative strategies and personal safety guidance.
5.5 LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

In the US, and to a lesser extent the UK, there has been an increased emphasis on universities having campus security and crime prevention strategies aimed at protecting staff and students. This is in response to a desirable need to establish what Nichols (1987, p.12) calls "a safe environment conducive to the pursuit of educational goals." Universities have a responsibility to maximise campus-user safety and it is important to explore the legal context of the demands placed on them. Fossey and Smith (1996) believe that one of the main reasons for the emphasis on campus security in the US is the increase in the number of students taking universities to civil court in pursuit of financial damages when they experience crime or victimisation. This is related to the introduction in the 1990s of legislation which required universities to record all campus crime and place it in the public domain. The murder of a student, Jeanne Clery, at LeHigh University in Pennsylvania in 1986, promoted her parents to campaign successfully for a change in legislation when they learned that only 4 percent of higher education institutions were reporting campus crime (Nicolletti et al. 2001). Their campaigning led to the introduction of the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act 1990, which required universities to collate and make public their campus crime statistics. A key purpose of this was that it allowed prospective students to obtain a transparent picture of the colleges and universities that they hoped to attend and make their choices accordingly.

According to Fossey and Smith (1996) the introduction of the Act also placed a legal responsibility on universities to protect their students and staff from crime, with a crucial emphasis on the 'forseeability' of crimes occurring. This is manifested as a 'duty to warn' principle (Smith and Smith 1993). In other words, if the HEI failed to respond to evidence of crime on their campus then they could be held legally accountable and pursued for damages (Smith 1989; Steiner 1989).

While there is a viable argument against the use of crime statistics in campus research, to which I have drawn attention in Chapter 2 (and will discuss later on in this chapter), it is entirely logical to suppose that placing campus crime data in the public domain will allow prospective students to make an informed choice of where they wish to study. This is particularly relevant if safety is a key concern on a prospective student's list of requirements. Seng and Koehler (1993), however, argue that the legislation does not achieve its primary purpose of informing potential students because, viewed in isolation, such statistics can be misleading. Another related issue is that in the US there is some concern about whether the issue of
Over the last five years the issue of student safety has moved up the agenda in the UK. Examples of this include the Home Office's conference in 2003 and reports by Barberet et al. (2003, 2004), Campbell and Bryceland (1998) and individual university research such as that at Roehampton (Hammond 2003). While the UK does not have the same pressures on reporting campus crime, universities in this country are increasingly taking the issue of campus safety seriously. It is thus extremely prescient that personal safety on university campuses in the UK is explored because it is not, as yet, in direct response to litigious claims and is driven ostensibly out of moral responsibility. Fossey and Smith (1996, p.1) were particularly prophetic when they observed that the financial implications of HE now place students in the role of 'clients' who pay for their education and consequently expect excellent services. This is crucial because it changes the dynamics between students and their institution and the staff who teach them; something which is evidently becoming an important issue in the UK as students increasingly have to pay for the cost of their own education. This was summed up in a recent edition of The Times Higher Education Supplement in the UK. Lipsett (2005, p.1) paraphrased Sir Howard Newby, chief executive of the Higher Education Funding Council for England, and claimed that universities "would be forced to treat students as customers and do much more to meet their demands." The crux of the issue is that students expect a better educational 'product' because they are now burdened with the financial cost of it; in previous times students received these 'goods' for free (in the times of the maintenance grant) so there was less likelihood of students questioning the quality of their education. It stands to reason that as 'clients' students will demand not only high quality teaching and facilities, but also a safe environment.

5.6 PREVIOUS RESEARCH INVESTIGATING CAMPUS CRIME AND STUDENT VICTIMISATION

A considerable research tradition exists in the US dating back nearly 40 years, and the introduction of the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act 1990 led to a tangible increase in research which can be attributed to not only an increased need for research but also the availability of crime data in the public sphere (Janosik 1999). The literature can be divided into two discernable themes according to whether it
Chapter 5: A critical review and discussion of the campus crime and student victimisation literature explores the extent or cause of campus crime (Sloan and Fisher 1995). I will review the literature first according to its different data collection methods, followed by an exploration of the different potential causes of campus crime.

5.6.1 Approaches to data collection
The predominant approaches to data collection in the available literature use quantitative methodologies. The empirical studies to date typically use either crime statistics or victimisation surveys to ascertain the extent, nature and causal models of campus crime and student victimisation and this implies an almost manifest unease towards using alternative qualitative approaches. There are some exceptions in the literature which I shall explore later in this chapter. What is clear is that although the studies have undoubtedly drawn much needed attention to the issue of student victimisation and generated interesting findings and debate, they do lack the depth and meaning that qualitative approaches can provide. I will now explore the different approaches to data collection used in the studies to date.

5.6.1.1 Crime statistics
Many researchers have attempted to explore the extent of campus crime in the US using official crime data. These typically are drawn from national databases such as the FBI Uniform Crime Report, one of the primary official data sources in the US (Bromley and Territo 1990, p.4). The basis for the body of research was that an analysis of official crime statistics would provide an insight into the extent of campus crime and whether specific features of a campus and its student body led to increased crime risk. Henson and Stone (1999) usefully broach the issue of the efficacy of using official crime statistics in accurately portraying the true extent of crime on campus. This is echoed by Griffaton (1993, p.577), who asserts that “the use of campus crime statistics ..... is replete with opportunities for misconstruction, misinterpretation, and misrepresentation.” Understanding crime by using recorded crime data is questionable because such data can never fully capture the true extent of crime; this issue has been addressed in some detail in Chapter 2. This can be due to problems or underreporting: Henson and Stone (1999) found that many students chose not to report crimes committed against them, while Barberet et al. (2004, p.21), attempting to quantify this trend, found that, disconcertingly, 58% of on-campus incidents went unreported; a startlingly high number. This is worrying on a number of levels; not only can it mean that official statistics do not fully represent reality, but it can also mean that students are not given adequate support when crimes occur
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because it is not brought to the attention of campus officials and dealt with appropriately.

In a campus context however, the major criticism aimed at studies which rely on such quantitative data is that the results create an unrepresentative depiction of campus crime. Spitzberg and Thorndike (1992, p.94) believe that “because of the unreliability of most crime data on campus, the opportunity for misinterpretation is ubiquitous." Campus crime data can be unreliable because some incidents can be omitted, crime data can be misinterpreted (Barberet et al. 2003) and many HEIs withhold crime statistics to convey an image that they are safer than they really are (Hunnicutt and Kushibab 1998). Under-reporting can also be a problem; “teenagers are the least likely of any age category to report victimisation." (Cockey et al. 1989, p.20). Recorded crime data is also rife with other problems, in particular related to terminology and its restrictive parameters. Terminology is a problem when accounting for certain crimes; theft, for example can be omitted in campus crime data which is particularly ironic considering that this is the most prevalent form of campus crime (Cockey et al. 1989). Campus crime statistics often only refer to those crimes which occur on campus; this is a problem when the boundaries of the campus are ill-defined, but also can be an issue because off-campus student victimisation is not included, perpetuating the detrimental implication that student safety stops at the boundary of the campus (Seng 1995). Furthermore, official crime statistics can prove misleading when used to compare crime rates in different universities because of differences between institutions and their unique characteristics: “high numbers may not mean that a campus is less safe than others." (Fact File 1998, p.A51). Using such data to make comparisons of safety between universities can be inappropriate because crime statistics do not account for the unique characteristics or social context of university campuses; for example a university with a high crime rate may be so because of its geographical location, yet it may be reasonably safe if it has extensive crime prevention strategies.

However, beyond this criticism, the use of crime statistics can be further denigrated for failing to reveal anything about what causes campus crime. Indeed, Sloan and Fisher (1995) argue that such descriptive studies do not provide insight into the key contributory determinants at work which result in crime on campus. In particular, as mentioned in Chapter 2, using official statistics as indicators of crime risk do not give much insight into the contextual details of the campus that may reveal much about why students experience crime and fear.
5.6.1.2 Surveys

In response to the obvious weaknesses of crime data many researchers turned to crime and victimisation surveys in order to obtain more insight into crime and its causes. Henson and Stone (1999, p.304) found that “the reliance of most previous studies on official data, which reflect only those crimes reported to the police, resulted in the creation of a distorted picture of campus crime.” In response some researchers wanted to explore the possible dynamics leading to campus crime and focussed on the why campus users, in particular students, have specific fear and victimisation risks. Research thus turned to victimisation surveys which sought to measure crime and fear of crime based on people’s responses. However although such methods allow for more meaning to be revealed than abstract crime statistics they are still encumbered with problems. The most obvious of these, briefly addressed in Chapter 2, is that they fail to portray the complex motivations and comprehensive meaning behind such perceptions.

Peoples' fear of crime is constructed from a variety of different sources and when responses are reduced to numerical data the reasoning behind such fears are dramatically over-simplified. As Pain (2000, p.368) observed, "'quick-tick' surveys are used inappropriately to quantify human behaviour, given the psychosocial complexities of experiencing and fearing crime." Seeking students' perceptions of safety using quantifiable attitude responses arguably provides an inadequate and superficial understanding of safety concerns. An example of such research is that of Rengert et al. (2001) who attempted to combat the problem of under-reporting of crimes by carrying out campus victimisation surveys. This did allow insights into fear of crime on campus, but because perceptions were over-simplified they lacked substance or depth. It is therefore arguable whether objective approaches provide a fully representative portrait of victimisation, its causes and effects and accurate insights into possible focal points for campus improvements.

5.6.2 Explanations for campus crime

The literature suggests that there are a number of possible correlates of campus crime. Much of these relate to criminological theory, in particular routine activity and lifestyle theories. The routine activities argument for crime as discussed in Chapter 2 (Cohen and Felson 1979; Felson 1986) is a theoretical framework which proposes that crime is the product of the convergence of three elements: motivated offenders,
suitable targets and the absence of a capable guardian. This theory has been used to explain student victimisation in many studies, with the everyday activities of the campus community having a strong influence on the risk of victimisation and the likelihood of experiencing fear of crime. This can be explained by the fact that college campuses and the student body typify these three parameters to a high degree. Students typically have a high number of desirable belongings such as computers, music systems and mobile phones (the attractive target), they can be lax about security measures, such as locking their doors (less guardianship), and they often live in densely populated, open access environments such as halls of residents or student communities (motivated offenders) (Fisher 1997). This view is supported by Henson and Stone (1999), Fisher and Wilkes (2003), Barberet et al. (2004) and Fisher et al. (1998). Student wealth was also found to relate to the prevalence of campus victimisation (Volkwein et al. 1995; Fernandez and Lizotte 1995), which is ostensibly linked to an increase in attractive possessions or 'targets', especially today when students are likely to possess a raft of high-technology possessions such as iPods, personal computers and DVD recorders.

However, while the most obvious victims of campus crime are students, and the majority of campus research has focused on their victimisation, staff are also at risk of victimisation on campus. This is recognised by Sloan (1994), Wooldredge et al. (1995) and Sloan and Fisher (1995). Fisher (1997) claims that staff can be vulnerable to crime because they often work alone and they can have valuable possessions, or have access to rooms with desirable equipment in. Interestingly, Fisher (1997, p.108) is one of the few authors to draw attention to the issue of visitors to campuses, and highlights their vulnerability to experiencing campus crime; she claims that "no known studies have examined crimes committed against visitors on campus." This highlights the need for campus safety research to consider all campus users in order to arrive at a comprehensive appraisal of campus safety.

Routine activity theory relates to the causes of crime identified in many of the empirical studies. It is entirely logical to take the lead from the criminological literature since the findings of the Delphi study presented in Chapter 4 demonstrated that there are indeed commonalities between crime and personal safety and this provides some insight into how campus safety can be promoted. For example, targeting the 'guardianship' aspect of the theory, for example, by increasing security measures on campus, may lead to a reduction in crime. Methodological criticisms aside, the following insights about the causes of campus crime have been presented:
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5.6.2.1 Demographic characteristics

Demographic characteristics can increase the likelihood of students being victims of campus crime. Students are a high risk-group, more at risk of experiencing crime than members of the general population. For example, a recent Home Office study by Barberet et al. (2004) found that one in three students had been victimised in the previous year. This is compared to a one in four risk of victimisation in the general population (Clegg et al. 2005). In the US, Smith and Fossey (1995, p.11) claim that "older juveniles and young adults also were disproportionately likely to be victims of crime." This is supported by several research studies which have explored the prevalence and nature of victimisation risk to students. The majority of students are 18-24 and this age group experiences the highest rate of violent crime compared to other age groups in both the UK and the US (Gottfredson 1984; Fisher 1997; Fisher and Wilkes 2003; Barberet et al. 2004).

5.6.2.2 Residential population

McPheters (1978) is one such example of research that identified a positive correlation between a high level of resident students and crime. His analysis is recognised as an influential study into crime on college and university campuses because it "was the catalyst for the proliferation of research on campus crime that has been conducted since the publication of the study." (Henson and Stone 1999) He found that the proportion of students living in dormitories increased the extent of victimisation. This is related to routine activity theory because an increase in resident students increases the number of available targets on campus. Fernandez and Lizotte (1995) and Volkwein et al. (1995) similarly found that the percentage of students living on campus was correlated with campus property crime.

5.6.2.3 Campus density

Crime was found to increase with density because the more buildings there are in a given space creates anonymity and increases the availability of targets in a compact geographical area. Fox and Hellman (1985) discovered that crime increases with density. Moriarty and Pelfrey (1996) support this view, claiming that campus crime is influenced by the number of buildings on campus and the size of the campus. This was further endorsed by Fox and Hellman (1985) and Fisher (1997). Again this could
be related to routine activity theory because the higher the density of campus buildings the more attractive targets there are and the potential for less guardianship. Pertinently, Fox and Hellman (1985) drew attention to the influence of internal campus features in shaping campus crime, such as the social environment of the campus; this was important because it raised the issue that campus crime may often come from within, rather than solely blaming off-campus causes in the surrounding community.

5.6.2.4 Campus location

McPheters (1978) found that the proximity to urban areas with high unemployment seemed to influence crime on campus. He suggests that off-campus influences, such as the socio-economic conditions in the adjacent neighbourhood, can shape crime prevalence. Fox and Hellman's (1985) in contrast found that the location of a college campus had no significant effect on the campus crime rate. Volkwein et al. (1995) and Boyer (1992) found that campuses were much safer than the communities to which they were adjoined. Fernandez and Lizotte (1995, p.89) explored the role of the community in shaping campus crime and found that “community crime rates have no statistically significant influence on campus rape, assault, burglary and larceny rates but they did influence robbery and motor vehicle theft rates.” They found that in comparison to the small influence of community characteristics, campus characteristics had a much greater effect on campus crime rates. This is supported by Bromley (1995a) and Henson and Stone (1999). Barberet et al. (2004) found that most (80%) student victimisation occurred off campus. Sigler and Koehler (1993) found that 86% of students were more likely to be victimised off campus than on campus, which has implications for targeted crime prevention efforts and is pertinent considering the legal requirements on HEIs and the ill-defined notion of foreseeability of crime off campus.

5.6.2.5 Physical characteristics

Research has shown that risk of crime and fear of crime on university campuses can be exacerbated by different features of the physical environment. Indeed, this is one of the most compelling arguments for crime and fear risk on university campuses. According to Hoffman et al. (1998) some of the most effective ways of promoting safety on campus have been through the design and maintenance of campus facilities. This implies that if an environment is more conducive to criminality then it
has a correlating impact on its safety and crime risk; therefore the design and management of the environment can be altered to reduce the propensity for criminality. Perhaps the most significant factor is the open-access nature of campuses. Schuh (1998) explains how campuses can be vulnerable by the open-accessibility of the campus, because there is no way of knowing exactly who is on campus. According to Edwards (2000, p.69) the key to effective crime elimination is "via a combination of design strategies and management policies." He also supports the use of CPTED principles, such as spaces which foster territoriality and natural surveillance, which were broached briefly in Chapter 2. It therefore seems logical that changes to the physical environment may reduce fear and crime on campus and instead promote positive senses of personal safety.

Other points of interest in the literature were that the majority of campus crime is theft (Sloan 1994; Bromley 1995b; Fisher et al. 1998; Henson and Stone 1999; Fisher and Wilkes 2003) and that, contrary to what may be traditionally expected, offenders who cause campus crime are often students themselves (Fox and Hellman 1985; Moriarty and Pelfrey 1996; Fisher et al. 1997; Henson and Stone 1999). Finally alcohol and drugs had a strong association with campus crime and the reporting rate of offences (Sloan 1994; Ruback, et al. 1999).

5.6.2.6 A multi-dimensional problem?

Having reviewed the different explanations for campus crime it seems probable that there may not be a singular explanation for campus crime and it is likely that all of the above factors converge and inter-relate in a complex way to create a unique dynamic for increased victimisation on university campuses. This is supported by Rengert et al. (2001); Barberet et al. (2004) and Fisher (1997, p.110), who claims that:

"The research on campus crime, victimisation and fear suggest that campus crime rates and victimisation on campus are influenced by the demographic and social characteristics of community members and the physical characteristics of the environment."

Interestingly, however the three key characteristics she mentions can be traced directly on to the personal safety triangle, presented in Chapters 3 and 4. The studies discussed so far have provided only one aspect of the campus crime debate. While they suggest possible causal explanations of crime, they lack an exploration of
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how campus users perceive their risk and fear of crime in relation to the university campus. This issue will now be explored.

5.6.3 Fear of crime on campus

Campus crime statistics provide no explanation for fear of crime which occurs on campus. Therefore, an important development was researchers addressing the importance of fear of crime on university campuses. Robinson and Mullen (2001, p.33), claim that “fear of crime and perception of crime risk can be as debilitating as criminal victimisation.” Dahlem (1996, p.3) asks: “is campus crime a real problem, or only a perceived one?...The mere perception of crime risk is as important as the reality.” Again, this suggests that it is not only actual crime or victimisation that can be damaging to the individual and concerted efforts should be directed at how campus users feel about crime and safety in their university environment. The literature suggests that fear of crime on campuses is a real problem and is prevalent in both the UK and the US. The 2004 University Lifestyle Survey (2004) carried out by Sodexho and the Times Higher Education Supplement found that less than 40% of those surveyed felt constantly secure around their university at night, while Fazacherley (2004) found that in the UK “3 in 4 women feel unsafe on campus.” In the US, Smith and Fossey (1995) found that 38% of students reported worrying about crime on or near their campus. A recent study by Roehampton University (Hammond 2003) found that 69% of survey respondents worried about their personal safety.

As discussed in Chapter 2 the effects of crime and victimisation can be extremely damaging. This is particularly heightened in a university environment because, as Trevino et al. (1998) explain, students can be under substantial pressure and stress during their university tenure, experiencing high academic expectations and peer pressures to name but a few. It is reasonable to suggest that concentrated efforts to explore fear of crime and identify constructive and targeted ways of reducing it are vital concerns. As discussed in Chapter 2, part of how individuals construct a sense of safety is dependent on visual cues from their immediate environment. Evidence of deprivation or neglected environments can increase fears (Wilson and Kelling 1982; Skogan 1990). These are significant issues when placed in the context of a study reported by Gaines (1991) in which it was found that 60% of students applying to university claimed that the visual environment of the campus was the most important factor in choosing a college. Of course such perceptions can be shaped by other factors such as personal experiences or hyperbolic story-telling but what is clear is
that the visual appearance of the campus is important in not only creating a good
impression of a university but also in significantly shaping feelings of personal safety
and consequently the overall well-being of campus users; something all universities
should seek to promote.

Kirk (1988) sought to determine what campus characteristics, in particular design
features, contributed to perceptions of safety. Students identified poor lighting and
places where people could hide, such as areas with high vegetation, as the most
important factors in creating a perceived sense of danger. Heavily used areas were
perceived as the safest.

JL Nasar and BS Fisher carried out seminal work in the early nineties to explore how
physical features of a campus environment can influence feelings of fear. They
explored how features of, firstly, a new building at Ohio State University, and
secondly, the wider campus at Ohio, impacted on feelings of fear and site usage.
Their work highlighted the importance of the proximate environment in how space
users constructed their feelings based on physical and social cues from the
immediate environment. In particular, they identified three features of a campus
environment which increased feelings of fear; prospect, refuge and escape (Fisher
and Fisher and Nasar 1995). 'Prospect' refers to visibility over ones area, 'refuge' to
potential offender hiding places and 'escape' to means of fleeing a potential attack.
These tie in with the discussion in Chapter 2 of identifying opportunities that the
physical environment can provide for crimes to occur. The features that are
mentioned above can be altered so as to constructively reduce crime and fear by
removing opportunities which potential offenders may seek out. Examples of campus
environments that illustrate these features include areas with high vegetation (refuge
or concealment for offenders), badly lit areas (limited prospect), and lack of escape
(alleyways). What their work illustrated is that the physical design and management
of a university and its facilities had the potential to impinge significantly on student's
perceptions of safety, affecting their behaviour and their ability to fully utilise
university facilities in an inclusive manner.

Brantingham et al. (1995) also argue that characteristics of the campus environment
generate high levels of fear. They identified some clear 'fear cues', including lack of
people, isolation, darkness, fear of the unknown, unusual behaviour, noises in
isolated areas and a lack of control over an area. Robinson and Mullen (2001) found
that feelings of fear correlated with isolated areas such as parking lots and tunnels and areas which were not very well lit. Sloan et al. (1996) meanwhile contend that fear of crime on campuses can be exacerbated by many of the university campus's defining features: they are often open spaces with limited access control.

What seems evident is that fear of crime can restrict use of a campus environment to the detriment of a full university experience. Cooper Marcus and Wischemann (1990) found that limits on the use of campus outdoor spaces were a key corollary of fear of crime. In light of these claims, attention should be focused on how best to reduce fears. Given their claim that the physical environment shaped feelings of fear and safety on campus, Fisher and Nasar (1992, p.63) claim that "the whole physical environment on campuses can be designed and maintained to reduce fear and opportunities for crime." This provides a strong basis for the development of a campus methodology which seeks to improve campus safety by focusing on the physical environment.

5.7 CRITICISMS OF EXISTING LITERATURE

Explorations of the extent and causes of fear of crime on campuses have been addressed in this literature review. However, with a few exceptions, most have relied on quantitative methodologies. These, as has been argued earlier in this chapter, provide only a limited understanding of the meaning and context of why campuses can cultivate fears. Qualitative research is lacking and this is unfortunate because studies of this nature would provide a more meaningful exploration of users' concerns on campus that would lead to realistic and relevant modifications to a campus to reduce users' fears and concerns.

The main criticism levied at the research into campus crime and student victimisation is not aimed at the theoretical frameworks that underpin the studies, but instead at the typically quantitative methodologies used. The majority of studies use recorded crime statistics or victimisation surveys and such methods raise important questions about the accuracy of such data in reflecting reality and their validity and appropriateness for developing corresponding crime and fear reducing efforts. This is supported by Tulloch et al. (1997) in their critique of the typically quantitative nature of research into crime and fear of crime generally. Official crime statistics and victimisation surveys alone arguably do not provide a representative portrait of
campus victimisation and its causes and effects and could also lead to misleading focal points for campus improvements.

The exceptions that were found in the literature were studies by Nasar and Fisher (1992, 1993), Day (1995) and Jackson and Heckman (2002). Nasar and Fisher (1992, 1993) used more imaginative and useful methods than other campus studies—they used open-ended questions to identify users' concerns on campus, as well as observations of student behaviour around the site and environmental assessment surveys to grade features of the physical environment according to whether it exhibited any of the fear-inducing characteristics discussed earlier. This is commendable because it was much more probing, in-depth and allowed for the meaning behind behaviours to be explored and understood in a way that crime statistics and victimisation surveys alone could not. Day (1995) conducted open-ended interviews with staff and students to explore perceptions of sexual assault and personal crime prevention strategies on campus. Interestingly, they also took photos of campus locations to explore perceptions. Jackson and Heckman (2002) meanwhile adopted a qualitative research approach in exploring the perceptual responses of white students to racial material. Although the focus of the research was very specific it is refreshing to find campus safety research embracing qualitative research methods. The authors carried out two focus groups and sought to garner in-depth information on how a small group of students felt about the research topic. All studies provide a refreshing and more illuminating insight into the subjects under study than quantitative method could achieve.

In light of these criticisms, it is evident that a more qualitative approach to researching personal safety on university campuses promised to elicit more profound and clearer insights into the complex relationship between people, personal safety and the campus environment and to identify ways of constructively reducing fear on campuses, particularly as they pertain to physical and social minutiae.

5.8 APPROACHES TO CAMPUS CRIME PREVENTION

Having explored the extent, nature and possible causes of campus crime and fear of crime, the next issue is the appropriate means to address the problems. As the literature is highlighted, this is no easy solution because so many complex and interwoven factors create crime and fear on campus. However, if we take the key themes that emerged from the literature and highlight further studies than we can
arrive at some broad themes for how best campus crime and safety should be addressed. Possible solutions to reduce campus crime fall into four broad categories:

5.8.1 Crime prevention information and programs

These include the requirement for new students to attend a crime prevention seminar, distributing leaflets detailing safety issues, using the internet to raise awareness of campus safety, campus escort services, night-buses and campus crime-watch programs. Barberet et al. (2003) found that only 18% of students surveyed had attended a crime prevention seminar. Although this is not necessarily the best or only way to get safety awareness across to students, a cohesive and responsive safety awareness system should be in place. The Home Office Development and Practice report Crime against Students (2004) recommend publicity campaigns to raise awareness, a campus-watch scheme, police HE liaison officers and preferred route schemes. Lenski et al. (1996, p.91) warns, however, that "safety education programs should include efforts to allay misperceptions about the hassle of taking safety precautions." This is an important consideration when designing appropriate awareness-raising strategies so as not to patronise students, especially since younger people are more inclined than older people to partake in risky activities. This is a view echoed by Bromley and Territo (1990) who recommend crime awareness programs which students themselves are involved in; this engages students in an appropriate manner, encourages them to take responsibility for campus safety and has the benefit of fostering a sense of community on campus. Although there is no such data in the UK it is interesting to note that 48% of US HEIs surveyed had night time escort services, and 45% had emergency telephones on campus (Lewis and Farris 1997). Richmond (1990) argues that university officials should effectively review their safety and security programs not only to better protect students but also to reduce the likelihood of being held institutionally liable and taken to court. This suggests that US universities are motivated to increase campus safety not just out of moral responsibility but out of concern for being sued. Richards (1996, p.46) claims that security measures such as education and training decreases the opportunities for "bodily harm, psychological intimidation and fear." Again, this is in keeping with the definition of personal safety from the Delphi study presented in Chapter 4 and is one way of reducing crime and fear on campus.
5.8.2 Alterations to the physical environment

These include ways of modifying the campus environment to reduce opportunities for victimisation and fear of crime. Molumbry (1976) explored how the physical environment on campuses, in particular, halls of residence, could be modified to reduce the incidence of crime. This has been supported more recently by Fox and Hellman (1985), Nasar et al. (1993), Fisher et al. (1997) and Deisinger et al. (1998). Strategies such as cutting down trees, monitoring lighting levels, controlling access to buildings and emergency communication systems were suggestions put forward by Nicoletti et al. (2001) to increase safety on campus. Crucially, Campbell and Bryceland (1998) found that physical characteristics of the campus were rated the most important influence on personal safety; with a particular emphasis on the open access issue. Fisher (1997) describes how principles of CPTED can be applied to the university campus to promote safety and reduce crime; these include securing buildings, limiting campus accessibility and promoting natural surveillance. Richards (1996) advocates the use of CCTV and access control to minimise the intrusion of potential offenders on campus. Other approaches include improved street lighting and campus-watch style groups (Rengert et al. 2001; Hummer 2004).

5.8.3 Effective campus security policies

Universities also need to have clear, effective and robust security policies to deal with events if and when they arise. This also sends out a clear message that the university takes the issue seriously. Barberet et al. (2003) found that there was a lack of standardisation of systems for collecting crime statistics and widely divergent approaches to crime prevention awareness in UK universities. The HeFCE report Management of Security Services in Higher Education (2002) recommends developing a security strategy that encompasses some key features, including risk assessments and co-operation and communication between departments. Another issue, specifically to the UK, is that there is no obligation for universities to systematically collate crime data. Both Barberet et al. (2003) and Campbell and Bryceland (1998) recommend that doing this will allow universities to gain a clearer insight into crime on their campus and to develop appropriate and effective safety strategies, regardless of legal requirements. McCreedy and Dennis (1996, p.78) argue that administrative policies and procedures targeted at crime prevention will help to “create the perception, and the reality, that college and university campuses
are safe environments for learning." Clearly, the university should ensure that the issue is taken seriously rather than token gestures to appease lobbyists.

5.8.4 A well structured and effective security patrol

An effective security patrol is important in creating a positive sense of personal safety for campus users and in portraying a message that the university takes security seriously. The tradition in America is that of community policing (Lanier, 1995). In the US security personnel can be authoritative figures on campus, comprising police officers with or without the ability to arrest. In the UK security personnel have no police-like powers and may be university employed or contracted out. However, extensive research supports the effective use of security to promote safety and reduce crime on campus (Powell 1971; Gelber 1972; Nichols 1987; Peak 1995; Gomme and Micucci 1997; Nicolletti et al. 2001). There is currently an emphasis on an integrated security approach, which fosters a better relationship with campus users and provides security personnel with a clearer insight into the specific campus safety issues on their campus. The HeFCE Report *Management of Security Services in Higher Education* (2002, p.3) claimed that "good security services not only help to prevent crime, but they also contribute to a positive image of the institution by creating a safe and welcoming environment for students, staff, business and community partners, and visitors." The role of an effective security team should not, therefore, be underestimated.

5.9 IMPLICATIONS FOR MY STUDY

What seems clear is that because the dynamics of crime and fear are complex, a multi-pronged effort that involves all of the approaches will best improve campus safety. Dahlem (1996) claims that one of the key impediments to effective crime prevention on university campuses is basing interventions and policies on inaccurate appraisals of crime and safety concerns. This is crucial; in order to develop effective personal safety strategies it is necessary to comprehend the extent and nature of the problem in an appropriate and robust way. Although the literature I have presented here mainly address the issues of crime and fear of crime, rather than personal safety *per se*, it provides a solid grounding into the study area because the relationship between personal safety and crime appears to be closely correlated. The literature shows support for the Delphi framework of personal safety and certain underlying elements of effective design and management should be addressed in any attempts
5.9.1 Qualitative research will provide a more detailed understanding of personal safety on campus that crime statistics

Eschewing the typically quantitative research approaches of the past and instead favouring a more subjective, experiential and perceptual approach is exciting and revealing. Roark (1987, p.368) argues that crime prevention efforts must be "built on an understanding of the issues involved and on an understanding of the population at risk." Therefore knowledge about how campus users perceive the campus environment is a pre-requisite for designing appropriate personal safety strategies. The methodology focused on exploring the subjective perspective of campus users perceived risks rather than a purely statistical approach to actual personal safety. This approach revealed more about the environmental contexts of personal safety which are characteristics that are amenable to alteration.

5.9.2 Perceptions are very important in shaping feelings of safety

By exploring perceptions of personal safety in a qualitative way, considerably more meaning and depth could be attributed to users' responses and the reasons behind their views on the relative safety of the campus. This allowed possible improvements to the campus to be grounded in meaningful and profound insights of how users experience the campus day-to-day. Barberet et al. (2004) argue that analysis of the subjective dimension of campus crime, risk and fear, will supplement the existing literature on statistical risk and causal determinants of crime. This is crucial as it recognises that human contextual responses on fears and concerns cannot be explained by statistical crime data. What seems clear is that perceptions of personal safety on university campus result from a set of complex dynamics and qualitative approaches offer a more profound opportunity for ascertaining these than quantified responses could attain.

5.9.3 The visual impression of a university is very significant to student choices and feelings of safety

By probing perceptions of campus users, characteristic features of the campus environment that promulgated feelings of fear could be clearly identified, proceeded
by the development of possible modifications to the campus to improve feelings of personal safety. Nasar et al. (1993) observed that individuals scan their environment for visual signals to reduce their uncertainty when they felt concerned for their safety. Thus it seems that exploring how campus users visually decode the campus environment will provide a forum for real insight. This is related to environmental perception studies that explore how people interpret the visual environment and helped to shape the campus methodology.

5.9.4 It is important to consider the experiences of a variety of campus users, and not just students

This was considered important because, although students comprise the majority proportion of campus users' and are indeed at higher risk of experiencing personal safety concerns than older age groups, it was considered that a thorough examination of campus safety should take into account the range of different campus users, including staff and visitors. Wooldredge et al. (1995) argued that the picture of campus crime was incomplete if faculty (or staff) victimisations are not examined. This is salient because the majority of the campus research focuses on student victimisation, while no known studies have explored the perceptions experienced by visitors to campuses.

5.9.5 The role and design of the physical environment in student victimisation and campus safety will be a key focus of the research

This has been presented and argued for in this chapter and constitutes a major aspect of my research design. Nasar and Fisher (1993) highlight the importance of looking at fears and concerns as they relate to specific features of the physical, built and natural, environment. Nasar and Fisher (1993, p.190) assert that "the physical cues are important because they tend to have more permanence than the social cues....They are site-specific and can be controlled through the planning process." This related not only to the Delphi study but also to more practical considerations; universities have much more control over the physical campus environment than the social environment or the characters of people who use it. This allows universities to take control of the issue and develop appropriate interventions.

These issues taken together provided an original and exciting direction for my fieldwork and led to recommendations for practical action based on campus users' needs rather than statistical data which is far removed from campus users'
interpretations of the campus and provides only a limited scope for understanding contextual correlates of fear. A true understanding of campuses' social and physical characteristics and their impact on personal safety is vital for developing effective crime prevention and safety promotion strategies.

5.10 SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a social, political and historical perspective of campus crime and victimisation to help understand the problems that campuses now face and how the role and nature of universities and the student body have dramatically shifted over the last century. This is further demonstrated by the exploration of the legal context and the extent and causes of crime and victimisation on campus. It seems reasonable to make analogies between crime and personal safety based on the insight highlighted in preceding chapters. While the theoretical frameworks for why crime and fears exist are not in question, the methods for empirical data collection are. I have argued strongly against the use of crime statistics and surveys alone to provide a realistic and adequate portrayal of campus crime and instead have suggested that it is time for a new approach to explore campus safety. This has been recognised to some extent in criminological research but there is little evidence of meaningful qualitative research in campus safety research. It is for this reason, fortified by the findings of the Delphi study, that my exploration of campus safety instead favoured an interpretative and more detailed approach to data collection which provided more insight into the safety issues facing campus users. Furthermore, a study of personal safety on university campuses that adopted a perceptual approach to the exploration of the design of the physical environment is supported by the Delphi study and the research presented here. It was also anticipated that my research would go some way to addressing the hiatus in the quantity of research studies into student and campus safety in the UK.
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6.0 INTRODUCTION

Following on from the research objectives presented in Chapter 1, the personal safety literature review in Chapter 2, the resultant findings about the nature of personal safety from the Delphi studies discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 and the campus crime literature review in Chapter 5, this chapter attempts to draw the salient issues together into a cohesive manner in order to inform and develop an appropriate methodology for the campus study and to identify the most appropriate techniques for carrying out an audit of personal safety on the university campus. This chapter discusses and critiques the range of methods available and explains the chosen methodology deemed most appropriate for the collection of data. This chapter presents the research strategy and methodology which I propose can provide the most revealing and valuable insights into the study of personal safety on university campuses and argues why certain methods are appropriate for carrying out the study. Finally, it discusses the pilot study that was undertaken to test the viability of the chosen methods and the implications and refinement this required for the main campus study.

6.1 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

The initial overall aim of this study was to conduct a review of personal safety on [Glamorgan's] campus. However, as set out in the research objectives (RO) in Section 1.5, a review of the literature led to key issues being identified which broadened the scope and depth of the study. This research therefore sought to apply this definition [of personal safety from the Delphi study] practically and conceptualise a review of personal safety on university campuses using a case study research method to probe the personal perceptions of campus users (RO4). These would also lead to recommendations of ways in which the two case study campuses can be improved to enhance users' perceptions of personal safety, and provide insights for designers, planners and architects of for the design and improvement of campuses (RO5) and consideration would also be given to ascertaining how underlying philosophical and methodological issues of a perceptual approach can be reconciled with recommendations that focus on changing the physicality of university campuses (RO6). Furthermore, the research also sought to contribute to the literature and knowledge-base of campus safety research (RO7) and to identify areas of further research which can
strengthen this body of knowledge and provide a focus for future work (RO8). Thus follows an exploration of the possible principles of research that need to be addressed in order to achieve these research objectives, reflecting on the literature reviews and Delphi study to inform the overall approach.

6.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE DELPHI STUDY

It became clear in Chapter 4 that personal safety is a multi-dimensional issue, comprising of actual risk of experiencing intentional harm and perceived risk and fear of experiencing intentional harm. Furthermore, the literature review discussed in Chapter 2 highlighted the small number of qualitative studies into this complex and personal construct, while Chapter 5 revealed that a user-led approach to campus safety research is severely lacking. Koskela and Pain (2000, p.271) argue that research has failed to do justice to the multifaceted and complex personal and social factors that shape fear of crime by its efforts and “commitment to quantifying human behaviour.” This, they suggest, is gradually being recognised as constrictive to criminological research and there is a growing awareness that fear of crime is not something which can be “easily and accurately measured by survey questions.” (Koskela and Pain 2000, p.271). It is the combination of these issues that led to the development of a research methodology that could adequately address them and as a consequence provide new insights into the phenomenon of personal safety on university campuses.

Based on the Delphi study and the literature review it seems reasonable to focus the campus research predominantly on the physical environment; one of the three key causal groups influencing personal safety. This is because the Delphi study and the literature in Chapter 2 have demonstrated that the physical environment plays a crucial role in shaping crime, fear and perceptions of safety. Of the three causal groups, it is also the easiest and most practicable to manipulate and influence; it is a lot easier, for example, to change the physical environment than the social environment. Nasar et al. (1993, p.164) posit that “knowledge of the effects of certain physical cues on fear can be used to manage surroundings to reduce fear and in so doing reduce crime.” However, social and personal determinants were not ignored.
A qualitative approach to users' perceptions of the built environment supports the views of Robinson and Mullen (2001, p.36), who contend that "alterations to the physical environment of the campus may make people feel safer and less fearful." This methodology was not looking to assess quantifiable correlates of personal safety; rather I am taken as read that the individual is complex and brings a host of interrelated personal characteristics to their senses of personal safety in any social-physical environment. Rather, I will be looking at the end result of this interaction – overall perceptions and feelings of personal safety and how it relates generally to the nature of the social and physical environment. This would build on previous research in the field by contributing a clearer appreciation of the relationship between how environments can propagate fear and concern for safety. In common with Nasar (1982, p.253), the research is underpinned by the view that "the manipulation of specified visual attributes of the building exterior can improve people's perception of the environment in terms of safety from crime." However, I will go beyond his focus on solely building appearance to encompass the wider campus environment.

6.3 IMPLICATIONS OF THE PERSONAL SAFETY AND CAMPUS CRIME AND STUDENT VICTIMISATION LITERATURE REVIEW

The available literature on campus safety demonstrated that no research studies focus specifically on personal safety on university campuses. The closest research instead centres on crime and victimisation on campus which aims to present levels of victimisation among the student population and to identify variables that correlate with victimisation risk. Perceptions are transient and dynamic and are uniquely subjective, but as discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, are strongly shaped by the particular social and physical context that we find ourselves. It follows that the collection and analysis of subjective data can provide a better catalyst from which to interpret personal safety in terms of the meanings campus users attribute to this phenomenon, with a particular emphasis on eliciting the reasons behind user perceptions. Furthermore, limited research has explored situational correlates of fear and exploited the data-rich, meaningful approaches characteristic of qualitative methods. As Clarke (1992, p.10) postulates, objective approaches to crime analysis that use aggregate crime rates are not effective in informing crime prevention strategies. Based on these issues it is reasonable to question the appropriateness of using quantitative data as the sole basis for developing strategies to promote personal safety on university campuses. Instead, a
research strategy that provides participants with the opportunity to discuss in-depth how they interpret the campus environment is the most desirable. It is therefore argued that the most effective and illuminating approach to learning about personal safety on university campuses, with the aim of developing practical solutions to make them safer, is predominantly a qualitative approach to data collection. Crucially, as Cozens et al. (2001a, 2001b) observed, a crucial direction for approaches such as CPTED, which serve to address environmental design and safety issues, is to address the perceptions of space users which can supplement objective crime data in the development of appropriate remedies.

6.4 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

My research approach adopted an interpretative research philosophy, whose aim is "to seek to understand the subjective reality and meanings of participants." (Saunders et al. 2003, p.480). This is particularly important to my research because as the Delphi study (Chapter 4) and the literature review (Chapter 5) highlighted, personal safety is very much subjectively constructed and in order to grasp how people attribute meaning to their perceptions of safety in relation to the campus environment it is vital that the views of campus users are acknowledged and addressed. This interpretative stance underpins the entire thesis with its central tenet being to explore perceptions of personal safety on university campuses. My research follows the inductive approach because of the lack of theory available in the domain of personal safety and because the Delphi study suggests that it is a highly complex issue. This is a fundamental point that has run through my thesis – the literature review demonstrated that there is no existing theory of personal safety and thus there is no literature from which to draw a hypothesis from. Although I have argued that crime and personal safety have commonalities, they are different constructs and to develop a hypothesis of personal safety loosely based on the criminological literature would be erroneous.

6.4.1 Research strategy

The principle research strategy in the campus research was a case study approach for two reasons; firstly, because this is an appropriate method for the investigative nature of my research and secondly, on a practical level, my job remit required me to carry out an
assessment of personal safety on the University of Glamorgan's campus and identify ways of making campus users feel more secure. The research strategy had to reflect the best means of extracting information about personal safety on campus and the most suitable ways of exploring the impact that the physical environment of the university campus had on personal safety. Having conceptualised personal safety in Chapter 4 as having a highly subjective dimension which is best explored by probing campus users' perceptions of personal safety, then a case study approach allows these perceptions to be explored on a practical level using appropriate research methods which are discussed below.

Yin (2003, p.2) defines a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident." The Delphi study demonstrated that this description is true of personal safety and the literature review in Chapter 5 accentuated how exploring the contextual features of a campus environment are extremely useful in reducing campus users' fears. The general description of a case study is applicable to my research. A case study provided an opportunity for seeking a more detailed understanding of how campus users interact with and interpret the campus environment. However, I deviated from Yin in that he advocates the use of specific data collection techniques: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observations, and physical artefacts (2003). An example was found in the literature of researchers who used a case study to explore the impact and consequences of a gun attack on a US campus. Asmussen and Creswell interviewed campus users to identify their responses immediately after the incident to develop key themes. They also used observations and audio-visual materials (Creswell 2003).

Case studies can be denounced for lacking external validity and reliability and for being unsystematic (Yin 2003). I would respond to these criticisms by claiming that to generalise a case study's findings would be contravening its aims of exploring the detail and the context of a social phenomenon, although the use of several case studies does provide a convincing argument for applicability of the findings to other comparable situations (Yin 2003, p.37). A case study taps into the rich detail of the phenomenon under study and by focusing on a given university much would be learnt about the nature of campus safety and how campus users decode the environment. As the literature demonstrated in Chapter 5, Fisher and Nasar (1992) and Nasar et al. (1993) highlight
the value of exploring contextual indicators of fear and how this can lead to effective, user-led practical recommendations to improve safety.

Alternative strategies to a case study would have been to conduct a grounded theory study, which would have been relevant owing to the lack of a theory into personal safety. It is concerned with the development of theory out of data and is an iterative process, whereby data collection and analysis proceed simultaneously (Glaser and Strauss 1967). However, this was rejected because grounded theory requires any preconceived ideas about the phenomenon under study to be withdrawn, which would have been difficult considering the Delphi study. Furthermore, a theory with causal conditions and consequences (Creswell 1998) was not the desired outcome because the underlying research aim was university specific which would not have lent itself to theory development or a definitive explanation of campus safety.

6.4.2 Data collection methods

This is concerned with what techniques to use to collect the data in the research study. There are two key approaches to data collection and analysis: qualitative and quantitative methods. They offer different perspectives on the phenomena under study and provide very different insights but it is important to derive the methods from the research objectives laid out in Chapter 1 and from what has emerged in the preceding chapters. I will explore the strengths and weakness of each as they relate to the study of personal safety on university campuses.

6.4.2.1 Qualitative methods

Qualitative research is, according to Punch (2005, p.3), "empirical research where the data are not in the form of numbers." This is a very simplistic definition but it highlights the fundamental difference between quantitative and qualitative research. As discussed briefly in earlier chapters, qualitative research places the emphasis on how individuals interpret the world around them. It is underpinned by the notion that people have diverse and subjective viewpoints and experiences (Bryman 2001). This view is central to my research project in that it seeks to establish how campus users construct their perceptions of personal safety on campus and provides a broader and more extensive
understanding of campus users' perspectives. Common criticisms levied at qualitative research include whether it is externally valid due to small sample sizes and the applicability to the wider population because of the inherent subjective viewpoints sought (Bryman 2001).

Qualitative data collection techniques are highly compatible with a case study because how participants interpret their reality on campus allows for a thorough exploration of the context that is characteristic of case studies. Such a research strategy goes beyond superficial data on how safe or unsafe the campus is and allows participants to explain why they exhibit certain views and how their safety concerns can be remedied by exploring important contextual features of the campus. Chapter 4 revealed that perception is predominantly an experience-based, individual construction and so it calls for subjective data to be collected. Furthermore, Chapter 5 revealed that this approach to campus safety and student victimisation has been severely neglected so this study promised to address the gap.

Focus groups were considered the most appropriate forum to stimulate a thorough discussion of campus users' perceptions of personal safety on the university campus because they provided an ideal arena to foster an unrestricted discussion of personal safety on campus. Langford and McDonagh (2003, p.2) define a focus group as a "carefully planned discussion, designed to obtain the perceptions of the group members on a defined area of interest". Such an approach encouraged the explorations of issues and perceptions which served to provide a revealing insight into personal safety on campus as participants discussed their views and thoughts on personal safety issues. Perhaps most significantly, Gibbs (1997) asserts that focus groups allow participants to choose their own descriptive categories and language to describe their perceptions of significant issues. Furthermore, focus groups are particularly useful in allowing issues to be probed in detail, which is particularly significant when unanticipated yet salient issues arise. Cozens et al. (2003a; 2003b) utilised focus groups to explore users' perceptions of railway station environments in a way that allowed for a more insightful exploration of user' concerns and their study led to the development of practical remedies to increase senses of security on the railway station network. Pain and Townshend (2002) also used focus groups to explore how different user groups perceived their personal safety in a city-centre setting. Both used photographic images to stimulate discussion.
Chapter 6: Methodology – exploring personal safety on university campuses

The main disadvantage with the focus group method is that it can be difficult to recruit participants in the first instance. Then, once a group takes place, it can be challenging to manage the discussion, particularly if participants go off on tangents; assertiveness is crucial to contain the discussion and direct it accordingly. They can also produce significant and overwhelming amounts of textual data (Bryman 2001). Furthermore, in line with general criticisms of qualitative research discussed above, Krueger (1988) indicates that focus group discussions are unique, dependent on the participants and their idiosyncrasies. However, common themes and insight can emerge from such qualitative data which can be used to "generalise to theory rather than populations." (Bryman 2001, p.283).

Alternative approaches to focus groups include individual interviews but this would not have done justice to the topic under discussion. I was interested in how a collection of campus users responded to the campus stimuli and how the group dynamics of the situation allowed a more robust discussion. It is the interaction between participants that is a crucial feature of the focus group because this communication allows them to consider their opinion against that of the other participants (Kitzinger 1994). I was also interested in allowing considerable free reign over the discussion so that the group elicited their own constructed concerns and issues which led to considerably more insight than a single interview ever could. Although it is easier to arrange and control a series of single interviews, and they are more suitable for introverted individuals than group discussions, I rejected them as a data collection method because I particularly wanted to explore how sub-groups of campus users interpreted the campus environment.

6.4.2.2 Quantitative methods

Quantitative methods deal with numerical data and serve to identify causal relationships between variables. Creswell (2003, p.154) summates quantitative methods as follows: "the reduction to a parsimonious set of variables, tightly controlled through design or statistical analysis, provides measures or observations for testing a theory. Objective data result from empirical observations and measures." It can therefore be criticised for offering an extremely narrow exploration of social phenomenon because inherent in this approach is a simplification of the complex social world. The data is used to generalise and arrive at cause-and-effect relationships. This view is particularly problematic when
the emphasis is on understanding the complex individual meanings of a given phenomenon.

Questionnaires are broadly defined as a data collection technique "in which each person is asked to respond to the same set of questions in a predetermined order". (Saunders et al. 2003, p.486). They are distributed to a desired sample of respondents who are required to answer questions regarding personal attributes, behaviours or opinions (Saunders et al. 2003). I could have conducted the whole study using questionnaires to derive predominantly statistical data from the University of Glamorgan or from a number of universities across the country, using software such as SPSS to compare features of campuses and the extent of harmful incidents on them. However, I rejected this approach because of my previous criticisms levied generally at quantitative approaches, in particular their unsuitability to exploratory research which demands less restrictive methods if truly illuminating and meaningful data is to be divulged.

However, although the dominant quantitative approaches to previous research has been criticised in this thesis, I recognised that such data should not be discounted entirely because some quantitative data would be useful in supporting and potentially complementing the qualitative findings. This was particularly important for a case study strategy, where multiple sources of data are favourable (Yin 2003). I therefore decided that distributing questionnaires would establish some statistical content with which to compare campus user's perceptions. However, its key purpose was that it provided the ideal opportunity to establish user routes around campus. This is consistent with my previous arguments against the use of quantitative or statistical methods to campus crime and safety research because my study sought to provide a balance of the two approaches.

6.4.3 Environmental perception and visual stimuli

Having established that a case study strategy would be used, with focus groups as the primary data collection technique, consideration also had to be given to the most suitable way of stimulating discussion of the campus environment in the focus groups. As Chapter 5 indicated people decode their environment as they manoeuvre through it and this contributes to feelings of fear and safety. It was thus necessary to consider the most
appropriate way of presenting the campus to users in an environment that would ensure a robust and rigorous empirical study. Gifford (1997, p.17) defines environmental perceptions as including "the ways and means by which we collect information through all our senses...to include aspects of how we appraise and assess environments." As with any study of environmental perception, there has to be a stimulus which participants can respond to. Traditionally, these can take the form of photographs of the environment or physically taking respondents to the scene of interest. However, since it was impractical and unreliable to take the campus users to the environment on campus, it is an accepted system in fields such as environmental psychology to present participants with an environmental stimulus. Indeed slides or static photographic images have been used in a number of studies to explore perceptions of safety and crime (Schroeder and Anderson 1984; Nasar 1992; Nasar and Fisher 1992; Pain and Townshend 2002; Jorgensen et al. 2002; Cozens et al. 2003a; Boyle et al. 2004).

Alternatively, video images could be presented to participants, but these present difficulties in terms of manoeuvring through an environment, although they do have the potential benefits of presenting dynamic changes in the social environment and an auditory stimulus, which provide further dimensions through which to construct perceptions. Bell et al. (2001) suggest that environmental simulation methods are appropriate if it is unfeasible to carry out a study in the actual environment. Stamps (1990) carried out a study to determine the efficacy of presenting photographs of environments in comparison to participants visiting actual environments. He found that responses to colour photographs and slides are comparable with responses obtained in the field, i.e. the actual environment from where the image was taken. This gives support to the use of photographs as a valid environmental stimulus.

Therefore, the methodology would focus on presenting standardised 'virtual-reality' walk-through scenes of a selection of campus locations or 'stimuli' to campus users in the focus groups. The subjective viewpoint of campus users was sought, from which a template of cost effective and practical campus design and management solutions were attained. By probing these perceptions, characteristic features of the campus environment that invoked perceptions of risk and feelings of fear were identified. This not only addressed the key research objective of assessing safety on university campuses but also led to pro-active solutions that can usefully promote personal safety on campus. The study of personal security in railway station environments highlighted
how such technology can lead to changes in the design and management of the built environment to promote feelings of security (Cozens et al. 2003a).

6.5. THE PRIMARY CASE STUDY

The University of Glamorgan was used as the main case study for this research and a pilot study served as a preliminary examination of personal safety on university campuses before a larger-scale study was undertaken. The University of Glamorgan currently has over 20,000 students (including full-time and part-time under-graduates, post-graduates and distance learners, with around 13,000 of these students based on the campus) and employs over 1300 staff, all of whom use the University campus to varying degrees throughout the year (www.glam.ac.uk). Visitors and local residents additionally use the campus, for example to use the cash-point facilities and the shops, albeit to a lesser extent than staff and students. The campus is spread over three sites, and is around 86 acres in size, with seven academic Schools and 12 corporate departments. The main campus is in Trefforest and a smaller campus, Glyntaff, is located a few miles away on the other side of the valley. The former Polytechnic of Wales was awarded university status in 1992 and has a unique social mission, shaped by its history and reflective of its location in a deprived part of South Wales. It has a widening participation ethos and is particularly aimed at recruiting students from the socio-economically deprived local areas. It has a high proportion of mature students and recruits high numbers of students from the local communities.

The University of Glamorgan is located in Trefforest, a town which is adjacent to the larger South Wales Valley town of Pontypridd. It is located in Rhondda Cynon Taff, a region which is considerably socially deprived and has a considerable number of old mining communities. Indeed, the University had its origins as a Miners Training College in the early twentieth century. The capital city of Wales, Cardiff, is around 13 miles away. Current security measures, policies and procedures at Glamorgan include lone working policies, violence at work policies and an outsourced security patrol called Q-Park. There is no requirement for ID Cards and there is no cohesive, university-wide strategy for collating crime or personal safety data. Personal safety induction courses are not mandatory and there is no clear guidance for students on general security procedures (apart from when they reside in Halls of Residence). The Students' Union
(SU) plays its own role in raising awareness to students and operates a night bus and Freshers' Week crime awareness seminars.

6.5.1 Data collection methods

6.5.1.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaires were designed to follow on from the Delphi findings in Chapter 4 and the various concepts related to personal safety: actual safety, perceived safety, fear, concern and behaviour. The questionnaires comprised of closed and open questions. They asked for respondents overall perceptions of security on campus, whether, where and when they fear for their safety on campus and whether they have been harmed on campus. Questionnaires also provided an ideal opportunity to identify campus users' common routes across campus.

6.5.1.2 Route identification

In order to identify which parts of the campus to explore and present to campus users in the form of Virtual Reality (VR) stimuli in a systematic and methodologically sound way, a key aspect of the questionnaire comprised of a section where each respondent was required to draw on a campus map the three key routes they used on campus. To ensure a sound basis for deriving routes and to maintain methodological continuity, the process of identifying which routes to film were based on those most commonly used. They were identified by layering each route drawn in the returned questionnaires on top of the other in an electronic form of the campus map using Photoshop software. The layers were then all superimposed onto one map and could thus be viewed simultaneously. The most commonly used routes were those for which Photoshop had drawn the thickest line. This process is demonstrated in Figure 6.1 below. Analysis of these routes determined which routes would be filmed for presentation to the focus groups. It also ensured a methodical and sound interpretation and representation of the user routes. This approach has been used in previous campus research by Nasar et al. (1993) who used overlaid maps to identify the thickest lines representing student routes on campus at night. My approach differs in that I am aided by advancements in
technology. It also proved more accurate than doing it manually. From the questionnaires 17 routes were identified.

Figure 6.1 How Photoshop was used to determine common routes

STAGE 1: I started by drawing the first routes on – ID number 5
STAGE 2: I then layered on top the next respondent routes – ID6-17
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STAGE 3: I then completed the layering with the final respondent routes and the result is a representation of all the routes, with thicker lines indicating the most commonly used routes.

It was thus easier to identify which routes were the most commonly used. Alternative methods of identifying routes to film on campus were considered including observational methods and gridding the campus into nodes. However these were dismissed as being too unscientific and complex respectively.

6.5.1.3 The Virtual Reality Panorama Tool

The use of digital images in the form of Virtual Reality panoramas (VRs) as an environmental stimulus is an already proven, versatile and innovative method for assessing perceptions of safety. This technique has been successfully used by the SLTRI in a study for Valley Lines (Cozens et al. 2003a; 2003b) and has been extensively peer-reviewed, which serves to highlight its validity as a research tool. It was therefore an ideal technique to use in this campus study. Having identified the most common
routes from the questionnaires they could now be filmed using the Virtual Reality Panorama Tool (VRPT). A digital camera was used to take 18 digital still images at key points (nodes) along the route that together represent a full 360° panorama from each point. These 18 images were knitted together using QuickTime software to produce a fluid 360° panorama, which was then knitted to the other nodal panoramas, resulting in a 2-dimensional virtual representation of the route. This ensured an accurate reflection of what you would see if you physically walked the route. Presenting standardised 'virtual-reality' walk-through scenes of a selection of locations can act as a convincing environmental 'stimuli' and the subjective viewpoint of participants can be sought. As Cozens et al. (2003b) assert, "This stimulus could then facilitate the collection of data in the form of detailed commentary regarding users' 'perceptions'." Users can more readily manoeuvre through an environment and this provides a more accurate representation of reality than static photographs, which provide only one 'view' of a scene.

This approach allowed for the exploration of how personal safety is influenced by the physical conditions on campus and identified any 'trouble spots' that existed by exploring the subjective viewpoint of campus users, from which a template of cost effective and practical campus design and management solutions were attained. By probing these perceptions, characteristic features of the campus environment that invoked perceptions of risk and feelings of fear were identified. One problem encountered when filming was that it took longer to film a route than it would take to walk it, so there were subtle difference in light and weather conditions that did not occur in 'real-time'. Figure 6.2 demonstrates how the digital images are filmed and knitted together to produce a 360 degree panorama using the VRPT:
Figure 6.2. The Virtual Reality Panorama Tool – an explanation of the technology used to explore perceptions of personal safety

Above: an example of the 18 still images that are knitted together using QuickTime software to form a 360° panorama.

Left: A plan of the filmed route shown on a large screen. Each photo represents a node in a 360° panorama of 18 sites.

Right: Taking the digital images at a node along the route.

This graphic demonstrates how routes are filmed using the Virtual Reality Panorama Tool. The 18 digital images are shot at key nodes along the route and QuickTime software is used to combine them into a 360° panorama for enhanced exploration of the environment and to identify possible solutions to make it safer.
6.5.1.4 Focus groups

The philosophy underpinning the focus groups was that the exploration of the subjective perspective of potential route users, an approach which had remained largely untapped in the literature, would contribute to the knowledge base on how campus users interpreted the environment. This approach, based upon exploring visual perceptions, provided insights into the location and specific characteristics of possible 'dangerous' and 'safe' places on campus. Identifying why fears for personal safety exist, and how they might be constructively reduced by practical solutions, were central aims of the focus groups and facilitated the development of a range of user-led possible solutions designed to reduce personal safety concerns. The focus group was first told the Delphi definition of personal safety so that they were aware of the scope of the discussion; the focus group was about intentionally motivated harm; no further clarification was given; rather the participants were left to interpret this for themselves. They were also told the add on-statements that the discussion was not about accidental harm or health and safety issues. They were then presented with each route in turn and asked to respond to the simulated routes. The group was asked about their perceptions of personal safety at different positions along the routes and for them to sum up their overall view of their personal safety on the routes.

Some broad questions were thought out prior to the focus groups but were by no means prescriptive for every group. I decided that to have some generic questions would guide the focus group but the actual wording or emphasis of the questions would be decided as the discussion progressed, dependant on the responses. Krueger (1988, p.60) provides some useful hints for asking relevant questions in a focus group; these include the use of open-ended questions because this allows "the respondent to determine the direction of the response." He recommends avoiding the use of dichotomous questions, i.e. those that can be answered only with a yes or no response, because this does not predicate a particularly meaningful response. It is important to note that my questions did not differentiate between perceived risk and feelings of fear, as differentiated in Chapters 2 and 4. Perceived risk and feelings of fear are understood to be constructed differently and have been operationalised differently in the criminological literature. As Robinson and Mullen (2001, p.34) claim, perception of risk and fear of crime are often used interchangeably yet are distinct concepts. Perceptions are cognitive responses or judgements of risk while fear is an affective or emotional reaction. I felt it was too complex to hold a successful focus group that distinguished the wording of questions and consequent analysis of
responses in such a way; this is the realm of an experienced psychologist or linguist. Because of my limitations in this area, trying to concentrate on issues of semantics would interfere with the free-flowing and easy nature of the focus groups that I wished to generate that was conducive to a productive discussion. Instead I hold that the questions, which include feelings and attitudes, were generic enough for the participants to interpret their own meaning from the questions and the insights gleaned would still be meaningful. My questions were therefore more general in nature. This can be justified because the distinction is only pertinent when trying to measure these concepts. These were the broad questions I hoped to ask, but was not limited or restricted to these:

First impressions of overall journey
1. Overall, how would you perceive your personal safety to be on this route?
2. Does the area look well maintained?
3. Do you think crime would be a problem in this area? If so, what sort of crime?

Go through each VR scene
1. Are there any features of the physical environment of these locations that make you feel unsafe?
2. In what ways do you think you personal safety might be at risk in these locations?

Overall perceptions
1. What emotions or feelings do you think you might have walking in these locations on your own?
2. What emotions or feelings do you think you might have walking in these locations with others?
3. Would you feel safe walking this route in the daylight?
4. Would you feel safe walking this route in the dark?
5. Does the area look well-maintained?
6. Do you think that crime would be a problem in this location? If so, what sort of crime?
7. In what ways do you think that your personal safety might be at risk in this location?
8. Would you prefer to avoid walking in this location given the choice?
9. What features of the physical environment make you feel safe/unsafe?
10. What changes to the physical or social environment do you think might improve your personal safety in this area?

11. What would you do to improve your personal safety in this location?

Conclusion

1. Overall, how would you perceive your personal safety to be on this route?
2. Overall, what solution do you think would best improve your personal safety on this route?
3. What changes to the physical or social environment do you think might improve your personal safety in this area?
4. What would you do to improve your personal safety in this location

As possible problem areas arose, the participants were asked to consider possible safety improvement techniques. The data from the focus groups were then transcribed verbatim and analysed for key themes and categories of responses.

6.5.1.5 Ethical issues

These were addressed through the School Ethics Committee. The main issues were informing the respondents comprehensively of what would be required of them, their option to refuse to take part, the issue of informed consent, describing the outcomes and outlets of the data and the potentially sensitive issue of personal safety as a research topic, although my research was not concerned with an acute analysis of personal safety experiences. The relevant documentation can be found in Appendices Twelve and Thirteen).

6.6 PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was useful for testing the appropriateness and quality of the questionnaires and focus groups in advance of the main study and also to provide an opportunity for personal development. In addition, the data contributed to the broader picture of personal safety on campus. The questionnaire design could be changed or adapted if necessary for the main study to ensure that the questions were succinct, unambiguous and generated appropriate responses for the research objectives at hand. During discussions with my supervisors it was agreed that a pilot study would be beneficial on a number of levels. It served five key purposes:
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1. To test the reliability and suitability of the questions in the questionnaire and focus group
2. To provide an opportunity for me to develop my focus group skills and understanding of data collection and analysis techniques
3. To provide practice in using the VRPT to film campus routes
4. The data contributed to the broader representation of perceptions and actualities of personal safety on campus
5. The data analysis served to tentatively reveal what the reality was of personal safety on campus

The questionnaires were piloted with four staff respondents and the focus group was piloted with 12 second year Social Sciences undergraduates. The pilot questionnaires (see Appendix Fourteen) identified some repetition of routes and common nodes, and it was therefore decided that two routes would be filmed and would be sufficient to test the methodology. These were filmed using the Virtual Reality Panorama Tool—a daytime route across campus and a night time route that began on campus and then left the campus towards the local train station. This allowed a thorough exploration of any possible effect of light conditions on personal safety and how being on and off campus correlated with the perceptions of campus users. The focus group participants were recruited with a flyer (see Appendix Fifteen). They were presented with each route in turn and asked to respond to the simulated route. I was reasonably happy with the questionnaire design. I received a few minor comments that I incorporated into the design of the questionnaires for the main study. Overall I was very pleased with the focus group in terms of the responses and the interaction between the group and the VR stimuli. The participants represented a good mixture with regard to diverse campus usage, age, area of residence and modes of transport to campus. I had also been on a Social Research Association (SRA) focus group training day and learned some valuable guidelines, including to be unconcerned about silences (because this was usually a sign that the group were considering the information and their responses), the importance of reacting to body language and the benefits of a good sample size (8-10 participants).

The pilot focus group provided me with valuable experience in holding a focus group and managing the situation, as well as the effectiveness of the VR route stimulus and questions. However, some supplementary questions would need to be asked in the main study. These served to widen the discussion to general issues of personal safety, rather than too narrowly on just the physical environment in relation to the VR
routes and eased the participants into the discussion rather than directly presenting them with the VRs. I would ask these before the route walkthroughs to get the group warmed up and to put the VR findings into context for the user group. These all relate to what Krueger (1988) refers to as presenting the focus group questions in context. This is particularly important so as not to throw the participants in at the deep end; they served to ease the respondents into discussing the topic and could also provide some meaningful responses. It also served to focus the group on the subject in hand.

Examples of such questions included:

1. What, if any, training or induction to personal safety and security matters have you had since you joined the university? (to staff and students)
2. What are your views on personal safety training/awareness?
3. What specific personal safety issues are there for you on campus?
4. Are there any parts of the campus that you would deliberately avoid?
5. Is personal safety a big concern for you?
6. Is personal safety something you think of as a priority issue on campus?

The pilot focus group was transcribed and analysed using the general framework of thematic analysis (Boyatzis 1998). The analysis, transcript and key issues that arose in the questionnaires and focus group are presented in Appendices Sixteen, Seventeen and Eighteen. The innovative VR approach was very illuminating and was a great aid to discussion. It provided a realistic portrayal of the campus and an innovative direction for the exploration of the built and natural environment (and to a lesser extent the social environment) and how campus users perceived and decoded them. The data contributed to the broader representation of perceptions of personal safety on campus. Most importantly, however, it allowed me to reconsider the intended methodology and refine it accordingly.

6.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY

Some limitations of the pilot study were that the questionnaire was piloted to just staff respondents, while the focus group was piloted to just students. This restricted the findings in terms of comparing responses between user groups. However I considered the testing of the methodology and the research design more critical at this preliminary stage. However, it was clear that the filming schedule would have to be considerably refined for the main study. The focus group was scheduled to last an
hour, with half an hour given to each route. However, what was immediately apparent when the day-time route was shown to the group was that there was considerably less discussion. This could be due to the following reasons: the familiarity with which they had with the route meant that they were less alert to characteristics of the physical environment that may influence personal safety, or the fact that it was daylight meant that they were less concerned and responsive to personal safety issues. The notion that familiarity decreases scrutiny of visual signals from our environs is endorsed by Boyle et al. (2004), who explored how women responded to static images of the urban environment in relation to fear of crime; they discovered that “unfamiliarity with an urban environment resulted in respondents examining design aspects of the built environment to a greater extent.” The result of this was that the respondents who were familiar with an environment looked less closely at aspects of its design and its corresponding impact on safety concerns than those who were unfamiliar with it.

The consequence of this is that my plan to do 18 focus groups over three academic terms, with each user group having two focus groups per term to explore perceptions of campus in the daytime and night-time and to explore possible seasonal effects on personal safety, had to be modified. Although I still felt it was important to explore the contrast in responses to day and night-time routes, the potential impact of seasonal effects had to be abandoned because the same routes filmed in winter, spring and summer would apparently generate similar responses. If day-time routes of familiar environments were not generating much discussion then I anticipated that the presence of a few more leaves on trees or a bit more sun would not radically transform the discussion. The respondents would be bored and I would not generate particularly informative findings. Because of these issues I decided that a second case study at a second university would serve to generate interesting responses, provide an opportunity for comparative analysis and potentially verify the findings of the Glamorgan study. Eight focus groups were therefore held: four different groups were each presented with a variety of day and night-time routes.

6.7.1 The refined methodological approach – a second case study: Loughborough University

This served to add another dimension to the findings and validate the methodology and findings of the Glamorgan study. This comparative study at a second university was initiated in order to explore the impact of unfamiliarity on personal safety and to
Contribute to a more robust framework of university campus safety. Loughborough University is a large campus university located in a town in the East Midlands. It is located between Nottingham, Leicester and Derby and the size of the campus is over 400 acres. It currently has over 12,000 students, 3000 staff and can be traced back to the early 1900s (www.lboro.ac.uk). It was awarded university status in 1966. It serves a different client base to Glamorgan and its social context is very different – Loughborough does not share the same deprived characteristics as the region Glamorgan is located in. Loughborough University has well-developed security procedures: they release their annual crime data on the web, they have an in-house security patrol that has vans to patrol the campus, they have many external campus maps and they have non-mandatory ID cards. In terms of the methodology, however, the key difference was that because of time constraints it was viewed as impractical to distribute questionnaires to campus users to identify common routes in the same way that had been used at Glamorgan. Instead an observational, pragmatic approach was taken in which we observed campus users to identify patterns of common pedestrian routes around the campus, some of which were short-cuts. Two focus groups were held at Loughborough to explore potential visitors' perceptions of Glamorgan's campus, and six routes were filmed at their campus that were presented to staff and students back at Glamorgan at a later date.

6.8 THE CASE STUDIES – DATA COLLECTION

6.8.1 Sample population

This research sought to provide a more thorough review of campus safety than previous studies, which have predominantly explored only students' risks and narrow perceptions of crime. Therefore a representative sample of the three key user groups of the campus were sought at Glamorgan; staff, students and visitors. This approach was taken because a sample was required that would represent the wide and varied use of the campus and immediate vicinity. By classifying the users into these three categories then three different perspectives could be sought and the campus could be genuinely audited in terms of all its users. This approach was used by Pain and Townshend (2002) to target particular types of people and is useful to explore different user groups' different relationships with and attitudes towards an environment. At Loughborough, a sample of students and staff were sought to form the 'potential visitors' perspective of Glamorgan's campus.
6.8.2 Selection criteria

For staff and students it was vital to ensure that all departments and schools were assessed, to ensure that the full length and breadth of the campus was included to fully audit the campus, as well as investigating different methods of travelling to and from the University. Staff had to have been in employment for over a year, while inclusion criteria for students was that they had to be in the second or third year of study, owing to such students having a potentially more rational and developed sense of their own personal safety in relation to the university campus, and a consequent more stable handle on personal safety issues than first year students away from home for the first time. Although visitors in the questionnaire stage were identified from the departmental representatives, the refined methodology meant that the focus group 'visitors' were recruited from Loughborough University.

6.8.3 Sampling procedure

While random sampling presents the most appropriate way of obtaining a sample from which findings can be generalised to a given population, the practicalities of this study meant that a different approach was required. Whilst I endeavoured to seek a sample from across the range of academic and support schools and departments in the university, the actual process of recruiting participants was troublesome, because of the difficult process of finding willing participants. I thus carried out purposive sampling because I was deliberately seeking specific groups; staff, students and visitors (Trochim 2002). This involved a more lateral approach. The sampling process involved liaising with the Heads of each academic and support school or department and identifying a contact point in each. I then approached each contact point for help to identify respondents. Finally I contacted these named respondents myself with information on the study, an invitation to participate in the questionnaires and informed consent documents (see Appendices Nineteen, Twenty and Twenty-One). A sample of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix Twenty-Two. See Appendices Twenty-Three, Twenty-Four and Twenty-Five for details on recruiting focus group participants at the University of Glamorgan. For recruiting students at Loughborough University a senior contact person was identified, who put details of my study on an inter-departmental website, with my details available for further information (see Appendices Twenty-Six, Twenty-Seven and Twenty-Eight for the information used to recruit and inform participants at Loughborough University). The same person asked fellow staff employed in her department to participate in the staff
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focus group at Loughborough. Each focus group participant was paid £10 for taking part, while the questionnaire respondents' names were placed in a raffle to win £25.

6.8.4 Sample size:

Two samples were made:

6.8.4.1 Questionnaires

120 respondents:
Staff (40) Students (40) Visitors (40)

Of these the response rate was:
Staff (21) Students (17) Visitors (8)

The overall response rate was 38.3%. The approach to identifying routes from the respondents ensured that the research was entirely user led – the routes I presented to the focus groups to explore personal safety concerns were routes actually used by the user groups. This ensured the most methodologically sound research basis.

6.8.4.2 Focus groups

A sampling frame of potential participants was produced initially with the aim of identifying a 'focus squad' so that there would always be around 10-12 respondents available for each focus group to ensure continuity. In the case of staff and students at Glamorgan, the aim was to have the same respondents participate in the focus groups in order to instil some continuity of perspectives and responses and the ability to mentally compare and contrast routes between the two universities. The total number of participants in each focus group varied between two and 11. The recommended number of people per group is usually seven to ten, with groups over 12 not recommended (Kreuger 1988). I found that the smaller groups, consisting of around seven participants were the most productive because they were more relaxed and allowed each member to participate fully. The focus groups were videoed on two levels: to record which respondents said what and a second video feed recorded what stimuli they were responding to so as to ascertain which features of the campus prompted debate. This eased transcription and interpretation and allowed me to
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match pertinent quotes with visual images of the campus. Image 6.1 demonstrates how this two-streamed videoing was done to highlight the advantages of simultaneously identifying participants (faces blurred to preserve anonymity) and their discussion with what stimulus they were presented with:

Image 6.1 Still from the video cameras recording a focus group

My 'pool' of respondents consisted of staff (11) and students (10) at Glamorgan and staff (7) and students (6) at Loughborough (although note that less Glamorgan respondents took part in the later focus groups where VRs of Loughborough were presented).

6.8.5 Focus group schedule

The eight focus groups took place over a nine month period and Table 6.1 shows the number of people who participated in each group.
Table 6.1 Number of participants took part in the focus groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>USER GROUP</th>
<th>VR STIMULUS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN – NIGHT-TIME ROUTES</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN – DAY-TIME ROUTES</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN - NIGHT-TIME ROUTES</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN – DAY-TIME ROUTES</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>POTENTIAL VISITORS - STAFF</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN – DAY AND NIGHT ROUTES</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>POTENTIAL VISITORS - STUDENTS</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN – DAY AND NIGHT ROUTES</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>POTENTIAL VISITORS - STAFF</td>
<td>LOUGHBOURGH – DAY AND NIGHT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>POTENTIAL VISITORS - STUDENTS</td>
<td>LOUGHBOURGH – DAY AND NIGHT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8.6 Number of routes filmed

Based on the questionnaire route analysis, the number of routes filmed per user group is shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 The number of routes filmed in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USER GROUP</th>
<th>VR STIMULUS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ROUTES FILMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITORS</td>
<td>GLAMORGAN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITORS</td>
<td>LOUGHBOURGH</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9 DATA ANALYSIS

Because of the multi-method approach, different approaches to data analysis were required.

6.9.1 Quantitative data analysis

6.9.1.1 Incidents on campus

Only the analysis of sections 4 and 5 of the questionnaires are presented. Section 4 refers to the incidents of harm on campus experienced by the respondents and section 5 details the route analysis. The questionnaire analysis and key findings can be found in Appendices Twenty-Nine and Thirty, while a discussion of the key findings is presented in Chapter 7.

6.9.2 Qualitative data analysis

6.9.2.1 Perceptions of campus users

The focus group discussions were very effective in revealing how user groups perceived the campus, what made them concerned and how they felt that these concerns could be reduced. The first step was to transcribe the entire interview from the video recording. This provides a complete verbatim record of the discussion (see Appendix Thirty-One for a sample of the transcripts from Glamorgan, and Appendix Thirty-Two for a sample from Loughborough).

Krueger (1988) argues that analysis of focus group data should be systematic and verifiable. The Appendices demonstrate how this has been achieved in a methodical and transparent way. The analysis began when I transcribed the discussions; the careful listening and meticulous writing up of the narratives allowed some initial interpretations to be made as I familiarised myself with the data. The transcription process allowed me to not only become familiar with the data, beginning the interpretation process as I was doing so, but also allowed me to reflect on my own performance in running the focus groups. The next stage was to reduce the data. Note that I did not explore any non-verbal communication because the wealth of verbal information was extensive. The aim of this analysis was to look for trends and
patterns which reappeared within focus groups and then across them as further transcripts were analysed. Commonly used words or phrases were clustered into themes according to their context, i.e. what the pertinent issue and environmental stimulus was. These themes were developed if they were reiterated throughout the focus groups and were highlighted using a function in Microsoft Word. The use of NVivo was again rejected, as critiqued in Chapter 4.

The analytic approach I applied to my data was based on the essence of 'thematic analysis,' whereby data is read looking for key themes that arise (Boyatzis 1998). This approach was taken so as to provide the most accessible way of interpreting the data. The aim was to end up with key themes that summed up the emergent patterns from the discussion and which were supported by direct quotes from the focus groups and, preferably, by digital images from the VRs. However, I deviated from Boyatzis in that he proposes five specific features of a code (a label, a definition, a description of how to know when a theme occurs, a description of when the theme should or should not apply and examples of the theme to aid coding, Boyatzis 1998, p.xi). Instead I simplified the process by sorting the data into themes and codes, which were generated when similar issues expressed by participants within the text were brought together into a common category, which I labelled according to the defining feature of the theme (Lacey and Luff 2001). Given the small sample size conclusions cannot be generalised to all campus users but the applicability of the findings to other campuses will be dealt with in Chapters 8 and 9. An example of the different stages of the analysis can be found in Appendices Thirty-Three, Thirty-Four and Thirty-Five for Glamorgan and Appendices Thirty-Six, Thirty-Seven, and Thirty-Eight for Loughborough).

I rejected content analysis, defined by Bryman (2001) as an approach that aims "to quantify content in terms of predetermined categories and in a systematic and replicable manner," because I judged this to be too restrictive, superficial and could be argued as being a quantitative approach. Furthermore, although the findings from the Delphi study had some influence on my interpretation of the data, I in no way held these as predetermined themes that I deliberately sought out in the transcripts.

6.10 SUMMARY

This chapter has argued that a perceptual approach to personal safety allows for a more thorough audit of campus safety and provides a deeper insight into how the
environment impacts on personal safety and feelings of fear than traditional campus research has presented, while a basic questionnaire served to garner some basic incident data and identify common route usage on campus. This multi-method approach is endorsed by Cozens et al. (2001b, p.245) who stated that “the highly complex socio-spatial dynamics of the built environment can only be better understood by analysing both the objective and the subjective “reality” of both crime and the fear of crime.” The methodology was shaped by the preceding chapters to form the most appropriate means of carrying out my research objectives. I have presented the different approaches to my research and critiqued various data collection methods, as well as details of a pilot study and the implications this had for the main study, the findings of which are found in Chapter 7.
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7.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter follows on from the methodology outlined in Chapter 6 that described the approaches to the collection, analysis and application of quantitative and qualitative data to the assessment of personal safety on the University of Glamorgan campus. The chapter starts with a discussion of the key findings from the questionnaires and focus groups and highlights the key themes that emerged, with quotes and images used to highlight them. These findings are mapped onto the personal safety triangle developed in Chapter 4 which lends itself to the development of the key recommendations to promote campus safety. The secondary study at Loughborough University is also discussed; this is a continuation of the pilot study findings that required a refined methodology and was useful to explore perceptions of an unfamiliar campus environment, as well as strengthen and validate the Glamorgan research findings. A critical discussion of the findings is presented, along with a summary of the differences between user groups, and the findings of both case studies are combined to form a cohesive and systematic framework for campus safety in Chapter 8.

7.1 PRIMARY CASE STUDY - UNIVERSITY OF GLAMORGAN

7.1.1 Questionnaire analysis – incidents on campus

On reflection the questionnaires were considered to have weaknesses because of the variety of responses sought. Although the questions were purposeful, the questionnaires were complicated by requiring responses that corresponded with different ratings scales. As Saunders et al. (2003, p.281) contend, “It is far harder to produce a good questionnaire than you might think.” I would agree with this because I failed to give adequate thought to the precise data that would provide the meaning I required. This meant that the results tell us something about campus users' feelings and experiences of campus safety but this could have been a lot stronger by maintaining consistent responses, such as dichotomous answers, throughout. Out of the 120 questionnaires distributed to respondents, 46 returned their questionnaires – an aggregate response rate of 38.3%, which is below what is considered a good response rate, but not untypical (Gillham 2000).
Some use can be garnered from section 4, which sought victimisation experiences: the incidences of victimisation give some indication of the extent of incidents on campus because of the lack of available recorded campus crime data. There were few reported incidences of harm on campus – 8/46 in total, representing 17% of respondents. Students were the user group most at actual risk, accounting for 5/8 incidents of harm, while visitors were the group least at actual risk.

17% of respondents had experienced some form of intentionally motivated harm: 2% had been physically harmed, 9% emotionally harmed, 2% psychologically harmed and 4% had been a victim of another type of harm. Interestingly, none were the victim of thefts, which the literature indicates is the most prevalent crime on campus. Furthermore, no respondents suffered from physical violence, which is the crime most often associated with student-age populations. Unfortunately this cannot be substantiated by official recorded campus statistics, because no coherent crime or incident reporting system exists at Glamorgan. Certainly, the findings suggest that different user groups experience different risks of experiencing intentional harm on campus. The different users have different tacit relationship to the university, dependant on whether they work, study or visit the environment. This in turn impacts on the frequency with which they visit the campus and dictates the time they spend on campus. Students were shown to be the most at actual risk, based on the number of incidents experienced by this user group. As most of the student group were aged 18-30 this seems to correspond with the statistical findings of the British Crime Survey and crimes recorded by police (Dodd et al. 2004), which reported that younger people were more at risk of being victimised. As might be expected, visitors were the least at actual risk and perceived themselves to be at low risk of experiencing harm. This is explained by the moderate amount of time they spend on campus and are thus less exposed to potential risks. This provides some insight into the extent of victimisation on campus, but due to the previously voiced concerns over survey data, they are best viewed as an indication rather than a reality.

7.1.2 Questionnaire analysis - route analysis

The real strength of the questionnaire was in section 5, the route identification question, which was one of its main purposes. The chosen approach to identifying routes was systematic and robust and due to the complex nature of trying to map the campus and...
ensure representativeness of the most commonly used routes, this section was successful.

7.1.2.1 Staff

The most commonly used parts of the campus were broken down into routes in order to make filming easier so that manageable and coherent stimuli could be presented to the focus groups. The routes were chosen so as to depict representative paths through the campus. Thus some form of logic was required to interpret the Photoshop maps. The amalgamated routes from the 21 staff respondents resulted in the following eight routes being filmed (see Appendix Thirty-Nine for a plan of the full routes filmed) and presented to the focus groups:

Image 7.1 Staff routes filmed
### Table 7.1 Staff routes filmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route number on map</th>
<th>Focus group route code</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FG1 R1</td>
<td>Students car park</td>
<td>Behind D-Block</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FG2 R1</td>
<td>Side entrance (west of campus)</td>
<td>Down Park Terrace to roundabout</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FG2 R2</td>
<td>D-Block</td>
<td>K-Block</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FG1 R2</td>
<td>J-block</td>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FG2 R3</td>
<td>UA (Halls of residence)</td>
<td>Behind G to front of LRC</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FG2 R4</td>
<td>Behind GBC</td>
<td>J-Block (under refectory)</td>
<td>Day Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FG1 R3</td>
<td>Glyntaff campus</td>
<td>Glyntaff campus</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FG1 R4</td>
<td>Union shop</td>
<td>Staff car park</td>
<td>Night-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.2.2 Students

The amalgamated routes from the 17 student respondents resulted in the following seven routes being filmed (see Appendix Thirty-Nine for a plan of the full routes filmed) and presented to the focus group:

**Image 7.2 Student routes filmed**
Table 7.2 Student routes filmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route number on map</th>
<th>Focus group route code</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FG3 R1</td>
<td>Students car park</td>
<td>Up Forest Grove and down past A and E Blocks</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FG4 R1</td>
<td>Down Park Terrace to roundabout</td>
<td>Over station and up Park Street</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FG4 R2</td>
<td>D-Block</td>
<td>K-Block</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FG3 R2</td>
<td>J-block</td>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FG4 R3</td>
<td>Round G-Block</td>
<td>J-Block</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FG3 R3</td>
<td>Round refectory</td>
<td>Shop and Students' Union</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FG4 R4</td>
<td>Halls of residence</td>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>Day-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2.3 Visitors

The amalgamated routes from the 8 visitor respondents resulted in the following three routes being filmed (see Appendix Thirty-Nine for a plan of the full route filmed) and presented to the focus group:

Image 7.3 Visitor routes filmed
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Table 7.3 Visitor routes filmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route number on map</th>
<th>Focus group route code</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FG5/6 R2</td>
<td>Up Forest Grove</td>
<td>Visitor car park</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FG5/6 R1</td>
<td>Students' Union</td>
<td>Shop and round car-park</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FG5/6 R4</td>
<td>J-Block</td>
<td>G-Block and out entrance to Park Street</td>
<td>Day time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also presented two additional routes to potential visitors (i.e. Loughborough staff and students):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Staff route 7)</th>
<th>FG5/6 R3</th>
<th>Glyntaff campus</th>
<th>Glyntaff campus</th>
<th>Night time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Staff route 4)</td>
<td>FG5/6 R5</td>
<td>J-block</td>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>Night time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that due to the refined methodological approach a further two routes were presented to the participants at Loughborough university to ensure a wider coverage of the campus. These were staff routes 4 and 7. These were chosen because potential visitors would feasibly use the train station to visit Glamorgan, while it was also considered important to show visitors the second campus at Glyntaff. A good coverage of the campus was thus achieved. Please note that staff and students at Loughborough University formed the ‘visitor’ sample in the focus groups which explored Glamorgan’s campus.

7.1.3 Focus group analysis

7.1.3.1 Thematic approach

The discussion from the focus groups revealed some decisive common themes in terms of aspects of the campus environment that were perceived to shape personal safety and corresponding solutions to reduce these risks and promote personal safety. This section has been structured so as to correspond with the three critical determinants in the personal safety triangle. I considered various ways of presenting the findings. Initially I was going to present each user group in turn but this resulted in a large amount of repetition because the themes across user groups were so similar. Therefore I decided...
that the groups' responses and key themes would be amalgamated, although a brief
discussion on the differences between the user groups is discussed at the end of this
chapter. I could have presented the findings according to divisions in routes, or by night
and day. However, because the focus groups were presented with different routes this
was unfeasible and it would not have been possible to compare user groups based on
routes shown to them. Instead I thought the best way of presenting the findings was to
list the key themes that emerged which followed on from my analysis. I interpreted as I
transcribed so I have presented the findings according to issues of concern – I have
used direct quotes from the focus groups and photographic stills from the routes to
highlight the issues raised. This resulted in key features of the campus environment that
influenced perceptions of personal safety. If we refer to the three key determinants of
personal safety then Table 7.4 provides an example of how my themes developed, using
an example from the focus group transcript.

Table 7.4 Example of coding process and reducing the textual data from the focus
group transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group quote (salient text highlighted):</th>
<th>Initial code:</th>
<th>Theme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID2 I don't think it's particularly well lit in certain areas at night. Not so much in the day as night. I'm a bit worried, especially if you come out of the building alone you have to go through dark bit to get to your car or whatever FG1</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID3 If there are big groups around, you don't think twice you know, you've got a safety net if someone did jump you, you would feel perfectly safe to say &quot;hey come and give me a hand&quot;. FG3</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>PRESENCE OF OTHER PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID10 that little E-Block - I mean it might be busier now cos the mosque is down there now but it used to be classrooms and that wasn't very nice down there and I mean I wouldn't go down there now umm. It's sort of all closed off. There's no way out of there it's sort of and there's all trees around it. FG2</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>ENCLOSED SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID2 It is - when first come to this country you are not sure of the area, which you might, which is um safe and as you get by and it gets familiar you can work out which place you should be avoiding, which time you should be avoiding in those area. These are the things that helps you feel safer FG6</td>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>FAMILLIARITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.3.2 Perceptions of routes held by campus users

As the transcript data was analysed key themes emerged; there were certain features of
the campus environment that invoked negative senses of personal safety and specific
parts of the campus that fostered fear. Although the VR stimulus and focus group
discussion was concentrated on the physical environment of the campus, social and
personal issues did arise. These themes were categorised into the three causal groups of personal safety: physical, social and personal. These themes were found in further focus groups. Although it was originally intended to present only the physical features of the campus, because the VRs prompted discussion of the social environment then the key themes that emerged from this causal group are also presented. This highlights one of the benefits of using the VRPT; although the transience of the social environment cannot be presented, the fact that people, or the lack of them, are visible in the images prompted comments on the impact this had on perceived personal safety. Although personal determinants were also raised these will not be presented here because of space constraints. This position is validated by the findings from the literature review in Chapter 5 that found that it is predominantly physical and social visual cues that contribute to feelings of fear and safety and they thus deserve attention. Figure 7.1 shows all the issues raised in response to the simulated routes around the campus, in the form of the personal safety triangle to distinguish between categories.
Table 7.5 demonstrates whether each of these themes was raised in each focus group, the ticks demonstrating how often the themes emerged: this shows how certain themes were salient to certain users, while others were not. The themes in the greyed out cells will not be discussed because of lack of space (this was based on a hierarchy of how often the themes emerged).
### Table 7.5 Key determinants influencing perceptions of personal safety: Findings from the Glamorgan case study focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL DETERMINANTS</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day light</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard security devices</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus boundary</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and maps</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport modes</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of year</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside buildings</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other people</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of other people</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to other people</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security presence</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security function</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access campus</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to traffic</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual triggers</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio triggers</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and perceptions of crime</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Cards</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security procedures</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of usage of route</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONAL DETERMINANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL DETERMINANTS</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance/risk reduction</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity/affinity</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Induction courses</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal usage of campus</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning ahead/preparation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>√ STAFF</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.4 Determinants of personal safety identified by focus groups

The discussion has been structured so as to coincide with the personal safety triangle – these were the key themes that emerged from the data. The aggregated results are shown below for ease of presentation. Only the key physical and social determinants raised in the focus groups are presented because of space constraints; those not discussed were identified because of a judgement made by myself that they were not as critical in the focus group discussion as the other points, and also that there was a more limited control over influencing these factors which has implications for the recommendations presented in Chapter 8. The key themes are illustrated by quotes from the focus group transcripts and by images from the VR if appropriate. The quotes presented highlight the key themes and are verbatim from the focus groups. To ensure that anonymity of the participants is maintained the quotes begin with an ID number, and are followed by a reference to the focus group which the quote was drawn from e.g. FG3 is focus group 3, which can be referred to the tables presented earlier in this chapter to identify which routes were shown and whether the image was filmed in the day or night. Typically the quote refers to a specific route, in which case this is shown by R3, for example, which means route 3. This can again be referred back to the previous tables to see what route the quote refers to. Where the code R- is not presented, this represents a quote from the initial discussion prior to any routes being shown. Then the user group is tagged on to demonstrate whether the quote is from a member of staff, a student or a visitor.

7.1.4.1 Physical determinants

**Night-time**

Personal safety concerns were considerably lower during the day, due mainly to high levels of visibility and high numbers of people to provide social reassurance. However, such perceptions changed dramatically at night as light conditions (and subsequent social conditions) changed. The state of ‘darkness’, it seemed, and what this signified in terms of reduced visibility and a corresponding reduction in the number of people in the vicinity as standard university hours ended, fundamentally changed the dynamics between people and their environment. There seemed to be a clear inter-dependence between reduced light as night fell and a corresponding low social presence. This is
reinforced in the literature by Nasar and Fisher (1992, p.50), who assert that at night, darkness "hinders individuals' ability to see what lurks in the shadows, what lies ahead or to see into areas that give offenders refuge." The upshot of this is that darkness creates anxieties about possible risks to personal safety; in particular about what the environment could be concealing.

ID2 You feel a little bit more aware at night and the kind of situations you put yourself in. FG3 STUDENT

**Darkness**

Perhaps the most decisive factor that influenced perceptions of personal safety was that of light and the inter-related issues of darkness, street lighting and night-time. Personal safety concerns were considerably lower in the day, due mainly to high visibility levels and high quantities of people to provide social reassurance. Darkness, it seemed, and what this signified in terms of less visibility and fewer people in the vicinity, changed the relationship between people and places. Respondents decoded the environment in a different way in the dark and had heightened sensitivity to personal safety issues to those experienced during the day. The groups' responses to the day-time routes were in complete contrast to that of the night-time routes. The darkness of the night-time routes led participants to decode the environment in a different way; they were sensitive to different issues to that of the day routes. The fact that it was dark altered the group's responses overall and had a significant impact on their perceptions of personal safety and the amount that they had to say on the subject. They were a lot more animated and talkative, and engaged more with each other. Darkness created a whole different interpretation of the built environment (corners, lanes), lack of visible security (lighting, CCTV) and the social environment (lack of people, lack of designated security guards). Darkness brought with it all kinds of unquantifiable unknowns; and there was increased awareness of 'danger levels' or the 'what-ifs?' The inter-connectivity of darkness and lack of lighting has been well addressed, with research suggesting that darkness increases fears because it hinders visibility over an area and creates a variability in social presence which inevitably accompanies changing light levels as day turns to night (Warr 1990; Nasar and Fisher 1992; Brantingham et al. 1995). However, although increased street lighting is one approach to reducing fear at night, "improved lighting may not reduce it unless the improved lighting is tied to something that reduces the sense of
isolation or being alone.” (Brantingham et al. 1995, p.147). This is an important consideration for practical recommendations.

ID3 My perception of the campus changes in October when the hour goes back. And it happens overnight. It's not gradual - it's just like that [clicks fingers]. And the campus does look different when it's dark. FG1 STAFF

Daylight

The routes filmed in the daytime and the abundance of natural light resulted in routes being perceived to be very safe. The groups generally thought day-time routes would be a lot less safe at night and the lack of light (natural and artificial) dramatically increased perceived risk. However the concerns about personal safety at night were mainly due to reduced visibility and what this ensued and not necessarily as a result of the innate design of the campus environment. The focus groups generally had less to say in the day-time routes. When asked to consider the same routes in the dark then they were more vociferous and could see potential problems. Daylight was the over-riding influence; a route in the day significantly appeared to reduce fears, even in unfamiliar environments. This is echoed by Brantingham et al. (1995, p.129) who also found that students' fears were low in the daytime.

ID2 It's funny how you perceive the danger in the night whereas you don't necessarily perceive it in the day. FG1 STAFF

ID4 Everything's lit so there's no hiding place, FG4 R1 STUDENT

ID2 I'd immediately feel safer in the daytime FG5 R2 VISITOR

Lighting

The lack of illumination (natural and artificial) dramatically increased perceived risk. Improved lighting was often cited in the focus groups as one possible way of improving personal safety on campus during the state of darkness. It is importance to distinguish between natural light from the sun and artificial light from street lights. It would seem
that street lighting works by boosting self-assurance and personal safety levels by improving intervisibility of the immediate vicinity. Although improved street lighting works by enhancing surveillance and allowing people to see each other better, it is generally accepted that improved street lighting only partially improves personal safety. This is supported to some degree in the criminological literature by Nair et al. (1997) who found that improved street lighting can considerably reduce fears and improve perceived safety, while Atkins et al. (1991) concluded that while this is true, the introduction of improved street lighting does not actually reduce crime. Therefore lighting should indeed be flagged up as a recommendation for improving perceptions of personal safety, but should be as part of a package of solutions rather than a stand-alone solution. A lack of lighting led to less visibility of the area and thus features of the physical environment were perceived as more threatening, with alleyways and dense vegetation perceived as providing potential places for offenders to hide. Nasar and Fisher (1992, p.50) suggest that “when an area has inadequate lighting it hinders individuals’ ability to see what lurks in the shadows...thus darkness becomes a signal of potential danger by limiting the victim’s prospect.” Improved lighting was cited in the focus groups as the obvious way of improving perceptions of personal safety on campus because campus users would gain increased opportunities for surveillance by enhancing visibility of the immediate vicinity. The other interesting issue raised was that of intervisibility, i.e. being seen by and seeing casual others. Nasar et al. (1993) found that 50% of respondents expressed safety concerns such as lighting or the presence of people, in their decision making process about choosing particular routes. From a personal safety perspective, Nasar and Fisher (1993, p.191) explain this as follows: “well-lit areas may lead people to think they can see a potential predator in time to react.” The issue of environments fostering natural surveillance was highlighted in Chapters 2 and 5 as a component of CPTED. The impact of lighting and darkness on personal safety is particularly significant for students and staff who stay on campus after ‘normal’ working hours for late lectures, particularly in the winter months, because there is a corresponding reduction in social presence at these times too.

ID2 I don’t think it’s particularly well lit in certain areas at night. Not so much in the day as night. I’m a bit worried, especially if you come out of the building alone you have to go through dark bit to get to your car or whatever. FG1 STAFF
One area of the campus that was continually flagged up was by one of the main pedestrian gates onto campus:

ID9 Anybody could lurk down there, it's really bad. FG3 R2 STUDENT

ID4 They should put a light at the entrance to that lane FG3 R2 STUDENT

ID8 A couple of street lights would be quite good just so you could see I mean being able to see what's going on all around you is a big part of your sense of personal safety I think FG6 R5 VISITOR

A most pertinent comment was made by one of the students: they asked whether campus facility managers deliberately lit the routes and areas of the campus that people are most likely to use, when in fact this may not be the best approach because, paradoxically, lighting is needed in the places which are not so commonly used such as short cuts.

ID6 Certainly I think two of the car parks looked well dodgy; not just because they had cones over it, it was very, very dark FG5 R3 VISITOR
Furthermore, the campus was perceived as having no consistency of lighting.

ID9 It's just disconcerting going from somewhere well lit to somewhere that looks like the last shot where it's not pitch black but not far off – yeah like that – if you went round the corner and it was like that I think I'd gone the wrong way. FG6 R3 VISITOR
Another issue raised was that of lights inside buildings and how this can create a positive sense of other people being nearby.

**ID9** It indicates that there is someone in there **FG6** **R3** **VISITOR**

**ID8** It's a perception thing isn't it? You might not actually be any safer but you feel safer because you think there must be someone in there if there's lights on. **FG6** **R3** **VISITOR**

Finally, the type of lighting was also raised; yellow sodium lights were perceived as creating shadows, while other lights were seen as casting more diffuse and spread out light. The latter were preferred. In addition, sensor lights were considered a possible remedy if cost was an issue.

**Hard security devices**

The lack of hard security equipment was a concern cited in the focus groups. While this refers mainly to the issue of CCTV, it also encompasses street lighting (as discussed above). There was a degree of cynicism aimed at the current use of CCTV on campus, with some respondents intimating that it is useful only when it is being constantly monitored. Many focus group participants cited CCTV as one possible solution to personal safety concerns on campus. This is supported by research carried out by Ditton et al. (1999), who found that 79% of people questioned thought that they would be less likely to become victims of crime in areas with street cameras. CCTV can be effective in increasing perceptions of personal safety because it acts as a deterrent to potential offenders and it provides reassurance that such surveillance, if used appropriately, can immediately alert security personnel if threatening situations arise. However, although CCTV is often cited as reducing fear of crime, the actual effectiveness of CCTV in reducing crime is uncertain; one possible caveat referred to by Pain and Townshend (2002) was that the potential for situational crime prevention strategies such as CCTV and lighting alone to improve safety is debatable. Common criticisms levied at CCTV, along with other situational crime prevention techniques, include displacement of crime, defined by Welsh and Farrington (1999, p.347) as “the unintended increase in crimes following from the introduction of a crime reduction scheme.” This can include moving crime problems to different locations where such security measures are not in place.
Campbell and Bryceland (1998, p.73) proclaim that "CCTV alone will not reduce crime but .... if properly managed and monitored it will have a lasting effect on crime reduction and community safety." The findings suggest that inadequate lighting and CCTV both play a key role in making campus users feel less safe on campus and contribute to the sense of a more sinister environment when the campus is shrouded in darkness. However, the impact of security devices appears to be intrinsically linked to the social presence on campus; for example, it could be dark with no CCTV but if there are lots of people around then users may feel safe – the social presence could be the dominant influence. This is an important consideration when considering solutions. Such situational crime prevention measures implemented to improve personal safety should not be viewed as a panacea to all personal safety concerns; rather, they should be integrated into a comprehensive package of solutions that together maximise personal safety on campus. Again this theme has commonalities with the target hardening aspect of CPTED discussed in Chapters 2 and 5.

**ID9**  
I wish there were more cameras around the back in J-Block area.  
FG1  
STAFF

**ID2**  
Yeah, is it switched on, is there any camera in it, is anyone looking?  
FG5  
R1 VISITOR

**ID2**  
I think it is sort of a form of deterrent – hope it will deter someone from certain things  
FG6 R1 VISITOR

Other security related issues raised were that of the lack of lockers on site, which was a problem for students who frequently had to carry large amounts of work and equipment around campus with them. Interestingly, intercoms were discussed as a viable security measure and overall were perceived as positive, although a degree of caution was suggested when considering that drunken or mischievous students might abuse them. Suggestions were to have a phone or some type of intercom system that were dispersed over the campus and that were linked up to central security so if you saw someone's car being broken into or if you felt like you were being followed you'd know you only have to go as far as the phone. This was perceived as useful to regular users of the campus but not so useful for visitors, who would not know where they were located.
Another major issue, cited by the students more than other user groups, was the issue of locking the Brook Street gate. This is locked everyday between 11pm and 5am ostensibly to prevent undesirables coming onto the campus, but also to prevent loud and drunken students walking up Brook Street to gain access to the campus and walking on to their Halls of Residence and disturbing local residents. Although this frustrated students as it meant they had to walk much further to the open side of the campus it was also seen as slightly nonsensical because students would simply climb over the gate. Furthermore, this was incompatible with having the other side of the campus open plan. Worryingly, students felt that their personal safety was compromised by having to walk further and adding an extra 20 minutes onto their journey on foot. This issue was even flagged up by visitors as something that should be changed.

**Campus boundary**

Routes within the campus boundary provided an almost intrinsic safety, a sense that users were better protected on university facilities than in the surrounding local environment. This was particularly an issue as users left the campus via a key entrance gate and entered the local neighbourhood. When participants left the perceived safety of the campus environment they claimed that they experienced different perceptions of personal safety as they entered the local community. This relates in part to the issue of control. As Donnelly (1989) observed, a common factor that plays a role in influencing fear of crime is the sense of control. Experiencing feelings of loss of control, for example over one's environment, can result in heightened fears and concerns. A further factor is discussed by Brantingham et al. (1995): possible triggers of fear include a fear of the unknown and unfamiliar people. These issues become exacerbated as users leave the campus environment. It could be suggested that users feel they have more control over their environment on the university campus, thereby prompting an increased sense of personal safety on campus. A possible solution is to have security guards patrolling the key routes off campus. This was particularly an issue as users entered the key route off campus, Brook Street. Brantingham et al. (1995, p.134) assert that "an edge effect almost certainly shapes crime and fear at the campus boundary." Edwards (2000, p.50) meanwhile suggests that universities need to have a clear boundary, but that oppressive measures such as big walls or gates can send out the wrong message: "such assertive physical separation may give those within the citadel of the university a feeling of security but the physical and psychological links to the town will be damaged." It is
crucial therefore to strike the right balance between personal safety and community relations. This issue relates to the territoriality element of CPTED discussed in Chapter 2.

ID1 Within the campus I don't feel so vulnerable as I do in the immediately adjacent streets. FG1 STAFF

ID3 It's when you leave the campus and when you go more into Pontypridd or Trefforest that you start to become more aware of who's walking on the other side of the road. FG3 STUDENT

ID2 I do feel generally safer on university campuses because I have a perception that they are better sort of umm that they are more secure - that there is security there even if there isn't always a 24-hour porter. I feel if that was an ordinary car park in town then I might be a bit more nervous than on campus FG5 R1 VISITOR

Geographical location

The issue of the geographical location was cited by all users as having a link to perceived personal safety. This appeared to have meaning on two levels. This seemed to hinge predominantly on whether the university was campus or non-campus and whether it was rural or city-centre based. The two may appear interdependent but consider universities like Leeds which is both a city centre and a campus university. Brantingham et al. (1995, p.136) hold that "urban campus boundaries may be much less certain than rural campus boundaries because they blend into the urban surrounds, creating mixed zones of campus insiders and outsiders, where, simultaneously, everyone belongs and no one belongs". There is a higher chance of non-university or unfamiliar people inter-mingling on campus in a city-centre campus because they often lack clear boundaries, and this can heighten fears.

ID6 I think it would vary from the environment that the campus was situated in - from one like ours, but I am thinking of a city centre campus where your personal safety issues might be extremely high umm because of the environment they are located in FG5 R1 VISITOR
Glamorgan was perceived by visitors to be very rural and this was generally perceived to be positive in terms of personal safety concerns, because potential offenders would have to make a specific effort to travel there, rather than opportunistic offenders in a city centre. This was also something concurred by Glamorgan staff about Glyntaff campus, which was located further out of the way.

**ID11** You're not likely to have people over there who shouldn't be there cos of where it is cos Trefforest campus is obviously in the middle of Trefforest you're more than likely to get people from there that shouldn't be there.  
*FG1 R3 STAFF*

**ID8** One thing that this walk-through sort of showed is how almost remote the campus is – I think that would make me feel a bit safer because someone would actually have to make the effort to go there if they wanted to attack you or steal from you  
*FG6 R2 VISITOR*

Substantial research has been undertaken on whether community crime rates influence campus crime rates. Their studies suggest different findings, although the dominant belief is that community crime rates are higher than campus crime rates (Bromley 1995a; Volkwein et al. 1995; Henson and Stone 1999). However, it seems logical that the situational and environmental context of a university does have some bearing on personal safety on the campus because the university does not exist in a vacuum.

While US stature makes universities warn students of known risks, the issue of protecting students off campus is more complex. This is an issue addressed by Smith and Smith (1993, p.191), who assert that "colleges and universities, then, cannot with impunity ignore off-campus issues. In circumstances where an institution....knows of dangers there, some duty to warn about and to protect from foreseeable dangers may well exist." This could go someway to boosting perceptions of personal safety by arming campus users with knowledge and awareness of the local community.
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**Signage, maps and building names**

These were perceived as very important, not only to visitors, but also to staff and students on their home campus. This seemed to have a bearing on getting lost and a recurring theme throughout the focus groups was the impact that getting lost can have on your personal safety and its effect on vulnerability. Cooper Marcus and Wischemann (1990) recommend campus maps, clear signs at building entrances, and well-designed and located directional signs on campus to boost safety.

*ID11* It would probably be a good thing you know from a focal point if you could have just a little sign saying 'this is to somewhere', 'this is to somewhere else' and that 'leads you down to this group' - it is - it would help in a general sense for people who are not aware of the campus. FG3 R3 STUDENT

*ID2* if there's a map when you arrive on the bus it's great to have a map there straight away, so you can go 'right I know where I'm going' - you don't have to kind of wonder around every place looking kind of for a cue where to go. FG5 R2 VISITOR

**Transport modes**

Transport was considered to have an impact on personal safety, particularly by visitors. Using public transport was considered to increase risk, as was being a pedestrian. However, using a car also came with its own risks, particularly those associated with the location of car parks; traditionally in remote locations which are not over-looked by people or buildings, and thereby increasing vulnerability. However, Morriss (1993) warns that having good local public transport provisions can increase the propensity for crime because it creates opportunities for potential offenders to access the campus. However, she asserts that “the benefits of improved transportation may outweigh any potential increase in crime.” (1993, p.16)

*ID2* Yeah because sometimes I've got buses to other universities and if it's not clear where to get off that's quite worrying because you don't want to get
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off at the wrong place and end up where you can't get onto campus easily and you're going to be kind of wondering around FG5 R2 VISITOR

ID1 I would be wary about a train station at night if it was unmanned FG5 R5 VISITOR

ID2 If you are in a car at least you can get around quickly; even if you walk in the road, especially at night. In the day-time I don't think walking alone would be much of a problem FG6 R4 VISITOR

However, the general issue of perceived increased risk off campus was raised in relation to transport use:

ID3 You are a bit more cautious when you go onto the train station cos there could be some drunk people waiting to go home on the train that aren't anything to do with the University. FG3 R2 STUDENT

Inside buildings

The only user group presented with the interior of a university building were the visitors. This was because the routes derived from the questionnaires included one which necessitated going through the main entrance building of the university, where a main reception desk was located. Generally this increased perceptions of safety, but it was mentioned that it did depend on the nature and design of the building; the interior presented was new and open. This is a view supported by Brantingham et al. (1995, p.147) who found that generally fear generators were external to buildings rather than inside them.

ID2 I feel safer in the building FG5 R4 VISITOR

Environmental design

The other most compelling determinants of personal safety are issues related to the physical design of the campus environment, both built and natural. This had one of the most dramatic influences on perceptions of safety and many features of the environment
were identified as correlating with increased feelings of risk and vulnerability. This has been given a sub-group of its own due to the importance of it as a powerful influencer of perceptions of campus safety. There were 29 further sub-themes within environmental design across all focus groups and cases. Table 7.6 shows whether each focus group discussed these themes. Again brevity requires a judgement to be made on the least salient issues as discussed in the focus groups and these have been omitted from the discussion – these are greyed out in the table below.
### Table 7.6 Key environmental determinants influencing perceptions of personal safety: Findings from the Glamorgan case study focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USER GROUP AND VRS</td>
<td>STAFF NIGHT GLAM</td>
<td>STAFF DAY GLAM</td>
<td>STUDENTS NIGHT GLAM</td>
<td>STUDENTS DAY GLAM</td>
<td>VISITORS GLAM (STAFF)</td>
<td>VISITORS GLAM (STUDENTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and appearance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of alternative routes/choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building colour</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building configuration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building design</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building function</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-up spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus layout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated or common routes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightening spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of space</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass frontage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated places</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and upkeep</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe places</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus/space</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style and age</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary structures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alleyways

This corresponds with Nasar and Fisher’s (1993) discussion of places of concealment as relating to increased fears. Alleyways translated as somewhere where there is limited places to flee a potential attack and for potential offenders to entrap a victim. The alleyways by the Brook Street entrance were mentioned in all of the focus groups by all users as places where personal safety would be questioned, in particular that it was unavoidable to pass these alleys when you went through the entrance gate. What made matters worse is that the alleyways were not lit; having one or two lights would significantly reduce feelings of vulnerability in this area.

ID5 There is a horrible pathway between buildings which has horrible bushes on either side up towards Sports Centre. FG1 STAFF

ID4 My God that’s even worse and you’ve got to go by both of those to get out or in? FG5 R5 VISITOR

Image 7.7 Trefforest – Brook Street pedestrian entrance

ID2 Certainly in the day-time some places like the small alley that would be some places that I would avoid, even in the day-time FG6 R4 VISITOR
Availability of other routes

This was an interesting point raised: the issue of choice and availability of other routes. This gave users more control over their own safety because if they were presented with a perceived threatening space then they could decide to choose another route, even if it was further away. This puts the user firmly in control of their own safety. When there were no other routes to choose then feelings of risk increased. This relates to the issue of personal responsibility and having the choice to avoid somewhere that is perceived to increase risk figures highly in this. Personal responsibility played a key role in personal safety construction and is concerned with the individual actively reducing any risks they may face in their daily lives. According to Hudson et al. (1998, p.29) "responsibility for crime prevention has also been placed on potential victims themselves, who were urged ... to become 'responsible citizens' taking practical steps to reduce their risk of victimisation." This is further supported by the establishment of individual responsibility as a central tenet of governmental advice, as typified on the Crime Reduction website: "the best way to cut the risk of attack is by taking sensible precautions." (www.crimereduction.gov.uk). Reassuringly, students were quite pro-active in taking responsibility for their personal safety, such as altering their behaviour in response to fear or personal safety concerns. However, individuals cannot make such choices about their personal safety if only one route is available to them.

**ID10** Generally speaking though, in all of them, from what you were saying normally you would take another route and out of all of the routes really there's always an alternative. You know if you feel unsafe you know there's another way of getting there - where you want to be FG1 R4 STAFF

**ID4** But it's about having choice as well – I mean if you want to walk across a car park you can walk across the middle – you don't have to walk along the side here where there is a path but it's next to a hedge. I think there are a couple of places where there wasn't much choice – you had a wall and a hedge and even walking in the middle of that you could still be grabbed at from out of a hedge FG5 R1 VISITOR
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Building configuration

By this I mean how the buildings relate to each other and the rest of the campus. This was particularly relevant to Glamorgan, a campus whose geographical location on the side of a valley has had a huge impact on the location and configuration of buildings. Because Glamorgan is effectively land-locked, the buildings are in close proximity to each other, creating more alleyways and reducing the amount of open spaces on campus. This undoubtedly has an impact on personal safety. Cooper Marcus and Wischemann (1990, p.161) argue that “campus outdoor spaces, too often it seems, have become what is left over after building decisions have been made.” This is particularly apt for Glamorgan which is limited to a small site.

ID5  I dunno, the campus how it's set with buildings is really weird - I dunno they really kind of don't make any sense. FG4 R2 STUDENT

ID2  They look like they haven't been put together very well. FG4 R3 STUDENT
Building function

This was another interesting theme that arose. The issue of how the campus was seemingly divided into a more student-orientated top half, where the SU, sports hall and Halls of Residence were located, and a more teaching-orientated bottom-half, was discussed. Although both were considered as safe as each other in the day, at night it was generally perceived to be safer in the 'student' part of the campus because there were more likely to be people around, even late at night. The teaching part of the campus was considered less safe at night because teaching finished at certain times, and academic blocks were locked at 9pm at the latest. This had a consequent impact on the number of people in a particular building. Interestingly, this was raised predominantly by the student focus groups; this stands to reason because they are the group most likely to be on campus late at night. However, the association between specific buildings and their function with people was also raised in the visitor focus groups. This theme is given credence by Sloan et al. (1996), who observe that "some campuses are divided into specific parts having distinct functions; this setting may also contribute to increased levels of perceived risk and feelings of fear."

ID4  But it's safe there (SU) cos that's where most people would be at night so that's the best place. There's always people milling around there and at night. It feels like a little village. FG3 R3 STUDENT

Image 7.9 Trefforest campus – Student Union
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**ID2** It's funny with Halls of Residence because I think I do feel kind of safer especially with students around FG5 R5 VISITOR

**ID9** The Students' Union looks quite recognisable and the shop quite reassuring. At least there'd be someone in there I could go and ask if I needed to find something. FG6 R1 VISITOR

**ID9** I think at that time of day especially because the Students' Union would still be open. The academic building is just a building at 7 o'clock at night. Whatever they do there, they are not open FG6 R1 VISITOR

One idea mentioned by the students was the possible merger of building function at night; for example, so that all late lectures were held in one building rather than scattered over the campus. This would boost safety and reduce the costs of running several buildings at once. This was something recommended by McEvoy (1992), who put forward some security suggestions as to how universities can promote campus safety; she suggests that "evening classes should be localised in one or two buildings which are centrally located on the campus." (McEvoy 1992, p.152).

**ID10** You know you have these late nights wouldn't it be a good idea maybe up by the SU finding a place where you could have a segregated room near the gatehouse so it's only open say from 8 o'clock until 12 o'clock or all through the night so then it's only one place rather than having all the buildings which is costing extra to manage because you've got to keep going around and you say J-Block, H-Block is open. Why don't they just have one area? FG3 R1 STUDENT

**ID6** We'd all be doing exactly the same thing and again it's safety in numbers. FG3 R1 STUDENT

**Enclosed spaces**

Enclosed spaces increased concerns for personal safety on campus because they were identified as being possible hiding places for potential offenders. Such features of the environment consequently figured highly in participants' fears. Locations mentioned by
the focus groups as being potentially risky included the main car park which was enclosed at the far end by a boarded up railway tunnel, surrounded by high vegetation and enclosed on three sides, and a key pedestrian entrance (Brook Street) to the campus which was adjacent to narrow lanes. Fisher and Nasar (1992) found that certain features of the campus environment could increase fear of victimisation, regardless of their correlation with actual crime risk. These included places which exhibited characteristics that prevented the ability to flee a threatening situation with ease; features that are associated with alleyways and enclosed spaces. Nasar and Fisher (1992, p.54) assert that “if the built environment blocks escape from the situation ... people feel unsafe because they lack a way to find relief from the perceived sign of danger”. Such areas on campus should therefore be targeted when considering the management and maintenance of the environment. Remedies include the promotion of alternative ‘safer’ routes, increased security such as extra lighting and, as far as possible, the ‘opening up’ of these areas to promote intervisiblity. This has similar connotations to alleyways but not all enclosed spaces are alleyways.

**ID5**  *On the central avenue as you come out towards the Gatehouse there - you don't actually walk on the road do you, the path is underneath by the big bank and that's pretty scary. FG1 R1 STAFF*
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ID10  That little E-Block - I mean it might be busier now because the mosque is down there now but it used to be classrooms and that wasn’t very nice down there and I mean I wouldn’t go down there now um. It’s sort of all closed off. There’s no way out of there it’s sort of and there’s all trees around it. FG2 R2 STAFF

Image 7.11 Trefforest campus – entrance to mosque

ID2  There was something like a little pathway between two buildings FG6 R3 VISITOR

Image 7.12 Glyntaff campus – alleyway between main buildings
I noticed on the walk down to the train station the paths seemed to have a lot of cars next to them and they seemed very narrow paths which I found sort of makes you more enclosed FG6 R5 VISITOR

Image 7.13 Brook Street – main pedestrian route from Trefforest campus to train station

Exposure

This was a contradictory issue; exposure was considered to increase risk because it created a sense of vulnerability or exposure to potential offenders. However a similar but separate theme, open spaces, was considered to decrease risk because of the opportunities it created for an individual to observe the space around them and thus become alerted to potential dangers.

But I don't like to feel too exposed FG5 R5 VISITOR

I feel those steps; I know it's a new building; I felt you were very exposed on those steps there and then having to walk through that (arch) and that was during the day. There are very steep steps. FG1 R3 STAFF
Frightening spaces

This was added as a theme because there seemed to be preconceived notions of what constituted frightening spaces; not just on campuses, but in any environment. In a similar way, notions of safe places are discussed below. Adjectives such as 'creepy' were frequently used and when probed certain features of an environment that could be characterised as frightening were disclosed. These places were considered ones to avoid if possible. This is supported in the criminological literature by Wilson and Kelling (1982) and Skogan (1990) who have been discussed earlier in Chapters 2 and 4 in reference to their work into how perceptions of poorly maintained and neglected environments can propagate fears.

ID2 The steps going up the side of the GBC - I mean that is the main route I would say the students use to walk up to the Halls of Residence. I mean that is quite creepy. I'd do it quite happily in the day, you know I wouldn't think anything of it, but I don't think I'd like to do it at night. FG1 R4 STAFF

ID5 Yes, I wouldn't want to go down there. It's quite well lit but it's still ... phew, no ... FG1 R3 STAFF
When asked what would constitute a dangerous or frightening place the visitors mentioned the following:

ID1  Dark FG6 R4 VISITOR

ID2  Vandalism FG6 R4 VISITOR

Function of space

This was a similar theme to building function but instead refers to more generic spaces on campus. Car parks were frequently mentioned as increasing fears.

ID11  Down by the railway arch, the bottom end of the long car park is not very well lit and very creepy in the dark because it's not a through .... unless you're going down there for your car there's no real reason for you to be down there. I try to avoid it as much as possible. FG1 STAFF

Another key point was that of how the university marked its presence and boundary by the use of colour. The university campus and its facilities are clearly demarcated so visitors in particular would know clearly where the university began and ended. This was
considered to be done in a sensitive and unimposing way so as not to impinge on the neighbouring community:

ID2 It’s the use of – you know how we were saying how you distinguish between what’s the university and what’s not? I was thinking of colour, like the use of colour; you know that entrance bit they had the blue G and then the blue carried on and you showed us the entrance and it was all kind of blue and nicely painted and yes this is there and then it kind of stops and you go oh great – do you know what I mean? It’s almost like colour co-ordinating FG5 R4 VISITOR

ID2 It does kind of make it look nice FG5 R4 VISITOR

Image 7.16 Trefforest campus, boundary by main entrance

Isolated places

Isolation was perceived to increase risk. Isolated areas such as car parks generated feelings of fear since despite fostering high levels of visibility because of their traditionally open-plan layout, their location meant that vulnerability was increased by the lack of proximate inhabited buildings; the implication being that if a harmful incident were to occur then nobody would be nearby to help. Robinson and Mullen (2001) found that feelings of fear correlated with isolated areas such as parking lots. According to Smith
and Fossey (1995) car parks are often positioned out of sight on campus, which they claim is "antithetical to security." They claim that car parks should be as visible as possible to promote surveillance by people in nearby buildings. Smith and Fossey (1995, p.70) also contend that "in accordance with principles of defensible space, isolated areas should be eliminated in campus buildings." While the practicality of eliminating isolated areas is problematic, the perceived safety of such areas can be boosted by having effective security devices, increased street lighting and the presence of security personnel. Smith and Fossey (1995, p.69) argue that for university campuses, "buildings should be placed and designed so that people do not have to use isolated areas; communal areas are overseen by many; and traffic (both human and vehicular) is restricted." This is a good idea in principle to constructively reduce fears but the practicality of applying such principles to existing sites is debatable. However, such ideas are useful for the design of future campus facilities.

There were certain areas on campus where isolation was heightened:

Tunnel end of the car park

ID6 When I parked there I tended to run in with key in hand, get in the car and lock the doors and then come out then. FG1 R1 STAFF

Glyntaff campus

ID10 I'm fine with Glyntaff but it does seem to empty out quicker than Trefforest does. It does get very, very quiet, very, very quickly. FG1 R3 STAFF

ID3 Because even though there were cars there that made you think there were people around it just felt really isolated like if you were walking through there on your own you'd be the only person possibly on the whole of that campus. It just seemed very isolated. FG5 R3 VISITOR
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Maintenance and upkeep

A key determinant of feelings of fear was the overall appearance and upkeep of the campus environment. Although there were few examples, locations of the campus that were considered run down or unkempt propagated feelings of fear and negative senses of personal safety. Graffiti, for example, indicated a lack of care for an environment. This is in support of Wilson and Kelling's (1982) Broken Windows theory, that holds that environmental signifiers such as features of poorly maintained built and physical environments can not only act as initiators for fear but they can also precipitate further disorder and decline. The overall up-keep of the campus thus plays a key role in determining users' senses of personal safety. This relates to the previously mentioned theme of 'frightening spaces'.

ID8 You sort of associate graffiti with you know sort of danger slightly. FG3 STUDENT

ID2 Yeah like you say it's almost as if that kind of feel that it's not much cared about or it makes you feel unsafe FG5 R3 VISITOR

ID6 Again you go to environments where you've got lots and lots of it and whilst there's nothing threatening about graffiti itself, the very fact it's there – it feels bad. FG5 R3 VISITOR

Obstructions

Anything that was considered an obstruction to campus users' routes or visibility increased their fears because they represented places where people could hide. This related to the issue of 'concealment' whereby potential offenders can conceal themselves behind features of the natural or built environment and so increasing an individual's vulnerability, perceived risk and fear. Nasar and Fisher (1993) found that physical cues such as places of concealment represent sinister hiding places.

ID6 I didn't like the umm – there was a container right at the first umm - images that we saw FG5 R1 VISITOR
Open spaces

This was a distinct theme to that of isolation. Open spaces were perceived to increase senses of personal safety by boosting surveillance and intervisibility of surrounding areas and other people. This is related to the principle of ‘prospect’ as held by Nasar et al. (1993, p.161), who claim that fear is pronounced in areas with vegetation which provided limited ‘prospect’ over an area. Conversely, unlimited prospect, i.e. maximum visibility, increases feelings of personal safety.

ID1 Yes, it’s leafy, it’s busy, it’s open, it’s nothing that makes me feel anxious.  
FG2 R1 STAFF

Image 7.17 Trefforest campus – open side of campus looking down to car park

ID3 That bit looks nice and safe for some reason – I don’t know whether it sounds silly but I don’t know whether it’s to do with the grass and stuff – it just looks nice so it makes you feel a bit safer I think than the bit before when you just saw this fence then this massive dark behind it FG5 R5 VISITOR

ID1 You know there’s no-one lurking about as well FG5 R5 VISITOR
Temporary structures

Interestingly, temporary structures were considered to have a negative impact on personal safety, specifically by the visitors. In particular, comments related to where building work was taking place on Glyntaff campus and the presence of temporary rooms. Building work was also an issue cited in focus groups held by Pain and Townshend (2002) to explore senses of safety in city centres.

ID2  Even things like the portocabins make me feel nervous, just a temporary thing maybe FG5 R3 VISITOR

ID2  I know there's a lot of work going on at York campus and you often find that you'll go so far down a route and then it'll be blocked off and you have to double back - things like that make you quite nervous like you know you might not be able get round a certain way or - that makes me nervous so I do think it doesn't seem to be as stringent when building work is going on FG5 R3 VISITOR

ID4  I think it's because it's not permanent - yet. It's like there's no guarantee that there'll be someone around if you need somebody in a hurry FG5 R3 VISITOR
Vegetation

The issue of vegetation on campus was also cited as being a potential source of fear, although it should be mentioned that vegetation also had a positive impact on the aesthetics of a campus. While well-maintained and suitably sized vegetation enhances the overall visual appearance of the campus, trees and bushes which were perceived to be too high or too dense increased feelings of vulnerability. Smith and Fossey (1995, p.70) claim that “shrubbery beautifies our campuses, but it also provides hiding places for assailants.” This is strongly related to the issue of visibility or as Nasar and Fisher (1992, p.50) coined it, ‘prospect’; they contend that “where pedestrians have wide and deep prospect onto an area which has no places of refuge for an offender, they would feel safer because they could anticipate and avoid an attack.” Vegetation should thus be considered as a crucial aspect of personal safety on campus and should be maintained to a suitable height or where it is particularly dense increased lighting would enhance perceptions of personal safety. Nasar et al. (1993, p.176) discovered that “trees, shrubs, and deflected vistas, desirable features during the day, become objects of fear in a climate of fear on the dark.” As a result they recommend that shrubbery should be no more than 14 inches high in vulnerable parts of the campus or cut back so as to be unable to conceal a potential offender.

ID5 And with lots of bushes too - lots of places for people to jump out at you.
FG1 STAFF

ID10 It looks nice in the day, it looks green and you wouldn’t want it to be taken away. FG2 R4 STAFF

ID8 I always like to see around me – it’s almost like an animal instinct to see around you and you can’t there if you are walking along. I know that I’m always aware you know don’t walk next to the bushes, walk near the side and edge of the pavement FG6 R1 VISITOR

ID2 Yes I think the bushes in the way so you would not be able to see what is coming round the corner FG6 R5 VISITOR
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Visibility

This relates to open spaces but it deserves to be a theme in its own right because it was an important corollary of environmental design and had an important influence on personal safety. Again this relates to the issue of prospect as argued by Nasar et al. (1993, p.161), who claimed that, fear is pronounced in areas with vegetation which provided limited ‘prospect’ over an area. It also relates to the issue of lighting and to places which are not conducive as hiding places for unknown others.

ID5 You can see all around you. FG2 R1 STAFF

ID3 You can see everything and you can assess the situation. FG4 R1 STUDENT

Windows

Although this relates to building design I have included it as a discreet theme because it was an issue that recurred throughout the focus groups and deserves special attention, particularly because it was also mentioned in the Loughborough case study. Windows and glassed entrances boosted senses of personal safety because it blurred the line between building interiors and exteriors. It also boosted visibility and allowed people
outside to see into a perceived safer area; as discussed earlier there was a sense that being inside a building was safer than being outside a building. This relates to principles of CPTED, which was discussed in Chapter 2, a central tenet of which is to promote natural surveillance, something which can be achieved through glass frontages and windows overlooking public areas. Dahlem (1996) indicates that glass doors and windows are effective in creating natural surveillance opportunities since they allow people inside to monitor activity. As Jeffery and Zahm (1993, p.332) suggest, “surveillance is the ability of residents to observe what is going on within their territory.”

*ID5 Well I think that's quite reassuring where you've got the glass front door and you can see people in there FG5 R3 VISITOR*

Image 7.20 Glyntaff campus, glass entrance to main building

7.1.4.2 Social determinants

**Number of other people**

It would seem that the presence of other people in the immediate vicinity generally increased positive senses of personal safety within the campus environment. In their study of community safety, Pain and Townshend (2000) found that concerns for safety were often shaped by the behaviour of others. In particular they found that “many of the
most frequently mentioned safety concerns revolve around the presence and behaviour of groups of people who it is widely felt are not part of a wider community with interest and values in common." (Pain and Townshend 2002, p.117). In a university campus environment, campus users were reassured by a high presence of other people who are perceived to be there for exactly the same purpose as themselves – to study, work and socialise. However, when the number of people in the environment diminished, fears correspondingly increased, and this was particularly acute as darkness fell. Large groups generally tended to increase positive senses of personal safety within the campus environment, while fewer people increased feelings of vulnerability (although the opposite effect can occur when the large group consists of perceived trouble-makers). In a university campus environment, campus users were reassured by the presence of other people in large numbers. Boyle et al. (2004) found that other people in an environment have a strong influence on an individual’s response to the space. In response to photographic images, they found that “the lack of people in a space was used by many respondents as a factor which would make them feel less comfortable.” In a campus setting, empty spaces were perceived as the most troublesome.

ID5 There’s usually a lot of people about in the daytime. FG1 STAFF

ID6 If you’re in a group you just go with the flow. When you are on your own your self preservation kicks in and you start to think about things that aren’t there, like shadows - it just heightens your awareness really. FG1 STAFF

ID7 I think even when you are on your own even if there is a lot of people around, even if you don’t know them you are likely to feel more safe than if you are the only person walking down the road. FG1 STAFF

ID6 It’s when there’s hardly anyone around that would make me feel uneasy. FG3 STUDENT

ID10 They say safety in numbers don’t they? FG3 STUDENT

The social environment was a stark issue on the night-time routes but was not as important in the daytime because the abundance of natural light appeared to be the
over-riding factor in fostering positive senses of personal safety, rather than the number of people.

**Nature of other people**

The number of people, or social presence, in the vicinity had a substantial effect on senses of personal safety, but this also related to the nature, or social identity, of other people. The quieter areas with fewer people present seemed to predicate an increased uneasiness and the focus group respondents discerned feeling safer as part of a group. Nasar et al. (1993, p.164) found that the social presence can shape feelings of personal safety. Fears increased at night, when the number of people in the environment diminished and the reduction in natural light were strongly correlated. Warr (1990, p.905) discovered that the role other people play in determining safety concerns is a complex matter: “the presence of others reduces fear through a presumption that offenders prefer isolated targets, then the presence of strangers (assuming they are non-threatening) may be as reassuring as that of, say, friends.” When the social presence consisted of perceived students then personal safety was not overtly affected.

*ID9* I mean there's always people hanging about, the majority I assume are students so I don't feel threatened by them. *FG1 R2 STAFF*

*ID10* Like you said here you feel more secure and safe because they are all students and someone knows somebody that you could find out whoever it was. *FG3 STUDENT*

This issue ties in with the open access nature of the campus, and the ability of anyone to walk on to the campus unchallenged, regardless of their relationship to the university:

*ID8* There was a thing about personal safety on campus with people coming into, people from the local area inviting themselves back to people's halls and stealing stuff from their rooms. *FG4 R4 STUDENT*
Proximity to other people

Campus users generally felt safer when there were other people nearby, particularly if they were other students. However an important point was raised by one of the visitors; how someone too close can invade your personal space and this can become a threat to your personal safety. Warr (1990, p.905) goes on to claim that the presence of others dramatically shapes fear of victimisation: "the company of non-dangerous others is reassuring, but being in the company of dangerous others is frightening." Krenichyn (2004) discovered, in an exploration of what feelings accompanied women's usage of a public park, that when safety concerns manifested themselves, women met with friends or acquaintances to provide reassurance, highlighting the issue of how personal safety concerns can be allayed by being in the company of trusted others.

ID10 I always feel fairly safe cos there's always people around any of the refectories if they are open FG1 R4 STAFF

ID8 I think it's just like being around people like not even on campus you know in a shopping centre I'd still feel safe because I know there's people everywhere so no one's going to come and attack you cos all you'd have to do is go "Help" FG3 STUDENT

ID1 And the people issue – it doesn't really bother me as much – what I feel about having people around me is if someone was too close to me – in my personal space, like if I'm in a busy high street and there's loads of people then that is a normal environment but if I was in an empty space like that and someone was really close to me then I would feel scared and uncomfortable FG5 R2 VISITOR

Security presence

Another observation was that designated security persons who could be easily identifiable and had a strong presence on campus were perceived as providing reassurance that considerably reduces concern for personal safety. Their presence was viewed as negligible on Glamorgan's campus; some respondents had not seen security guards on campus during their entire tenure. The perceived concern about the walk
between the campus and the train station at night was suggested to be remedied by having security guards patrolling this route, since the presence and visibility of identifiable security agents was viewed as enhancing personal safety, although it is debatable whether this would be possible because off-campus is the jurisdiction of the local police force. Students thought this would not be worthwhile during the day but at night they thought it would be quite useful, providing it did not restrict the open access of the campus. Another observation was that the university security personnel's weak presence on campus did not provide adequate reassurance to campus users. The other issue was having a balanced security presence; a reassuring presence without being overbearing. The importance of a trained and effective security force as an integral component of promoting campus safety is supported extensively in the literature (Gelber 1972; Nichols 1987; Sherrill 1989; Schuh 1998; Nicoletti et al. 2001).

ID1 Yes, patrolling security guards with high profile clothing so everyone is aware of what their certain responsibility are. FG1 STAFF

ID1 I think that's one thing that would make me feel more comfortable would be like having a security person who would respond; who you knew was within a couple of hundred metres of where you are at the time and is always on campus. FG2 R4 STAFF

ID6 It's alright having a security presence but it needs to be seen and it needs to be balanced as well because you don't want it to be like a prison FG5 R1 VISITOR

ID9 I think things like security patrols and stuff like that are more likely to make me think personally I'm safer FG6 R1 VISITOR

Security function

Another crucial determinant of perceptions of personal safety was the actual role and attitude of designated security persons. Although Glamorgan does indeed have security guards patrolling the campus their primary aim was perceived to be to manage and monitor the car parking facilities. The focus group respondents perceived security's role as to militantly identify illegally parked cars rather than as protectors in the event of
suffering harm. Another observation was that designated security persons were not clearly identifiable and did not have a strong presence on campus; they thus did not adequately fulfil their role as providing reassurance and reducing concern for personal safety. Students were worryingly ill-informed about security's role and their function, and how to contact them in an emergency. In contrast, security at Halls of Residence and the SU were widely praised. It was suggested that security guards should have a stronger presence on campus, and their remit should be explicitly to increase personal safety. This would provide reassurance that would considerably reduce concern for personal safety. Campbell and Bryceland (1998, p.37) suggest that “the time spent patrolling the campus by HEI security personnel is a very important aspect of ensuring a safe and secure campus.”

ID2  I would regard them as traffic wardens rather than security. It seems to be their main role. FG1 STAFF

ID3  Yes, they love doing that - it's disappointing cos they're paying attention to how many cars are parked where and stopping people from being naughty as opposed to funding more security guards at night. FG4 R2 STUDENT

Open access campus

While the open access policy of the university can be equated to the lack of literal physical restrictions that prevent people from accessing an environment, it is the consequent impact that this has on the social presence and composition that is perhaps most significant. This was a key influencing factor but seems to traverse both the physical and social elements of personal safety. The result of this is that ‘anyone’ can come on and off campus unchecked, regardless of whether they are there for reasons connected to university business or not, leading to increased opportunities for undesirable people to blend into the university population (Brantingham et al. 1995; Fisher 1997; Fisher and Nasar 1992; Rengert et al. 2001). This was a concern particularly at night, when there were less people available to provide natural surveillance and identify people who are not supposed to be there (but arguably this is difficult in the day too). However, this is a complex issue since the very ethos of an open access educational environment underpins the whole principle of a welcoming,
accessible and creative learning environment which would be dramatically altered if a fortress image was adopted. Sloan et al. (1996, p.84) observed that "campuses are typically park-like and easily accessible day and night. This openness may create high levels of fear and perceived risk of victimization among members of the campus community." Questions thus arise about how best to balance the conflicting issues of accessibility and safety. Campbell and Bryceland (1998, p.71) crystallise this succinctly: "failure to have some form of access control in place seriously undermines the overall security of the premises and any measures already applied." This was a concern particularly at night, when anyone can come on the campus, and when there were less people available to witness them. One issue raised was the logic of having one side of the campus open and another closed at night.

**ID6** People from anywhere can walk in and they're never apprehended at all so you could be anybody - nobody knows who is actually on campus and who is not. I think that's quite a big issue. That anyone can walk in and out at will. FG1 STAFF

However, campus users were adamant that an open-access environment was a fundamental part of the university ethos and experience and should not be sacrificed in the name of security. The introduction of ID cards is one possible method of monitoring the rightful use of campus facilities without suppressing the open access philosophy that underpins higher education establishments and which all focus group participants rigorously defended. Campbell and Bryceland (1998) suggest that "the foundation on which to build a safe and secure environment is a tried and tested access control policy."

The introduction of ID cards, perhaps initially limited only to certain areas of the campus, is one possible method of monitoring the rightful use of campus facilities without suppressing accessibility for valid campus users and overtly infringing on civil rights. Edwards (2000, p.50) argues meaningfully that "edges are best delineated by perception barriers than physical ones." Thus it is a delicate balance to appease security concerns, maintain civil rights and preserve good links with the adjacent community. The focus groups were asked whether they thought it would affect the atmosphere of the University in terms of its open access ethos if more severe approaches to boundary control were adopted, and the responses send a resoundingly clear message:

**ID2** You'd feel like you were in a fortress. FG3 R2 STUDENT
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ID6 If you were to gate areas and youngsters were coming in to the University - what kind of institution would they think we were? FG3 R2 STUDENT

ID6 They would literally think that we were an institution and it would make a lot of people fearful. FG3 R2 STUDENT

ID6 I don't think universities can go down the level where you've got perimeters totally secure. At the end of the day you are trying to sell the place to people and you want it to be welcoming and it's supposed to be like a university not a prison FG5 R5 VISITOR

**Sense of community**

This was a particularly strong theme and the University of Glamorgan ethos was viewed by staff and students as enhancing personal safety. As a 'widening participation' university with a social mission it was viewed as being a caring and considerate institution that implicitly looked after you and your welfare, and *ergo* your personal safety. In addition, the sense of community and oneness with fellow students was a strong correlate of personal safety. The role of community in influencing crime and fear of crime has been extensively researched; areas with high sense of community have reduced levels of fear and this plays a strong role in theories of criminality, such as Broken Windows theory. For example, if there is a sense of respect for a neighbourhood then fewer fears exist. This was cited frequently in the student focus groups, who also liked the fact that teaching staff intermingled with students in common areas such as refectories on campus. Boyer (1990) reinforces the view that a strong sense of community on campus can foster feelings of well-being and safety. Nichols (1987), meanwhile, argues that most colleges and universities share common features which contribute to a distinctive campus community and this can ultimately have positive consequences on personal safety. Pain and Townshend (2002, p.111) also found that "there is evidence that this feeling of community serves to reassure some people using shared public spaces."

ID2 It's vibrant isn't it? You know when the students are here during the term time. FG2 R3 STAFF
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ID3 It is different here, it's more of a community FG3 STUDENT

ID6 There's no ageism, there is no gender .... there's nothing - everyone just gets on and I think it's because that maybe it's the location of the place, I don't know. The people. FG3 R2 STUDENT

ID4 Also, we've all got that one thing in common. We've all given up whatever else we were doing - coming here is our choice; to learn, to better ourselves. We've all got that in common. FG3 R2 STUDENT

7.2 SECONDARY CASE STUDY – Loughborough University

No quantitative data is presented here because questionnaires were not distributed at Loughborough for practical reasons discussed in Chapter 6. Key pedestrian routes around Loughborough's campus were identified by observation and filmed using the VRPT. These images were taken back to the University of Glamorgan and shown to staff and students there – it is the findings of these focus groups which are presented in this section. (In the focus groups held at Loughborough, staff and students at Loughborough University took the role of potential visitors to Glamorgan's campus and their perceptions of personal safety were explored, as discussed in the previous section. Staff and students at Loughborough were not presented with images of their own campus).

7.2.1 Route analysis by observation

As discussed earlier, the routes on Loughborough University were not derived from questionnaires but, on a more practical basis, were based on observation of commonly used routes. These are shown in Table 7.7 and correspond with a route drawn on to a map of Loughborough campus shown in Image 7.21.
7.2.2 Perceptions of routes held by potential visitors

The transcript data was analysed in the same way as those from Glamorgan. Key themes emerged again, informed from the Delphi study and the themes arising in the Glamorgan analysis; there were certain features of the campus environment that invoked negative senses of personal safety and specific parts of the campus that fostered fear. These themes were categorised into the three causal groups of personal safety:
physical, social and personal, as shown in Figure 7.2. By identifying these key factors and discussing them in more depth in the focus groups, exploratory possible solutions to reduce negative perceptions of personal safety were explored. This has been structured so as to correspond with the three causal determinants of the personal safety triangle. For ease of presentation the key themes will be presented aggregated for the two user groups, then a comparison will be made between the user groups and between cases at the end of the chapter.
Table 7.8 demonstrates whether each of these themes was raised in each focus group, the ticks demonstrating how often the themes emerged: this shows how certain themes were salient to certain users, while others were not. The themes in the greyed out cells will not be discussed because of lack of space (this was based on a hierarchy of how often the themes emerged).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USER GROUP AND VRs</th>
<th>VISITORS L'BORO</th>
<th>VISITORS L'BORO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Determinants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day light</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard security devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and maps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Determinants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other people</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of other people</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to other people</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security presence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access campus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual triggers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio triggers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and perceptions of crime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of usage of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance/risk reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity/affinity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Induction courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal usage of campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning ahead/preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3 Determinants of personal safety identified by focus groups

The discussion has been structured so as to coincide with the personal safety triangle - these were the key themes that emerged from the data. The aggregated results are shown below for ease of presentation. They will only be supplemented by a discussion if they have not been mentioned in the earlier focus groups at Glamorgan, in order to avoid repetition. A summary of the comparison between perceptions of the different user
groups is located at the end of this section. Again, only pertinent physical and social
determinants are presented. Personal determinants are not discussed because of lack
of space.

7.2.3.1 Physical determinants

Night-time

ID9  In the days I wouldn't have any problems; in the night you just think
maybe 'what if'. FG7 R3 STAFF

ID10  Yeah I don't think I'd like to go through there (at night) FG8 R6 STUDENT

Image 7.22 Loughborough campus – route to main student village/halls of
residence

Darkness

ID4  There were quite a few places that looked quite dark and shadowy. FG7
R1 STAFF

ID4  You couldn't really be seen. Yes – like there FG7 R1 STAFF
ID 10 That's what I mean – it's so bright there and then boom! Nothing; there's just no consistency in the lighting FG8 R1 STUDENT

Day light

ID 10 Even in the day time the brighter buildings looks more inviting to walk through FG7 R2 STAFF

ID 11 I think it's even bigger in the day, when you look at the various shots FG8 R2 STUDENT

Lighting

ID 10 And there's a big contrast in lighting isn't there? FG7 R1 STAFF

ID 10 You know from really bright to that FG7 R1 STAFF
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Image 7.24 Loughborough campus route to Students’ Union, boiler room

ID11 Cos that’s excellent there I mean the lux level there is fantastic, you know
FG8 R1 STUDENT

Image 7.25 Loughborough campus, route to Students’ Union

ID9 Most of the lighting there appears to be coming from rooms – apart from the one that seems to be coming from a pillar there – if those room lights get switched off, how dark would it get? FG7 R1 STAFF
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ID4  I think that white bright lighting is more reassuring than the orange coloured sodium lighting. FG7 R1 STAFF

ID6  They could do with a couple of lights on this side FG7 R1 STAFF

Image 7.26 Loughborough campus, approach to Students' Union

ID4  Yes. I don't like it – it creates lots of shadows doesn't it? FG7 R5 STAFF

Image 7.27 Loughborough campus, route to halls of residence via conservation area
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Hard security devices

Swipe cards were discussed as ways of controlling entry to buildings, but they were viewed as an access control strategy that had the potential to be abused.

ID10 We used to have a pin code on our doors like they have on the left hand side there and umm when someone would leave if someone was coming in you'd just let them in – you didn't ask, you didn't note – you'd think they were visiting one of the other places so to be honest I think they're a waste of time – it just encourages vandalism. FG8 R3 STUDENT

SOS phones

Participants felt that security phones would be a good idea at Loughborough because of the vastness of the campus. At Glamorgan they thought they would be less effective because of the smaller site size. Kirk (1988) found that safety could be improved by having emergency telephones on campus.

ID10 It may be worth having you know like you see those SOS phones on motorways, because it's .... so vast – that would be worse a thing wouldn't it, because you think the security hut is on one end, you're on the other end? FG8 STUDENT

ID10 You could be there within a couple of minutes or two wherever you are on the campus whereas there like you said it took you 25 minutes from one end to the other. FG8 STUDENT

Campus boundary

ID10 It sort of relates to what we were talking about in the first session – when you are on campus you tend to feel safer umm because you know a lot of people and you recognise a lot of people but yes that's right close to ... anybody can come in there really, can't they? FG7 R4 STAFF
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Geographical location

They were asked if they went to an unfamiliar campus; would the automatically feel safer on the campus than in the local community and the consensus was that this depended on the location of the campus.

ID10  Umm I think it would depend on what kind of community it was really. So I think it would depend on the area that it is in FG7 STAFF

ID6  I suppose it is area – it depends where you go, doesn't it? It's the same with everything though – if you went anywhere you were visiting for business purposes; whether it was a university or a business, you would take where the locality is into consideration FG7 STAFF

Signage, maps and building names

ID10  You do want to know where you are – especially because it's a very big campus. I mean you could get lost, especially at night when you don't have as many landmarks really. FG7 R1 STAFF

ID10  Yeah, there's nothing to direct you is there? FG8 R1 STUDENT

ID10  The signage; there's not that much that you can see. There don't seem to be definite signage FG8 R2 STUDENT

Size of campus

This seemed to have a bearing on a visitor's perception of personal safety when they were unfamiliar with an environment. Loughborough is a large campus and this came across clearly in the VRs. The focus group participants felt that this would represent more of a challenge in terms of finding ones way around and potentially getting lost and this could have a consequent negative impact on personal safety because it increased vulnerability.
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ID4 I think going back to the issue about the size of the campus – you – that would have quite an impact because you'd only become familiar with a small part of it so if you were going to other parts of the campus you wouldn't know it at all probably, would you? Whereas here it is quite easy to become familiar fairly quickly with quite a big part of the campus FG7 R3 STAFF

ID11 I would imagine that people would get a bit worried you know arriving on such a big, open site, you know and you don't really know where you are going and what you are doing. FG8 R1 STUDENT

ID11 I think the sheer size of that worries me a bit FG8 STUDENT

ID11 It opens up the possibilities of things to happen. FG8 STUDENT

Environmental design

As in the Glamorgan case study, the impact of environmental design on perceptions of personal safety was profound. The key environmental design features discussed in relation to images of Loughborough campus are presented in Table 7.9.
Table 7.9 Key environmental determinants influencing perceptions of personal safety: Findings from the Loughborough case study focus groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL DETERMINANTS - ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 7</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USER GROUP AND VRs</td>
<td>VISITORS L’BORO</td>
<td>VISITORS L’BORO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and appearance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of alternative routes/choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building colour</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building design</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-up spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated or common routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightening spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of space</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass frontage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and upkeep</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe’ places</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus/space</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style and age</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As before, only the most pertinent issues are presented below.
Aesthetics and appearance

There was an interesting psychological connotation from a well maintained campus; that if care was given to the environment then so, as a consequence, was people’s personal safety. Again this ties in with how people respond to visual cues (Nasar et al. 1993) from their physical and social environment and how maintenance has implications for perceived welfare.

ID9  I’m just thinking off the top of my head now – the fact that we said earlier – with the Students’ Union building, all the glass made us feel better yet those workshops because they are grubby looking, you seem to not notice all the glass in them – it doesn’t seem to serve the same purpose because the buildings look so dowdy and unkempt FG7 STAFF

ID10 I think if it looks like umm it’s kept, there’s a very good upkeep on it you get the impression there’s a lot of people around, you know working and just more people I think, whereas the sort of darker sort of buildings with lots of alleyways and stuff umm it’s almost as if they are almost left and there’s not much done with them; and not many people around. FG7 R2 STAFF

ID3  Neglect means ‘oh we don’t care’. If it’s proficiently presented it means they care about the environment, they care about the buildings, they care about us. FG7 R2 STAFF
Apart from the first ones that we seen where like the pre-fabricated and the tower block that – if that was the place I wouldn't want to go, I wouldn't want to go any further if that was my first image of the place because that was my first thought – I don’t like that – it reminds me of a bad neighbourhood, a council, derelict place, but after seeing the rest of
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the place it really felt more community and a much safer place, a much nicer place. FG8 STUDENT

Alleyways

ID6 Like I would never, never go down there but if I did have to go down there I'd run FG7 R1 STAFF

Availability of alternative routes/choice of routes

ID10 It's more spread out. Some of the ones – I remember they were quite narrow paths weren't they umm but I mean unless it's quite an enclosed area you've got options about where you are walking really FG7 R4 STAFF

Building colour

This was a very interesting point raised about how the colour of a building's façade or construction materials can influence feelings of safety. This is supported in the literature, in particular by the work of Dalke (2004), who claims that "contrary to popular belief, individual colours are not so powerful that they can change moods, but different use of colour, light and design can influence the way people feel about their environments."

ID6 It does make a difference FG7 R1 STAFF

ID9 Because it illuminates and reflects FG7 R1 STAFF

ID9 It reflects any light that you have got so it makes it more prominent FG7 R1 STAFF

ID4 Again the dark colours of the buildings make it seem less safe I think FG7 R3 STAFF

In particular, light or white coloured facades made users feel safer by creating a sense of more space, cleaner lines and reflecting light.
Designated or common routes

Campus users as visitors took cues from the routes that the majority of people were using. This raises important issues about whether people use designated or official routes which may be well lit, or whether they use short cuts, which may by their nature be darker or more threatening.

ID10 That alley where the barrier is – the barrier is telling me that people don’t go down there. In fact, I mean I know it’s for vehicles but it just sort of says to me people don’t go down FG7 R1 STAFF

ID10 And it was interesting as well, the first one that we saw at night – and as visitors you knew that that was the main route to the union umm and it didn’t look like it at all and you think if it was well known that that was the main route to the union that there might be some more lighting umm even if it’s not an official route it is used a lot so FG7 R3 STAFF

Enclosed spaces

ID9 Yes. It might just be that it is closed in. There’s too many places where people might hide FG7 R1 STAFF

Image 7.30 Loughborough campus, short-cut to Students’ Union
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ID10 There's lots of sort of little cubby holes around there though; there are doorways FG7 R3 STAFF

ID9 You'd actually have to be in that, approaching that space before you could see, you'd have to be sort of there – if somebody was choosing to wait there – your not going to have the view to see them first – they've got the element of surprise that you haven't expected. FG7 R3 STAFF

ID10 There's so many places that you could hide FG8 R1 STUDENT

Function of space

ID10 Well at night I'd prefer to be around halls or sports centres or unions because there's more people around FG7 R1 STAFF

ID10 Yeah and you know that there's a lot of people there as well FG7 R1 STAFF

ID10 I'd turn it all into halls of residence – have it one or the other, not mixed. Because one the lighting, but I think in the daytime with the people, like I said, in their rooms and then you are teaching just a few metres away. It's just the lighting; it's so varied, so varied. FG8 R1 STUDENT

Maintenance and upkeep

ID9 If something is well kept and maintained – for some reason you get a mental impression of perhaps there's a bit more care; a bit more pride into what's going on as opposed to something that's a bit sort of not quite so well kept. FG7 R1 STAFF

ID9 Somebody cares, as you said earlier, if they care about the building then they care about you FG7 R4 STAFF
Obstructions

Obstructions not only appeared to effect perceptions of personal safety and aesthetics but also had an immediate impact on choice of route. This is a theme strengthened by Nasar et al. (1993) who found that removing obstructions, which acted as barriers to escapability, can reduce concerns for personal safety.

ID9 The only thing I thought was odd was the first, probably the second shot that you showed us, umm those large dustbins, container things – if that's a main route it was next to two sort of thick bollards; it just seemed an odd place to put – a little bit of thought into positioning them in a better place.

FG7 R2 STAFF

ID9 It just seemed to block the sort of the way through – if that's a main way for people to walk. Yes this shot here FG7 R2 STAFF
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Image 7.32 Loughborough campus, route obstructed by recycling bins

ID4 It creates a narrowing of the walkway and potentially somebody could be behind it FG7 R2 STAFF

ID3 It forces you to go down one route – if you block off that bit, you’re forced to go that way umm someone could be hidden behind it FG7 R2 STAFF

ID9 Your view is being restricted by it as well – you can’t see FG7 R2 STAFF

Open spaces

ID6 But the fact that it’s all grass. You can still see shadows even if you couldn’t you know pick out a figure - there’s nowhere to hide really is there? FG7 R1 STAFF

ID6 Yes and it is quite wide and open and you can see quite a way ahead of you FG7 STAFF
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Image 7.33 Loughborough campus, open vista to halls of residence

ID4  It's obvious they've got more space and therefore they can – they don't
      have to have everything on top of each other like it is here [in Glamorgan]
      FG7 STAFF

ID4  It feels safer if it's more open. It's not – there's not the little alleyways and
dark corners so much FG7 STAFF

ID10 This area of the university seems very umm very more open it's not so;
      the buildings are not on top of each other – there's a lot more open
      space FG8 R4 STUDENT
Safe places

When asked about what is it about this particular area that inspires more positive senses of personal safety they responded as follows:

ID9 It's not quite so closed in FG7 R1 STAFF
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ID11 It's bright, yeah FG7 R1 STAFF

ID4 And it looks well kept FG7 R1 STAFF

ID3 It's also the fact that the render on the building is white and it reflects back FG7 R1 STAFF

Style and age

There was a discussion about the type of building design currently popular, i.e. those finished with white cladding or constructed of glass and steel. The types of buildings were seen as reflecting the age of the campus. At Loughborough there was more freedom to construct buildings because of the amount of space, whereas in Glamorgan the small site constrains building construction and creates alleyways from the densely packed buildings.

ID3 You know you wouldn't paint that white because it's a non academic, office use type of building ... Yes a workshop. The types of buildings probably reflect the age FG7 R1 STAFF

Image 7.36 Loughborough campus, old-style maintenance buildings
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ID11 It’s a bit more like a university, isn’t it? FG8 R2 STUDENT

ID10 See it does look like somewhere you should be; whereas you go to the other side and it does look like it’s a converted council estate. FG8 R2 STUDENT

ID10 You see that looks like a university FG8 R2 STUDENT

Image 7.37 Loughborough campus, open panorama over rugby pitch

Vegetation

ID9 I’d want to pick up my pace a bit just because of the bushes either side of you. FG7 R3 STAFF

ID6 That would heighten your awareness, wouldn’t it? FG7 R3 STAFF

ID10 You see you’ve got that bush there – at night, who’s to say someone just jump out of the bush at you? FG8 R2 STUDENT

ID10 It’s the bushes that get me for a halls of residence sort of place; why there’s all these big bushes everywhere FG8 R3 STUDENT
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Visibility

ID9  Yes. You can see a long way ahead of you FG7 R1 STAFF
ID9  A lot of the area around you – you haven’t got this sort of tunnel feeling FG7 R1 STAFF

Windows

The focus groups were asked to comment on the number of windows and entrances to many of the buildings on campus being constructed of glass and whether that made a difference to their personal safety. It seemed to depend on the building function.

ID10  It’s interesting because that bit there the first bit, you know the workshop where the windows were very high umm that; if you go back around, there’s no windows there but it doesn’t seem as bad as the .. even though the windows are high there it doesn’t seem as bad as the workshop one because it’s brighter and lighter. FG7 R1 STAFF
ID10  Yeah it’s open and bright FG7 R1 STAFF

Image 7.38 Loughborough campus, glass frontage to halls of residence
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ID10 Yes. Because that is – you wouldn't feel threatened with that cos you can see under the stairs. FG8 R3 STUDENT

7.2.3.2 Social determinants

Number of other people

ID6 You don’t feel quite so intimidated then if you’re in a big group do you? FG7 R3 STAFF

ID6 If I’m on my own I am more aware than if I was with my family or a group of people – I don’t even think about it then. FG7 R3 STAFF

Nature of other people

ID10 I think generally it’s not a huge problem but you do feel – when you do see people around that you recognise you do let your defences down FG7 R4 STAFF

ID10 A little bit I think umm you know when you are in a very, very familiar place; particularly the students if they were – if they’d gone to the union at night, mucking around and stuff, their defences aren’t up at all – it’s not like if they were in the middle of a city centre and they don’t know anybody FG7 R4 STAFF

Security presence

ID9 I think it would make you feel a little bit better to see somebody FG7 STAFF

ID3 You just know there’s somebody there who’s doing a job looking after yourself, your belongings, whatever. Yes; it’s just a reassurance thing FG7 STAFF
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**ID6** On a larger campus I would expect a heightened awareness of security so I would expect them to have CCTV around. Obviously they can't man every huge campus like that all the time so I would then expect them to put umm things in place; security measures in place such as the cameras, security lighting, you know and just maybe have the occasional person wondering about – just for heightened security FG7 R3 STAFF

**Open access campus**

**ID3** We don't know who, what people are here for. It's easy to blend in, walk around for two or three days FG7 R6 STAFF

**ID3** I think if there are people out in the community who want to come on to any campus and create trouble, they will do so – it's just how you limit it, how can you sort of prevent it and I think as you said looking through this; it's good use of maybe CCTV cameras, regular patrols by people not doing the same route at the same time, breaking up routes, visiting paths then at night maybe use and good lighting systems and maybe colour differentiation on certain buildings. FG7 R6 STAFF

**ID11** You know, if you can walk on to it from the outside, one would assume you'd get the weird people who do that sort of thing and it frightens some on the site I'd have thought. FG8 R2 STUDENT

**Sense of community**

**ID10** Yeah but then like we said last time – wasn't it – when you're in university it's a bit like a campus code, isn't it? You don't thing and everyone seems to be just smile even if you don't know 'em. FG8 R3 STUDENT
7.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I will now look at the aggregated findings for the themes that emerged across all user groups and both campuses, as demonstrated in Figure 7.3. In total the following themes emerged from all of the focus groups:

- 14 physical determinants (and a further 29 environmental design determinants)
- 16 social determinants
- 11 personal determinants

Figure 7.3 Key determinants of personal safety – aggregated for all user groups and across two case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical determinants</th>
<th>Social determinants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>Number of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>Nature of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Proximity to other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Security presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard security devices</td>
<td>Security function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus boundary</td>
<td>Open access campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>Proximity to traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and building names</td>
<td>Sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport modes</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of year</td>
<td>Visual triggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Audio triggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside buildings</td>
<td>Porters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus</td>
<td>Crime and perceptions of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td>ID Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and appearance</td>
<td>Security procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Frequency of usage of route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of alternative routes/choice of routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building colour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building configuration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-up spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated or common routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightening spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass frontage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and up-keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Safe’ places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus/space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style and age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal determinants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance/risk reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Induction courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal usage of campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning ahead/preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.1 The University of Glamorgan

The findings encouragingly suggest that the University of Glamorgan’s Trefforest campus is a safe place during the day and there is probably little that can be done to improve it in the day. Naturally occurring conditions as a direct result of the university environment such as institutional responsibility and high social presence denote that personal safety is almost inherent to the university during the day. However, perceptions of safety noticeably decreased at night, and this is exacerbated by certain features of the physical and social environment. So although it is inescapable that darkness reduces feelings of personal safety, solutions can be recommended based on this study. Certainly, increased lighting and CCTV would provide reassurance but a key recommendation would be to have an increased security presence patrolling the campus, and the local environs, and to strengthen the image and relationship of security staff with university users. Positive perceptions of personal safety were less apparent on the Glyntaff campus, primarily due to participants having a lack of familiarity with it, its location in a more remote part of the area and its function as a mainly academic rather than social site. Furthermore, the construction work taking place on the campus at the time of filming had a tangible negative impact on the perceptions of campus users. The hoarding, cones and portocabins all gave the site a temporary feel and suggested that less care was taken over safety issues. To sum up for both of Glamorgan’s campuses, measures which concentrate on the physical, proximate features of the environment are key ways of promoting personal safety, and social measures should also be considered, particularly the availability of a designated security person in times of need. There was clearly uncertainty about the role of security personnel. This is something that needs to be addressed as it is symptomatic of a more widespread lack of clarity among campus users in general. This confirms the findings of the Delphi study; that social factors such as the presence of other people and physical factors such as the environment and time of day all contribute to perceptions of personal safety.

7.3.2 Loughborough University

There was limited scope for assessing personal safety on this campus because I only explored visitors’ perceptions of the campus, rather than additionally those of staff and students resident at the university. However, the general view was that it appeared a relatively safe campus in the eyes of potential visitors, although the vastness of the site was cause for concern. Very similar issues were raised to those
at Glamorgan, pertaining to darkness and the change in perceived safety as a result of coming off campus into the local community. Overall, the respondents did not have any major concerns about their personal safety that would lead them to overtly fear for their personal safety or, perhaps worse, perceive the campus to be a threatening, dangerous and un-welcoming environment. The campus was viewed to have some good security measures, to be well maintained, and not an environment that would greatly precipitate crime and harm against the person. Respondents did not perceive themselves to be at risk during the day, but their perceived risk increased substantially on campus when light conditions decreased. All groups indicated a decreased sense of safety over the course of the day as darkness fell and fewer people were nearby. Interestingly, the use of light coloured building facades boosted feelings of personal safety at night. The findings encouragingly suggest that the campus is a safe place during the day but features of the physical environment at night, in particular enclosed and dark areas, need to be addressed.

7.3.3 Assessment of the two case studies

Both cases seemed to produce findings in support of some of the themes raised in Chapter 2, the personal safety literature review, Chapter 4, the Delphi findings and Chapter 5, the campus literature review. Brantingham et al. (1995, p.129) argue that “neither is fear of crime randomly or uniformly distributed in time and space. It varies by time, place, situation, demographic characteristics, experience and personality. Even with this variability, clear patterns in crime and fear of crime frequently emerge.” I think the findings from the two cases support this view – the Delphi study demonstrated that personal safety is indeed constructed from a variety of factors at play, but the case studies demonstrate that common patterns and themes have emerged as to what shapes personal safety on campuses. The key fear cues they flagged up came across strongly in this study; darkness, social presence and isolation. Furthermore these related to a lack of familiarity and the physical environment and were common themes to the focus groups. Interestingly, the two case studies produced remarkably similar results. There were no widely divergent themes that emerged from the analysis; most of the issues raised at Loughborough had already been discussed in Glamorgan, which indicates that the same issues face people when they are presented with different campus environments. Themes raised by potential visitors to Loughborough’s campus were concurrent to those raised by staff, students and visitors to Glamorgan but minor or more subtle differences emerged. Perhaps the most interesting was the issue of building colour and how
buildings with a white façade were perceived to promote personal safety. The other issue was that the VRs managed to convey the sheer vastness of Loughborough's campus and the size was perceived as increasing vulnerability. Again the issue of getting lost was raised, as was the importance of having clear and regularly placed signage. In addition the function of space was viewed as important—in particular the differences between, for example, a boiler room and a new academic block, were acutely observed. The issue of vegetation came up more obviously on Glamorgan's campus but Loughborough has actually got more vegetation. However it does not seem to be as big an issue because it is spread out over a bigger campus and there were lots of playing fields and open spaces. Furthermore, there were natural differences in the impressions of the sites because Glamorgan is more densely packed with buildings, while Loughborough has a bigger site and more green and open. What is evident is that a number of the issues that arose in the focus groups were iterated from the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5, which strengthens their validity.

Although the results are not presented here because I have not discussed aspects of the 'personal' determinants of personal safety, the notion of familiarity with an environment was a recurrent and strong theme. The more that campus users were familiar with an environment, the safer they felt. This was particularly acute in the visitor responses when faced with an unfamiliar campus. This is something echoed by Boyle et al. (2004).

7.4 SUMMARY OF EACH USER GROUP

This discussion will be brief because there were only minor observable differences in the perceptions between user groups. It was anticipated that there may have been more starkly divergent views that characterised the different perspectives of the three user groups so it was interesting that this was not the case. The findings demonstrated that different user groups exhibited mainly common concerns for personal safety and only minor differences existed in their interactions and interpretations of the campus environment, primarily as a result of their tacit relationship to the university, dependant on whether they worked at, studied at or visited the campus. This in turn impacted on the frequency with which they visited the campus, their concept of familiarity with the environment and the time they spent on campus. What is clear though is that there were common themes that emerged for all three user groups which indicate that similar personal safety concerns face
different campus users regardless of their affiliation to the university. This makes personal safety promotion an easier task.

7.4.1 Staff

Staff tended to use only small parts of the campus that they needed as part of their job compared to students. They were thus less concerned about personal safety overall. They were more concerned about car parks, especially isolated parts like the tunnel end of the car park, since they relied more on their cars as transportation to and from the university. However, they were proactive in reducing concerns for their personal safety and took such preventative behaviour as moving their car near their building of work if they were working late or if it was going to be dark when they finished work. Interestingly, what came across is that staff, students and visitors do have different daily routines on campus, as supported by Wooldredge et al. (1995, p.103). This meant that they may experience different actual risks of being harmed but the study demonstrated that their fears and concerns for personal safety have a similar basis.

7.4.2 Students

Minor differences included that students were more concerned about youths hanging around the campus and they also did not feel that the campus was divided according to building function as the staff did. Certainly students daily routines on campus differed to staff because they are often more exposed to risks; they move more frequently from building to building over the course of a day and may be on campus later at night, whether for late lectures, visiting the library or socialising in the Students' Union. Perhaps because of this, students were generally more laid back and savvy than staff out of necessity. Despite age and potentially more exposure to risk due to the time spent on campus and increased reliance on walking and public transport than staff, personal safety was of importance to students and they relied on their friends for support. Students were annoyed by the closure of the Brook Street gate because this meant they were forced into going a longer way around to their Halls of Residence, and this potentially exposed them to more risk. This issue should be carefully considered by campus managers. This was also raised in the visitor groups as paradoxical, especially since the true aim of closing the gate was unclear. The students were particularly aware of an acute sense of community on campus. This was not mentioned by visitors (for obvious reasons) and it was only mentioned
briefly by staff, perhaps indicating that they had less affiliation with the university; it being primarily a place of work, rather than a place to live, learn and socialise. Students felt a sense that they were all on campus for one purpose and thus experienced a sense of unity with fellow students which inspired positive senses of personal safety. This could also in part be because of the small size of Glamorgan's campus which may foster a more intimate atmosphere.

7.4.3 Visitors

This is the group which can be compared directly with staff and students because the potential visitors came from another campus. The most obvious theme that emerged from the visitors as unique was the issue of unfamiliarity with a campus environment and consequent concerns for getting lost. This issue is borne out by visitors, who were predominantly concerned about transport issues and arriving at unfamiliar campus, as well as getting lost. This was considered more important than personal safety but further probing revealed that the two issues are linked. This stresses the need for effective campus maps, signage and route indicators on campus, since getting lost increases risk and vulnerability. Visitors to both campuses were generally more aware of the environment, especially in terms of scanning the environment for cues that would allay their unfamiliarity, such as maps and signage.

7.5 CRITIQUE OF METHODS USED

The methodology shows how the impact of the physical and social environment on personal safety can be successfully assessed and the findings demonstrate how a sample of user groups perceived their personal safety. The focus groups proved an effective forum for discussion and the meaningful findings tell us what physical and social attributes of the campus need to be addressed to improve personal safety for users. The focus group approach also allowed for a more holistic endeavour to capture the various facets of personal safety as experienced by the users and the subjectivity of their interpretations and experiences. This takes forward study in this area from the traditionally quantitative research methodologies that have conventionally underpinned campus crime and victimisation research. The focus groups were very effective in exploring perceptions; the methods used were highly transferable and lent themselves well to being used on a second campus away from the primary case study. There were minor technical problems, such as the more basic recording equipment that was available for travel, but the focus groups
ultimately ended up in the same DVD format for ease of transcription. Indeed, the virtual reality panorama tool was very effective for bringing the environment to the respondents. Its weaknesses, however, were that it presented only 2-dimensional representations of the campus, and the dynamics of real-life situations and changes in the social environment were lost (although a pleasing outcome was that the participants discussed issues related to social presence without being presented with a transient social environment on the VRs). Respondents were also dependent on solely visual triggers and not other sensory cues such as auditory triggers that would be present in reality. Furthermore, the amalgamation of routes meant that campus users, in particular those familiar with the environment, had to use their imaginations because the routes filmed were not necessarily the shortest routes (which people would really use) but joined on so that maximum coverage of the campus could be presented in fewer routes. Warr (1990) asserts that people frequently evaluate their risk of crime by scanning their immediate environment for signals of danger; the methodology thus allowed an exploration of some facets of the proximate environment as they exist in actuality. Although the research focused mainly on physical elements of the campus it is still pertinent to explore social and personal attributes in order to produce a well-rounded picture of personal safety, and develop the most well-informed recommendations for possible improvement solutions. A final issue is that my specific research objectives and intentions did mean that the issue of personal safety was deliberately raised in the focus groups and this could have raised fears merely by drawing attention to the issue of campus safety. However, I believe I overcame this satisfactorily by the careful wording of questions and avoiding unnecessarily provocative or dramatic language. In addition, these issues were considered in the Ethics process and the participants were well-informed of what was required of them.

7.6 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

I will now address the issues of external validity and reliability. External validity refers to what extent my findings will be applicable to other university campuses. The first point to address is that of the case study as my chosen research strategy. It is difficult to justify the applicability of case study findings on the basis of one case alone, but multiple cases can strengthen claims of generalisability to other comparable universities. (Yin 2003, p.53) suggests that “if ... you still can arrive at common conclusions from both cases, they will have immeasurably expanded the external generalisability of your findings.” According to Hummer (2004) exploratory
research, which is essentially what my study is, has limited power to be generalised. Instead he proposes that such findings are used as 'baseline data'. Thus in terms of applicability to other campuses then my findings provide a starting point for promoting personal safety, some clear insights into themes and issues that can influence personal safety and a springboard for further research.

The University of Glamorgan has a unique location, ethos and history, as does Loughborough University. However, I would suggest that they both, along with other campus universities, share common physical features: university campuses are contained in a defined area; they have common buildings and spaces such as car parks and share common access issues. When focusing on the physical environment and social factors such as security I would argue that the insights gleaned are transferable to some degree to other campus settings. Although conclusions cannot be generalised to the entire population of campus users because of the small sample size, the data provided descriptively rich and valuable information. It seems reasonable to suggest that valid insights gleaned from the case studies may be transferable to other campus environments to promote personal safety because both studies revealed common themes. The other issue is that of reliability; in other words would someone else who assessed the campus obtain the same findings as I did? (Saunders et al. 2003). This a difficult issue because the very nature of focus groups and their dynamics mean that the same issues may potentially not arise in other discussions. The focus group findings are a product of the specific people who take part and their responses at a specific time. However, if presented with the same environmental stimuli and the same questions then it is feasible that the same general themes would emerge. Would another researcher arrive at the same conclusions that I have? I have aimed to convey openly and transparently the various steps and processes of the research and analysis that I have undertaken. However, the very nature of exploring the subjective view means that the scope for differences is possible. Yet, I think that the general themes that emerged from the data would still be identified and the Delphi study findings would provide guidance on the possible themes to emerge, supported by the fact that Loughborough staff and students identified common issues to those from Glamorgan.

7.7 CONCLUSION

The findings from both case studies showed recurrent themes, and these were further iterated among the different user groups within the case studies. The findings
from both studies can be amalgamated to form an overall framework of key recommendations for improved personal safety which will be discussed in Chapter 8. The findings from the analysis of the focus groups from the primary study at Glamorgan demonstrate the key determinants of personal safety and confirm the findings from those discussed in Chapter 4 which presented the findings from the Delphi study. The results from the supplementary study at Loughborough University verify these findings and demonstrate the general applicability of not only the methods used but also the key findings. In addition the results from both studies are supported by criminological theory and research discussed in Chapter 2, in particular how the environment can shape fear of crime. Indeed the findings suggest that personal safety and crime have similar features and that although personal safety or 'freedom from intentionally motivated harm' is a wider construct than crime (which is limited to certain offences), personal safety research promises to contribute to the wider criminological debate and supplement the existing literature.

The findings and discussion presented in this chapter usefully highlight how features of the social and physical environment influence perceptions of personal safety. These are also given greater credence by the supporting campus research presented in Chapter 5. In particular, the findings support the important work into campus crime and fear of crime presented by Nasar and Fisher and echoes their findings that features of the proximate social and physical environment play a key role in shaping campus users fears and concerns for personal safety. Furthermore, the themes that arose in the focus groups exhibit commonalities with the principles of CPTED discussed in Chapter 2. How users' fears translate into practical and cost-effective remedies to promote personal safety on campus will be explored in Chapter 8.

This study contributes and enhances criminological and campus crime literature by its novel qualitative approach. Since the majority of previous research adopts quantitative methodologies and bases crime reduction strategies on crime data and official crime statistics, the research presented here sought to enhance research in the field by providing a different perspective and data source, with the additional aim of providing practical guidelines for facilities managers on university campuses as to how their efforts are best directed to reduce crime and personal safety concerns on campuses. Interestingly, the findings support the quantitative literature that focuses on crime and the environment but instead offer a different perspective on the issue. The study confirmed that qualitative, user-led research, with an emphasis on perceptual insights, provides a detailed, contextual and more comprehensive
understanding of how campus users decode their environment and how the built environment of a campus can engender feelings of both fear and safety. Focus groups provided an ideal arena in which to discuss important issues in detail and while features of the campus that influenced personal safety were sought, the reasons why they did so could be readily probed. This information can supplement the data based research and suggests that the two approaches are compatible and can best be used in tandem to lead to better informed security and crime reduction solutions.

This chapter has successfully addressed the following three research objectives:

**RO4:** To apply this definition practically and conceptualise a review of personal safety on university campuses using a case study research method to probe the personal perceptions of campus users

**RO7:** To contribute to the literature and knowledge-base of campus safety research

I will now direct my attention to how best to translate these findings into practical recommendations that universities can use to improve personal safety on their campuses.
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8.0 INTRODUCTION

In response to the issues raised in Chapter 7 a number of key themes and practical solutions emerged as to how to improve perceptions of personal safety on campus. This study presents one of the first attempts at providing recommendations for how campuses could be modified to improve perceptions of personal safety based on a user-led methodology. The research findings from the two campus case studies have revealed some decisive common themes for how a campus can be made to feel safer based on user responses. As discussed in Chapter 7 these are not only supported by the Delphi study findings (Chapter 4) but are also supported in the academic literature (Chapters 2 and 5). The outcome of the study was the development of an initial framework of recommendations which can contribute to our understanding of how people perceive and decode a university campus environment. This is particularly beneficial to the literature and debate on campus safety and has implications and benefits for campus facility managers who may wish to incorporate the findings into their safety practices and procedures which are supported by empirical and evidence-based research. The methodology used demonstrates how a relatively straightforward assessment of spaces can lead to solutions and recommendations to improve environments based directly on the needs and perceptions of space users. These will be explored below in relation to existing literature and their relative strengths and weaknesses are appraised.

8.1 A NOTE ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY AND ACTUAL SAFETY

Having discussed my broadly interpretative philosophical approach in Section 6.4 some discussion is necessary on the exact legitimacy and merit of the practical outcomes and potential benefits that the research findings from the campus case studies provide. This thesis has focused on the exploration of perceptions of personal safety on campuses, rather than actual safety in terms of objective risk based on recorded crime data. Therefore it is important to note that the recommendations presented in this chapter are intended to improve perceptions of personal safety on campus rather than the actuality of safety on campus. The recommendations cannot provide any fail-safe guarantees of a safe campus or safe campus users. Rather, they pertain to addressing key issues that will make a perceived safer campus. The key concepts and themes that are presented
here are intended to increase understanding of the relationships at play between campus users and their environment, an increased awareness of which will potentially enable a better understanding of the personal safety needs of campus users and how certain environmental features can enhance or reduce perceptions of personal safety. Based on a qualitative perceptual approach a general framework of user-environment interaction was created. The underlying philosophical approach does not seek to provide a generalised understanding of how all campus users may respond to all campuses but instead to generate themes for action which might improve the perceptions of personal safety on the case study campuses.

Nasar et al. (1993, p.176), however, suggest that the issues of perception and actuality may be entwined: “although fear does not always reflect patterns of crime, in this case, reductions in fear through environmental manipulation might well reduce the likelihood of an offence.” Indeed, the key themes and recommendations presented in this chapter can be seen to echo major crime reduction strategies used by the police all over the world. In this sense, the recommendations can be viewed as potentially fulfilling a second role of reducing actual intentional harm too. The key themes presented in this chapter are relevant to the issues raised in Chapter 5, the campus crime literature review, which highlighted research which demonstrated that targeting the physical environment in order to reduce crime and fear of crime was a viable and effective tool in appeasing students concerns. Indeed, what is again apparent is that crime and personal safety have commonalities. What is particularly discernable is that the methods for reducing crime and fear of crime are echoed in the recommendations to reduce fears of personal safety. This again reinforces the literature in Chapter 2 and the Delphi study in Chapter 4 - that they are similar concepts. This indicates that my research may have transferable implications for crime reduction strategies and provides persuasive evidence that objective and subjective approaches to personal safety and crime research can compliment and reinforce each other.

It should also be noted that making people feel safe or safer is an important objective in itself; discussions in earlier chapters on the distress and disruption that fear for safety can cause to quality of life is testament to this. Therefore, creating a university environment where people feel safer will encourage campus users to maximise their usage and enjoyment out of a university and its facilities, thereby enhancing their overall...
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educational experience. This is notwithstanding the caveat that creating a campus which feels safer should not be construed as one which is also consequentially safe.

Due to the nature of my research methods, generalisability to all campus universities would be impossible to defend. However, I do argue that the insights about campus safety and the proposed recommendations should be more widely relevant because of their verification from across the two case studies and from support in the literature. However, this should be done with caution and further research in this area could investigate this.

Crucially, I have taken an overall pragmatic approach to the research, with the research methods being chosen based on their relevance and suitability to addressing the specific research questions and objectives rather than because of any adherence to a particular philosophical research paradigm. Thus I have used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. This is a position which Hathaway (1995, p.539) asserts is a legitimate path to take and is in contrast to the 'purist' view, which advocates using only one research approach since "the philosophies grounding the two approaches are so divergent in terms of assumptions about the world, truth, and reality that one should not even consider combining quantitative and qualitative research." The pragmatist instead adopts a more practical approach, considering a combination of these approaches if appropriate, which are "capable of simultaneously bringing to bear both of their strengths to answer a research question." (Hathaway 1995, p.539). It is this notion which underpins my central argument that campus users' perceptions can be used to inform campus modifications to foster increased senses of personal safety on university campuses.

8.2 SUMMARY OF OVERALL FINDINGS

A number of key recommendations are proposed and these have been arranged into categories following the three critical determinants that were found to impact on perceptions of personal safety, as laid out in Chapters 3, 4 (The Delphi studies) and 7 (please note only the most pertinent issues identified are discussed here due to lack of space). They are: those which relate to physical factors and the design, redesign or maintenance of the physical environment of the campus and those that focus on the social environment. This section will be structured according to the causal groups of the
personal safety triangle as depicted in Figure 8.1 below. This discussion involves an exploration and critical evaluation of the five main physical and social factors associated with increased perceived risk. This follows from the focus group discussions.

Figure 8.1 Recommendations will be made along the outline of the three critical determinants of personal safety:

The discussion from the focus groups at both universities revealed some decisive common themes in terms of aspects of the campus environment that were considered to impact on perceptions of personal safety. These have been developed into a composite framework that can be used as a template by campus managers to improve personal safety on campus (see Figure 8.2 later on in this chapter) and can contribute to the literature and theory on campus safety.

8.3 A USER-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR PERSONAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

The possible solutions and recommendations to improve campus safety can be ranked according to how common an issue they were across the focus groups. Based on Table 8.1 presented below and reiterated from Chapter 7, a coherent framework and hierarchy of solutions to improve personal safety on campuses can be developed. There were 14 key physical determinants, with a further 29 environmental design attributes, 16 key social determinants and 11 key personal determinants. Interestingly, Table 8.1 allows
for a useful assessment of how each individual element ranked in importance in relation to other user groups.
## Table 8.1: A hierarchy of determinants of personal safety per causal group placed in rank order: Findings from the two case study focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant Group</th>
<th>% of user groups who cited</th>
<th>Determinant of potential safety</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 1</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 2</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 3</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 4</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 5</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 6</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 7</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>100 Night-time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>100 Lighting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td>100 Environmental design</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>87.5 Darkness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day light</td>
<td>87.5 Day light</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard security devices</td>
<td>75 Hard security devices</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and maps</td>
<td>75 Signage and maps</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus boundary</td>
<td>62.5 Campus boundary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>62.5 Geographical location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport modes</td>
<td>37.5 Transport modes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside buildings</td>
<td>25 Inside buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of year</td>
<td>12.5 Time of year</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>12.5 Weather</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of campus</td>
<td>12.5 Size of campus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access campus</td>
<td>100 Open access campus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other people</td>
<td>87.5 Number of other people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security presence</td>
<td>87.5 Security presence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of other people</td>
<td>75 Nature of other people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>62.5 Sense of community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to other people</td>
<td>50 Proximity to other people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to traffic</td>
<td>50 Proximity to traffic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Cards</td>
<td>50 ID Cards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>37.5 Isolation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual triggers</td>
<td>37.5 Visual triggers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security function</td>
<td>25 Security function</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio triggers</td>
<td>25 Audio triggers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of usage of route</td>
<td>25 Frequency of usage of route</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>12.5 Porters</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and perceptions of crime</td>
<td>12.5 Crime and perceptions of crime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security procedures</td>
<td>12.5 Security procedures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance/risk reduction</td>
<td>75 Avoidance/risk reduction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity/affinity</td>
<td>75 Familiarity/affinity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>75 Awareness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Induction courses</td>
<td>50 PS Induction courses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>50 Vulnerability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal usage of campus</td>
<td>37.5 Personal usage of campus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>25 Intuition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning ahead/preparation</td>
<td>25 Planning ahead/preparation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td>12.5 Common sense</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>12.5 Personality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>12.5 Mobile phones</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8.4 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON SALIENCE AND PRACTICALITY

A critical analysis of the key determinants of personal safety on campus was undertaken with an insightful critique of how these translate into manageable personal safety recommendations. Due to space constraints only those ranked at or over 50% in the physical and social groups in Table 8.1 will be included in detail in the recommendations but the other factors should also be considered by campus officials in an endeavour to develop a holistic approach to promoting personal safety on campus.

8.4.1 Physical determinants

8.4.1.1 Lighting levels

The campuses were perceived to be a lot safer in the day because visibility and intervisibility was naturally enhanced by daylight. Daylight also had a corresponding natural influence on the presence and number of other people in the vicinity which also boosts perceptions of safety. However, perceptions changed dramatically at night time with the reduction in natural light and the corresponding reduction of the important social presence. Campus users' main source of surveillance and visibility at night is therefore street-lighting and this played a crucial role in shaping campus users' perceptions of personal safety. Not only is it important to have sufficient lighting over the campus but the nature and locations of the lighting is crucial. Campus users disliked yellow sodium lighting because it created shadows and instead preferred white lighting and floodlighting. However this could have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring residents and community relations. Location of street-lighting was also significant; users felt that any negative features of the physical environment of the campus could be dated by shining light on them, such as lanes or alleyways. In addition, attention must be paid to the commonly used routes. These may not correspond to official or designated routes; some may be short cuts. But if they are going to be used as common routes then they should be well lit.
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8.4.1.2 “Hard” security devices

CCTV plays a key role in making campus users feel safer. However there is a lot of cynicism aimed at CCTV; users complained that they were poorly monitored, often ran out of tape and were used only after a crime had been committed rather than to monitor what was occurring on campus in real time and act as a preventative measure. This clearly needs to be addressed in order to restore confidence in CCTV (it is interesting to note that since this study began the University of Glamorgan has upgraded their CCTV system). Other useful suggestions were for ‘panic’ or information points to be scattered around the campus; similar to the devices found on Arriva Trains Wales stations, whereby an electronic box links an intercom with security staff. In a campus context, a similar device could operate by depressing a button which provides the campus user with a direct line to security staff who can advise and come to their aid. Although the potential is there for abuse it is worth considering that these devices are particularly of use in remote or isolated parts of campuses, such as car parks. They can additionally be monitored by CCTV to reduce misuse. Although these were perceived to be more useful on larger campuses they may be useful in isolated parts of any campus (like car-parks) because of the inability to move such static features of the environment.

8.4.1.3 The campus boundary

This served as a defining and tangible line with regards to perceptions of personal safety. Campus users generally felt less safe out of the university environment. This is difficult because in the local community you are in the domain of the local police force and the onus is on police officers to come to your aid rather than university security staff. However, because the concerns were raised in relation to transport nodes, especially the train station and car parks, then it is feasible to have better security, lighting and CCTV on these routes to boost perceptions of personal safety.

8.4.1.4 Signage and building names

Signage and clear directions played a key role in how visitors perceived their safety on campus. Their main concern was for getting lost but this can increase vulnerability and
therefore have a negative impact on personal safety. Therefore clear signage and well marked building names is vital. This was also applicable to local transport modes; visitors felt safer when they were sure of which stop they had to exit a bus or train and were guided appropriately to a university. This issue also relates to staff and students on campus. In particular, it was noted that a recent decision to rename buildings on Glamorgan’s campus was ill-considered. Traditionally buildings on campus were referred to by letters from the alphabet, such as D-block and B-block. However, these were changed to names such as ‘Ely’ building. This caused substantial confusion because room numbers are still based on the old system: for example, my office in G-block is G717. However it is now called ‘Rhondda’ building, so based on the new nomenclature there is no apparent link that allows someone looking for a room to determine its location. This caused confusion and again the issue of getting lost, and the consequent impact this had on personal safety, was raised. Since this study was carried out, the University of Glamorgan has improved signage on and off campus to direct visitors to the university.

8.4.1.5 Environmental design

There were a large number of features of the environment and its design that played a role in shaping feelings of fear or safety; these have been condensed and put into bullet points for ease of discussion:

- The overall aesthetic appearance of the university should be optimised and maintenance and upkeep is paramount. Any signs of neglect or poor upkeep such as graffiti or rubbish should be removed immediately.

- Alleyways and enclosed spaces on campus should be removed wherever possible because a sense of confinement reduced feelings of personal safety because it provides limited opportunities for escape or surveillance. Where this is not possible, enclosed areas should be free of high or dense vegetation and should be well lit. The polar opposite of such spaces was perceived to boost feelings of personal safety; open spaces were viewed positively because visibility was high and there were limited places for potential offenders to hide.
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- One of the most interesting issues raised pertaining to environmental design was the colour of buildings. Interestingly, modern buildings clad in white were seen as having a positive impact because they reflected light, thereby giving the impression of more space and visibility, and there was some level of association between new buildings, aesthetics and safety. Newer buildings would by definition be cleaner and less run down and this inspired positive senses of personal safety. While it would be strange to paint an entire campus white, this is nonetheless an interesting way of promoting personal safety.

- In a similar way newer buildings often had large glass entrances; this transpired to be a positive feature. People could see in and out, it blurred the line between the internal and external environment and provided opportunities for natural surveillance. It also provided reassurance that there would be assistance nearby. Windows produced a similar result, providing you could see in and out.

- Attention should also be paid to the usage of routes on campus. Firstly, users felt more confident when they had a choice of routes. They could therefore make an informed choice or risk assessment of the routes and decide which one they preferred to use. Some would choose short-cuts while others would choose longer but perceived safer routes. Choice is therefore very important. However, some commonly used routes are not necessarily designated or well defined routes. They may be the quickest route from A to B but if they are heavily used routes then better lighting would boost safety.

- This also relates to the open accessibility of the campus; on Glamorgan's campus, the main route to the Halls of Residence was restricted by a locked gate at night; students therefore usually climbed the eight foot high gate to gain access. The anomaly here was that they were otherwise forced on a longer route to the open side of the campus, thus it did not make sense to have one side blocked and one open, because personal safety could be compromised late at night if a student is forced to walk the long way around. This was perceived as illogical because other parts of the campus were entirely open access.
Obstructions should also be removed where possible. Skips and wheelie bins represented places for people to hide and also reduced visibility. In a similar way, temporary structures such as building works and portocabins were perceived as increasing risk; however it is often difficult to avoid these.

Vegetation should also be maintained at a suitable height so as not provide hiding places and reduce visibility. Trees, shrubs and bushes play an important role in creating a positive aesthetic on campuses so care needs to be taken to strike an appropriate balance. Isolated parts of the campus can be improved by having better hard security devices, as discussed earlier.

The function of space is also important, especially at night. Users said they would feel safer if specific buildings contained lectures or computers at night, rather than having them scattered over the campus. This would also reduce electricity bills. All of these issues should be taken into consideration for university buildings and facilities of the future.

The photographs of the environment that invoked fears effectively illustrate how these issues shape feelings of personal safety. It is striking that these themes were not only highlighted by the different campus user groups, but were also reiterated across the two university studies, suggesting that these may be universal issues and can be targeted for harm prevention strategies on campuses. It is legitimate therefore that removing potential danger spots or loci of vulnerability will increase perceptions of personal safety on campus. Furthermore the interaction between the social environment and the physical environment and the consequent impact on personal safety was marked. This was noted by Cozens et al. (2001a) who proclaimed that there is a "complex interplay that exists between the physical and social environment." The physical environment remains static, but the dynamic and transient social environment ultimately held sway over how people perceived the physical environment and they should be viewed together.
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8.4.2 Social determinants

8.4.2.1 Security presence

It is imperative that any university has a strong and effective security presence on campus; patrolling security personnel boost confidence and feelings of personal safety by simultaneously providing a social presence and also by providing a distinct service. Thus a strong visibility on campus and clearly identifiable uniforms would be beneficial.

8.4.2.2 Security function

The role of security should be clearly stated and publicised to campus users; where security are contracted out then there can be confusion about their role; at Glamorgan security were rarely seen patrolling campus but beyond that many campus users felt their responsibility was for managing car parking rather than personal safety. This is a clear problem because the reputation of the security personnel can be undermined and campus users can have a reduced faith in their abilities. A publicity drive to increase awareness of security's remit is a possible way of overcoming this, as well as educating campus users on the role of campus security personnel and their relevant contact details. In contrast, Loughborough University employed its own security service who regularly patrolled the campus, had distinctive vans to travel across campus (because of its large size) and more robust crime reporting systems and this was perceived as very positive.

8.4.2.3 Proximity to other people

Although this is difficult to exert control over, certain measures can be taken because, particularly at night, users felt safer nearer other people. This may be other campus users or security staff. Porters on duty in reception areas are one way of reducing anxieties. Unfortunately, at Glamorgan, porters' roles have changed and they are not present in all buildings yet their very presence contributes substantially to feelings of reassurance. Conversely, proximity to the wrong kinds of people can have a negative effect. Close proximity to a gang of boisterous youths, for example, is not desirable.
This can only be overcome by changing accessibility to the campus. While heavy handed measures such as harsh fencing produces an undesirable prison effect, security personnel and CCTV could be used to discourage such gangs from accessing the campus. At the other extreme, complete isolation can increase vulnerability and a strong security presence, porters in buildings and panic buttons can help to reduce concerns. Oc and Tiesdell (1999) have argued that promoting the use of environments at night can foster increased feelings of safety by providing social reassurance.

8.4.2.4 Open access campus

This has a major bearing on perceptions of personal safety because it was associated with the number and nature of other people present on campus. This was a double edged sword – all campus users enjoyed the open access ethos of the university and its central role in creating a creative and accessible higher educational establishment. However this does lead to the potential for people unconnected to the university to come on to the campus who can then blend in unnoticed to the mass of students. Some might simply want to use certain facilities such as the cash point or the bookshop but others may be intent on exploiting the vulnerability of students. While drastic security measures could be taken to secure the campus, this would create not only a negative impression of the university, it would also compromise the university experience for students. Therefore a softer approach is required and one possible security solution is the introduction of ID cards. While there are arguments for and against these on civil liberties grounds, the compulsory wearing of ID cards is one answer to the problem, although there may be resistance to the idea at first. They could be colour coded; red for staff, blue for students, yellow for visitors for example, but this may compromise the sense of community discussed below and very possibly lead to unwelcome feelings of segregation. On a positive note, however, it would be easier for students and visitors to identify staff if help were needed.

8.4.2.5 Sense of community

This was an interesting theme in itself; how a campus university, in particular the staff and student body, can portray and foster human characteristics such as warmth and inclusion. A naturally occurring sense of community can increase feelings of personal
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safety but there is no prescriptive way of achieving this. It is based on the very essence and ethos of a university and the way it teaches and fosters learning and shared university experiences. Certainly the shared objectives of students create a mutual understanding and respect on a smaller campus and this is often inherently tied to the community in which it is based. However certain things can increase this sense of community, such as teaching staff and students sharing facilities and promoting an atmosphere of caring and welfare.

These ten issues are presented in tabulated form in Tables 8.2 and 8.3 below to highlight the key issues:
Table 8.2 Aggregated physical campus features that invoked concern for personal safety and some suggested solutions for improving personal safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of personal safety triangle:</th>
<th>Determinant of perceptions of personal safety:</th>
<th>Risk factor identified in focus group:</th>
<th>Risk caused by:</th>
<th>Possible safety solution based on campus users' responses:</th>
<th>Risk potentially reduced by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>Low lighting levels and state of darkness</td>
<td>Reduced visibility and surveillance</td>
<td>More lighting</td>
<td>Street lighting improves visibility and boosts confidence by promoting intervisibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARD SECURITY DEVICES</td>
<td>Insufficient security equipment, particularly problematic at night</td>
<td>Lack of help response if victimised and A sense of isolation at night</td>
<td>More CCTV and alarm points or intercoms scattered over isolated parts of the campus</td>
<td>Reassurance that individuals and their property are being protected and, if an individual is victimised, help will arrive. Alarm points can provide social reassurance if harmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS BOUNDARY</td>
<td>Problem of leaving campus and entering local community; perceptions of safety reduced off campus</td>
<td>Campus boundary/ entry into local community lead to feelings of reduced protection</td>
<td>Improved street lighting and security guards patrolling key routes off campus</td>
<td>Better visibility boosts surveillance and security guards provide social reassurance and person to contact in event of being harmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAGE AND MAPS</td>
<td>Inadequate signage Makes it easier to get lost and this has an impact on vulnerability and personal safety</td>
<td>Clear signage, more maps on and off campus and clearly marked buildings</td>
<td>Reducing the opportunity to get lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN</td>
<td>Neglect A perceived lack of care over environment and of campus users</td>
<td>Efficient maintenance of campus environment eg if there is graffiti, remove it immediately</td>
<td>Provides a more positive sense of control and belonging. It also gives the impression that there is more care extended to the campus environment and ergo, to people who use it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed spaces</td>
<td>Inability to escape a potential offender</td>
<td>Ideally, removal of such spaces but this is impractical. Therefore, the promotion of alternative routes, better lighting and security</td>
<td>A choice of routes allows campus users to take control and assess the risks involved, while lighting and security provide visibility and reassurance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building colour</td>
<td>Dark colours give the impression of being 'hemmed in' and promote fear</td>
<td>White or light coloured façades reflect light, give a feeling of more space and boost perceptions of personal safety.</td>
<td>Paint or re-clad older or dark façade buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of space</td>
<td>Late lectures scattered over campus equals more vulnerability</td>
<td>Late lectures held in one central building</td>
<td>A sense that there is 'safety in numbers' and also the benefit of saving electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape concerns such as tall and dense vegetation</td>
<td>Opportunities for potential offenders to conceal themselves</td>
<td>Less vegetation</td>
<td>Improve visibility and reduce opportunities for potential criminals to hide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.3 Aggregated social campus features that invoked concern for personal safety and some suggested solutions for improving personal safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of personal safety triangle:</th>
<th>Determinant of perceptions of personal safety</th>
<th>Risk factor identified in focus group:</th>
<th>Risk caused by:</th>
<th>Possible safety solution based on campus users’ responses:</th>
<th>Risk potentially reduced by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY PRESENCE</td>
<td>Low security presence</td>
<td>Lack of people responsible for personal safety</td>
<td>Security guards with more visibility patrolling the campus</td>
<td>Provides reassurance, natural surveillance and fosters a sense of community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY FUNCTION</td>
<td>Perceived lack of security personnel responsible for personal safety concerns – considered responsible for patrolling the campus</td>
<td>Lack of personnel to protect from harm and come to aid.</td>
<td>Clearly defined security roles and more interaction between security and campus users</td>
<td>A strong and effective security service promotes the image that personal safety is taken seriously and boosts campus users confidence that there are people to rely on in case of harm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROXIMITY OF OTHER PEOPLE</td>
<td>Reduction in usage of campus at night and perception that there is an increased risk when alone</td>
<td>Lack of people generally implies there are less people available to help if needed; this is exacerbated in the dark or night-time as the social presence decreases</td>
<td>More security guards and other campus users</td>
<td>Other legitimate campus users and security patrols generally seen as a boost to personal safety, although lighting and CCTV should supplement this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN ACCESS CAMPUS</td>
<td>Open-access ethos of universities</td>
<td>Unable to monitor who comes on campus and enter buildings</td>
<td>ID cards</td>
<td>More control over who uses the campus and easier to identify individuals who are not on campus for valid reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE OF COMMUNITY</td>
<td>A positive sense of community on campus boosts personal safety</td>
<td>A negative sense of community suggests that the institution and its members do not look out for one another and does not promote an atmosphere of care or welfare</td>
<td>Encourage interaction between campus users; students enjoyed sharing facilities such as cafes with all strata of university staff.</td>
<td>Less of an 'us and them' atmosphere. Also a more intimate atmosphere fosters feelings of consideration for others and their property, a key aspect of personal safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How these recommendations can be incorporated into a cohesive framework to be practically utilised by facilities managers is presented below (these are combined with all of the themes that arose in the focus groups to ensure the most effective way of promoting personal safety on campus). All of the themes that emerged have been considered and possible ways of remedying concerns have been developed based on the focus group discussions and are shown in Figure 8.2.
Figure 8.2 A framework for integrating personal safety into university facilities management

**FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

**SECURITY DIVISION**

**PERSONAL SAFETY ENHANCERS**

**PHYSICAL**
- Improve street lighting – and use white light not yellow light
- More effective and visual CCTV
- Panic/information points across campus
- Clear signage on campus
- Clear building names
- More maps on campus
- Clearly marked transport modes
- Building interiors open plan
- Attractive buildings
- Aesthetically pleasing natural environment
- Removal of alleyways where possible/well lit
- Availability of alternative routes/choice
- Paint buildings white or light colours to reflect light
- New builds in sand or buff coloured brick
- New builds – don’t construct buildings too close together
- Design buildings with safety in mind
- Have common routes well lit and signposted
- Removal of enclosed spaces
- Fencing should be less industrial
- Buildings with glass frontage
- Adequate lighting and security in isolated parts of the campus
- Ensure maintenance and up-keep; remove signs of vandalism or decay immediately
- Do not obstruct routes with skips or bins
- Have as much open space as possible
- Remove temporary structures
- Vegetation maintained to low levels
- Ensure visibility
- Maximise windows to ensure maximum surveillance

**SOCIAL**
- Consider access controls
- High security presence
- Security to patrol key routes off campus
- Clear role of security
- Promote sense of community
- Reinstate porters
- Introduce ID Cards
- Make campus users aware of security procedures
- Encourage use of common routes rather than shortcuts (or light short-cuts)

**PERSONAL**
- Increase personal safety awareness on campus
- Provide visitors with maps and campus/locality information
- Introduce mandatory PS induction courses
- Use of mobile phones
- Involve people in awareness process
- Provide information about incidents
Chapter 8: Recommendations – towards a framework for improving perceptions of personal safety on university campuses

8.5 APPRAISAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations comprise approaches to two of the three critical groups that influence personal safety: physical and social (due to limited space the 'personal' determinants have not been presented but they should still be addressed in making campuses safer). It is clear that the most detailed dissection of these groups has been the physical environment; this stands to reason because the methodology was geared around showing the physical environment of the campus. Furthermore, as Warr (1990, p.893) suggests, "humans negotiate their world by constantly monitoring it for signs of danger", and the literature has demonstrated that this 'danger' can be shaped, to a large degree, by the physical environment. However, the physical environment is also the group which a university has the most control over and can therefore approach manipulating the built and natural environment more readily than it can, for example, influence people's characters. The majority of this section will therefore address the issue of manipulating the physical environment to improve perceptions of personal safety on campus.

How the design of the environment impacts on crime and fear of crime has been reviewed earlier in this thesis in Chapter 2 and 5. Possible approaches to overcome the issue of crime and fear of crime that centre on how the physical environment can be manipulated include common crime prevention techniques. Some of the recommendations presented here have significant commonalities with widely used crime prevention techniques, discussed briefly in earlier chapters (2, 4 and 5). In particular, the recommendations for improved perceptions of safety on campus based on the focus group findings exhibit commonalities to CPTED. Many of the proposed recommendations concern the design, maintenance or management of the environment to reduce fears and concerns for personal safety in the same way that CPTED can lead to a reduction in crime or fear of crime occurring. This was highlighted in Chapter 5 and is ratified by Edwards (2000) and Smith and Fossey (1995) who support the view that effective design can reduce crime on campus. Robinson and Mullen (2001, p.36) elucidate this:

"Since alterations to the physical environment of the campus may make people feel safer and less fearful, as well as increase the aesthetic quality of the surroundings, CPTED and situational crime prevention have a place there."
Such approaches have been supported by Clarke (1992; 1997), Clarke and Homel (1997) and Painter and Farrington (1999). These approaches to crime reduction are similar to the themes that emerged from the focus groups as to increase perceptions of personal safety. So while situational approaches such as CPTED concentrate on ways to deter potential offenders, they can be turned on their head to relate to ways of making people, or potential victims of offenders, feel safer. The efficacy of techniques such as street lighting and CCTV is debatable (Davies 1992; Nair et al. 1993; Welsh and Farrington 1999; Ditton and Short 1999). Welsh and Farrington (2002) found that CCTV reduces crime to a small degree. Farrington and Welsh (2004) meanwhile found that improved street lighting causes actual crime rates to decrease. Furthermore, CPTED was considered as a viable crime prevention approach suited to improving campus safety; Nasar and Fisher (1992, p.49) claim that "environmental design strategies can produce long-term positive effects on crime and feelings of vulnerability." Kirk (1988) also argues that street lighting and environmental design can be manipulated to alter perceptions of safety.

However, given their commonalities it stands to reason that the same criticisms levied at such approaches may apply to the recommendations I have presented here. Of most significance is that such measures can lead to a displacement of crime, whereby crime moves from improved places to those that are not. This has been refuted by Felson and Clarke (1998). Another is that such interventions actually propagate fear of crime by symbolising that crime is a problem; "walls, guards and conspicuous security devices divide rather than build communities by separating and isolating their members." (Wortley 1996) Pain and Townshend (2002) claim that efforts to reduce crime by preventing access and increasing natural surveillance can reduce fears but do not dramatically reduce actual crime.

Furthermore, concentrating on reducing fear of crime by solely manipulating the design of the physical environment has also been criticised, mainly for failing to acknowledge how the social environment impacts upon fear. Pain (2000) and Koskela and Pain (2000) contend that an emphasis on the built environment in fear of crime research has ignored the central role that social factors play in generating fear of crime. However, I think this has been addressed sufficiently in my research which is why I am advocating a holistic approach to campus safety and wide-ranging solutions to promoting a safer campus. Jefferey and Zahm (1993) assert that manipulating the physical environment to reduce crime may be appropriate for crimes such as theft but is not effective in preventing other crimes, such as murder. The
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crux of these issues is that the solutions presented here should not be perceived as an infallible approach to making a safe campus.

However, this study has attempted to explore the main weaknesses on the entire University of Glamorgan campus and, to a lesser extent, at Loughborough University, so providing the recommendations are introduced to the campus as a whole and all of the elements of the personal safety triangle are addressed to maximise personal safety, then a multi-effort approach may boost perceptions of personal safety. The recommendations are also relevant to the approaches to safety enhancement presented in Chapter 5; in particular, the importance of effective physical design and security personnel in promoting a safer campus.

The recommendations as a whole represent a wide-ranging framework of solutions to improve and maximise personal safety on campus for all campus users. While some of the determinants of personal safety are impossible to control while maintaining an open-access campus, such as the ability to control the level and proximity of casual others, these nonetheless provide revealing insights into how personal safety can be enhanced. The physical determinants are those that can be more readily adopted and introduced on any campus because a university has considerably more authority and control over its built and natural environment than the personal characteristics of its campus users. Some of the recommendations are underpinned by common and accepted crime prevention approaches used by the Police in the UK and abroad. Nonetheless, it should be noted that other elements of personal safety should not be disregarded. Personal safety induction courses for example can play an important part of personal safety enhancement. These need to be embraced holistically rather than piece-meal because if only certain solutions are introduced then this fails to address the fundamental nature of personal safety as comprising of physical, social and personal determinants, as scoped in the Delphi study in Chapter 4.

While most of the recommendations presented here relate to physical features of the campus which will be maintained by the facilities department, it is also important to consider that in order to achieve a high level of personal safety on campus that everyone should take their part in maintaining personal safety; from other departments to the taking responsibility on an individual level. Bromley and Territo (1990, p.18) assert that "in order for crime prevention to be successful, a more comprehensive campus-wide approach must be taken." They recommend that students and staff become involved in crime prevention programs. The approach of
consulting different campus users provides a new direction in efforts to boost perceptions of personal safety. This approach is endorsed by Pain and Townshend (2002, p.117), who claim that, in relation to boosting community safety in city centres, "there has been very little meaningful consultation about perceptions and experiences of safety, and users' views on strategies to reduce crime and fear. " They assert that there is a need in fear of crime research to ensure that "users' voices are listened to and feed directly into action." In other words an all-embracing, robust and comprehensive approach should be attained when addressing campus safety.

8.6 ADDRESSING PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES

The recommendations presented in this chapter for modifying various aspects of the campus are based on campus users' perceptions of personal safety and are intended to lead to an improved perception of personal safety on campus. The inherent contradiction of philosophical issues that this presents needs to be addressed in order to clarify what may appear paradoxical; whether I can validly make claims for recommendations for practical improvements to the physicality of the campus (an objective reality) which are based on campus users' perceptions of the campus (a subjectively defined reality). I have made reference to an interpretative approach throughout this thesis, whereby I have advocated understanding personal safety from the perspective of those experiencing it. However, there appears some uncertainty as to whether this stance can be reconciled with my proposed framework of recommendations to modify the actuality of a campus environment to make it perceivably safer.

If the interpretative belief is that reality is defined and constructed by individuals which cannot be divorced and the positivist belief, in contrast, is that an objective reality exists separate to the individual, then I appear to be advocating both positions: my focus groups and perceptual approach are based on the interpretative belief that reality can only be understood by the people who construct it, while the recommendations refer to changes to an objective reality! However, I advocate a pragmatic approach to research, which Hathaway (1995, p.539) describes as one in which "quantitative and qualitative methods are viewed as capable of informing one another throughout the research process." This might seem incompatible when considering issues of knowledge and reality construction, but using a combination of methods on a practical basis ensures that all collected data are the most informative and relevant to the research objectives of that particular study. Furthermore, such an
approach also serves a second purpose - triangulation, a method of cross-checking data from multi-method sources to strengthen the research findings.

It is my belief that methods should drive the research rather than one particular philosophical viewpoint and there needn’t be such divisive incompatibility between the two. It should also be reiterated that qualitative research, with its accompanying assumptions about reality and knowledge, serves to increase understanding about a phenomenon in its context. Thus the perceptions of campus users and their understandings can generate tentative concepts and theories that relate to the specific context and environment. There is no claim for universal or generalisable theories across contexts and therefore my recommendations relate to the specific campuses from which they were sought. There is also debate about whether my recommendations have any relevance beyond the people who participated in the focus groups – the campus recommendations might make them feel safer but there is no basis for assuming that they represent the wider population and that all campus users would feel safer as a result. In response I refer to the themes and issues being reiterated not only across different user groups but across case studies. Furthermore, the criminology literature provides evidence that the recommended solutions echo those used in established crime reduction strategies. This therefore clarifies the apparent discrepancy of philosophical issues that arose out of advocating and adopting a perceptual approach to personal safety followed by recommendations for changes to the actual campus environment.
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8.7 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The recommendations from this research will be presented to key personnel within the University of Glamorgan for appraisal and discussion. This will take the form of a technical report and a seminar for key personnel. The main department whose remit covers personal safety will be the Estates and Facilities Department, from where campus security is currently co-ordinated. However, Directorate, Student Services, Health and Safety and the Students’ Union will also find the recommendations useful. It is imperative that inter-departmental co-operation and communication is maintained and encouraged to ensure that everyone remains informed of decisions being made. Of course, the implementation of recommendations will be dependent on financial considerations. Furthermore, any recommendations that are introduced will need to be monitored and appraised to assess their effectiveness; further focus groups could be held after sufficient time has elapsed to explore whether perceptions of personal safety have improved. This is a view endorsed by Richards (1996) who suggests that a follow-up study to assess improvements is necessary. Crucially, as stated earlier, if a university wide crime/incident recording system can be introduced then the effect of the solutions on crime levels can also be assessed.

8.8 CONCLUSIONS

The results have highlighted the key features of the physical and social environment that significantly shape perceptions of fear and safety as well as how the property, facilities and management of a campus can be designed to make them safer. Such findings can not only be utilised by existing campuses but can be usefully applied to enhance the design of campus buildings of the future. The principles can also be employed by planners, designers and architects when considering how educational facilities are designed by integrating the principles of personal safety promotion from the outset.

The majority of the themes raised have been cited as predictors of fear in the criminological literature but these studies have been mainly survey based. In this way, adopting a qualitative approach to assessing users concerns on campus served to flesh out such findings and provide more depth to how campus users relate to the campus environment. The personal safety triangle and critical determinants from the Delphi study show remarkable commonalities with the issues raised here and in Chapter 7 and the fact that the participants raised these issues with no prompting
serves to validate the conceptual framework of personal safety. The ten key recommendations presented here provide an over-view of the most important issues that face campus users, and provide some general guidance on why this is the case and how campus managers can incorporate this information into workable personal safety strategies. Most of these recommendations are situational in nature, referring as they do to features of the immediate physical environment. However, what may be the most valuable outcome of this study is the diagram presented in 8.2, which stresses a systematic, all-encompassing approach to boosting perceived safety on campus.

This chapter, following on from Chapter 7, addresses the following research objectives:

**RO5:** To make recommendations of ways in which the two case study campuses can be improved to enhance users' perceptions of personal safety, and provide insights for designers, planners and architects of for the design and improvement of campuses..

**RO6:** To ascertain how underlying philosophical and methodological issues of a perceptual approach can be reconciled with recommendations that focus on changing the physicality of university campuses

**RO7:** To contribute to the literature and knowledge-base of campus safety research

This chapter brings to a close the discussion of the findings and resultant recommendations for improved campus safety and the next chapter will review the thesis in its entirety and assess whether the research objectives were successfully achieved.
Chapter Nine
Conclusions and recommendations for future research
9.0 CONCLUSIONS

This thesis set out to assess perceptions of personal safety on university campuses. The initial phase involved defining the term 'personal safety' using the Delphi study in order to delineate the term and specify its focus and boundaries. It is empirically sound and can be usefully applied in a variety of contexts. The definition has already been adopted by the SLT, who have included it in their new printed literature and material, and, more importantly, it ensures that the central tenet of their work is empirically underpinned. It also serves as a basis for future academic research whilst being of value to the practice communities too, whilst providing a springboard for future research. Crucially, the comprehensive Delphi study findings also led to an emerging conceptual framework that highlighted the importance of perceptions when considering safety concerns and distinguished three crucial determinants that influence personal safety at any given time: social factors, personal factors and physical factors. The Delphi study and literature reviews demonstrated that a novel and academically and practically useful approach to the campus study was to concentrate on a perceptual approach to campus safety, with the focus on the subjective perspective of how users decode the campus. It was essential that the definition and framework were established prior to carrying out the campus study in order that the precise margins of the study were clarified and that the study was centred on a specific focus. This shaped the entire methodology of the campus study. Indeed, this research went beyond the original scope of the study by exploring perceptions of personal safety on two campuses and discussing possible recommendations to improve perceptions of personal safety on the campuses used as case studies.

9.1 SUMMARY OF EXISTING RESEARCH

Personal safety on university campuses is a recognised research concern, as highlighted by the forty-year research history in the US. In the UK, such campus research is limited. Previous research has shown that university students are more at risk of being victimised than the general population because of their age and because campus crime can be exacerbated by specific features of the environment. Despite a wealth of literature into campus safety and student victimisation, the approaches of these studies are characterised by typically quantitative methodologies. This has limited the scope of their findings and restricted the depth of understanding achieved. This is notwithstanding the important issue of using such limited data from which to base safety and crime reduction strategies.
Using official statistics can fail to provide a comprehensive exploration of the context of crimes, i.e. why crimes occur in specific places and how features of the immediate environment can lead to an increased propensity for crimes to occur. Furthermore, approaches which rely on victimisation surveys are hindered by their inability to fully explore the specific causes and implications of crime and fear of crime on an individual level.

### 9.2 NEW INSIGHTS

The stark gaps in the literature decisively guided my research approach and design. Most notably, the lack of qualitative approaches, the inherent weaknesses of the prevailing data-based research, and my own personal research skills and preferred orientation all contributed to the overall research design.

The Delphi study demonstrated that personal safety can be constructed objectively as risk of suffering intentionally motivated harm, and subjectively as perceived risk or fear of suffering intentionally motivated harm. The criticisms levied at research processes that concentrate on actual risk which use predictions based on official crime or incident data have been extensively criticised. An exploration of the subjective perspective was therefore considered as contributing significantly to increasing an understanding of personal safety concerns, perceptions of risk and campus usage. Furthermore, the definition of 'personal safety' served to make explicit a term which was so often used in criminological research without being elucidated. Perceived risk of harm, in contrast to actual risk of harm, is constructed by the individual and is transient, in response to changes in our physical and social environment. It is this perceptual, subjective approach that formed a central tenet of the research and offered a fresh perspective on campus safety and crime research. Furthermore the literature and practical research have demonstrated that crime and fear of crime have much in common with personal safety or the 'intentionally motivated harm' aspect of the phenomenon. This linkage has informed my study and can potentially inform future research and debate too. In particular, the recommendations for promoting personal safety on campus have a basis in situational or design-orientated approaches and these too form the core approaches to official crime reduction strategies in the UK and abroad. This strengthens the validity of the recommendations and grounds them in an established discipline.
Adopting a perceptual approach to exploring campus users' concerns therefore addressed a key void in the literature and embraced a new and potentially more revealing stance to assessing personal safety than previous studies. The research has demonstrated clearly that such a perceptual, qualitative approach contributes much to the understanding of safety concerns and the complex interaction between space users and how they decode their environments and provides a more thorough, contextual understanding of issues than quantitative techniques, particularly those which are survey based, could ever reveal. Perceptions are arguably a more realistic portrayal of users' concerns than statistical approaches allow for and when explored in a qualitative way they can lead to environmental improvements that more accurately reflect the needs of end-users.

The overall strategy of the research was a case-study methodology and various data collection methods. The two case studies provided an opportunity for exploration, expansion and verification of key themes that shaped users' perceptions of personal safety. The primary objectives of the research were to identify areas of the campus that posed possible threat and vulnerability to campus users and to identify solutions in the form of design and management modifications that were based on users' perceptions of their personal safety.

The utilisation of Virtual Reality (VR) as an environmental stimulus to probe user viewpoints is an innovative advancement for exploring users' perceptions. This approach embraced the dynamic relationship between campus users and their environment and revealed how campus users contextually decode their environment. The study has focused on features of the immediate campus environs that affect personal safety which provided a detailed contextual understanding of fear generators and a more appropriate basis for developing personal safety solutions. The interpretation of the environmental space on campus was a significant focus of the research and the user-led approach produced a number of cost-effective and achievable recommendations for modifications so that all users can feel safer.

The study has supplied some meaningful findings that give an interesting indication of perceptions of personal safety on campus which tell us what physical, social and personal attributes of the campus and its' users need to be addressed to improve personal safety. This provided opportunities for developing solutions that are grounded in users' every-day perceptions and behaviour. Indeed the findings revealed much about the personal safety issues that impacted on campus users than
any data-based approached could attain. The focus groups served as a successful arena within which to generate discussion with a group of campus users and the environmental stimuli encouraged enthusiastic and relatively free-flowing discussion about salient points as they arose. The collection and analysis of subjective textual data from focus groups thus offered a more detailed awareness and insight into campus safety.

Key findings have identified a hierarchy of concerns and some practical recommendations that can improve perceptions of personal safety on campus. Recommendations for possible situational solutions to improve perceptions of personal safety were therefore mainly in terms of tackling the negative effects of darkness and included upgraded lighting and CCTV, which provide reassurance by improving visibility and reducing users' fears. The caveat is that although such measures are often cited as reducing fear, their effectiveness in terms of reducing actual or objective victimisation is uncertain and should therefore form part of a package of solutions rather than stand-alone solutions. Another useful intervention is to have an increased security presence patrolling the campus and the immediate local environs, to strengthen the image and relationship of security staff with university users and to clarify security guards' roles on campus.

Such measures implemented to improve perceptions of personal safety should not be viewed as a panacea to all personal safety concerns; rather, they should be integrated into a comprehensive package of solutions that together maximise personal safety on campus. The matrix of solutions is structured according to the personal safety triangle developed from the results of the Delphi study for ease of interpretation and practical applicability. This provides a useful layout for campus officials to use as guidance. The research successfully addresses the lack of research into not only campus research in the UK, but also highlights how insightful and powerful qualitative studies can be. Such a research approach succeeded in achieving the research aims and objectives, which I shall now explore.
9.3 ADDRESSING THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research successfully addressed the important research questions set out in Chapter 1:

1. What is personal safety?
2. How is personal safety constructed?
3. In what discipline should personal safety be anchored?
4. What influences personal safety on university campuses?
5. What can be done to improve personal safety on university campuses?

This was achieved by addressing the eight research objectives, which are discussed below:

RO1: To define and scope the term 'personal safety', with particular emphasis on the distinction between objective and subjective dimensions of the construct

The Delphi study scoped the term personal safety as "an individual's ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others". The study also concluded that the following additional statements contribute to a broader conceptual framework of 'personal safety': Harm is intentionally motivated, and includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person. Personal safety is about a combination of perceived risk and actual risk, where risk is the likelihood of coming to harm. Personal safety is not always dependent on another person and their behaviour. Personal safety is distinct from health and safety. These successfully bounded 'personal safety' as a concept discrete from accidental harm and more generally accepted 'health and safety' issues. This is crucial when considering appropriate safety promotion procedures and strategies. The Delphi definition and framework highlight how complex is the notion personal safety, which has important methodological connotations, i.e. that the research methods should reflect this complexity and possible multitude of perspectives that are exhibited by different people or groups. The Delphi definition of personal safety and framework, in particular the personal safety triangle, echo these principles.

Crucially, however, the Delphi study led to discussion about the multi-faceted nature of personal safety, in particular how it can be constructed objectively and subjectively.
This was appraised against the existing literature and both approaches critiqued. The recorded crime approach, which was considered as a measure of actual risk of harm, and akin to a probability of actual risk in the same way that crime statistics are used to extrapolate to the risk of crime ascribed to certain social groups, was considered to be severely deficient. This led to the discussion of a subjective perceptual approach which focused on how individuals construct their own sense of safety, which was extremely pertinent in relation to understanding more about the phenomenon of personal safety.

**RO2: To identify an appropriate conceptualisation of perceptions of personal safety to facilitate its practical application**

This objective was intertwined with RO1 and the conceptual and methodological implications of adopting a subjective perceptual approach to researching personal safety. Above all, the conceptualisation of personal safety as a powerfully individualistic and subjective construct led to the choice of methods to gather data in the campus case studies which were needed to do justice to the construct. Inevitably there were inherent assumptions about the nature of knowledge and reality that were bound to these choices which had to be acknowledged. Although I have referred on occasion to the broadly interpretative approach of my research, I deliberately avoided becoming too absorbed in the epistemological and ontological debate. The main reason for this was because my research was method-driven. In other words, I chose my research methods based on what would gather the most relevant, novel and insightful data rather than one philosophical paradigm driving my choices. Thus my emphasis was on the research methods that would be most appropriate in answering the research questions and addressing the research objectives.

Different data collection methods would provide different insights into the phenomenon of personal safety. A quantitative approach to obtaining campus users' perceptions was criticised for failing to provide adequate meaning, depth and context to user responses, and for requiring their responses to fit into researcher-imposed and restrictive response categories devoid of context or depth. I therefore considered that a qualitative perceptual approach was the most fruitful to seek and gain understanding and meaning from campus users in terms of how they manoeuvred through and decoded the campus environment and constructed their senses of personal safety. The findings of my research therefore relate to the specific contexts
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in which they were collected and this has implications for the outcomes of my research which will be dealt with in research objective 5.

RO3: To ground personal safety in an appropriate discipline and establish it as a valid subject for academic research

The research firmly scoped personal safety and a review of the criminological literature revealed many commonalities between the concepts of crime and personal safety. Thus the study contributes to the criminological literature, while the thesis also contributes to the campus crime and safety literature.

RO4: To apply this definition practically and conceptualise a review of personal safety on university campuses using a case study research method to probe the personal perceptions of campus users

The research applied the definition of personal safety to a two case studies where perceptions of campus users were sought. The University of Glamorgan and Loughborough University were used as suitably contrasting case studies and a multi-method research approach was adopted.

For the initial and major case study of Glamorgan's campus, quantitative data from the questionnaires were used to contribute to the overall robustness of the findings but the research methods chosen favoured a more qualitative and user-led approach because of the ability of such methods to elicit more profound and contextual understandings of the themes and issues of importance to campus users, rather than any simplification of responses or predetermined categories. Pilot studies were carried out to test and refine the techniques used to ensure maximum effectiveness of the data collection methods.

Currently, crime data on Glamorgan's campus is dispersed over departments: there is no single source of statistical information of crime and personal safety incidences on campus. Instead the Health and Safety Department, the Students' Union, Student Services, the Facilities and Estates Department and the local Police Department record their own data but they each have their own procedures. This unfortunately means that no complete representation of crime incidences on campus can be reported. The questionnaire I developed for the campus study, despite its necessary limitations, revealed that 17% of respondents had experienced 'intentional harm' on
campus but this is viewed as being only an approximate indication because of the previous criticisms of survey-based crime data in representing actuality.

Focus groups were the ideal arena within which to explore issues of concern with campus users and proved extremely fruitful in engaging with campus users and exploring personal safety issues as perceived by them. The use of environmental stimuli was extremely effective in provoking discussion and as an effectual tool to generate discussion. Personal safety is potentially a very sensitive subject and I considered this throughout my research, particularly in relation to the research design and the development of questionnaires and focus group questions. I consciously avoided specific questions that probed experiences of intentionally motivated harm, except in the questionnaire which was not face-to-face and could be unanswered if required. I also considered the impact of my research on the respondents. I hope that my research generated thoughts about personal safety in a positive manner. It is a fair question to ask whether my research made respondents more fearful but my questions aimed to be balanced, particularly in the focus groups where questions concentrated not only on negative signifiers of personal safety but also positive indicators whereby features of the campus which inspired positive senses of personal safety were also explored.

The focus groups were held with different user groups in attendance so that differences in how different users used, perceived and decoded the campus could be explored. However, it emerged that the different user groups had broadly comparable views of the campus and there were remarkable similarities between the groups as to what influenced their personal safety on campus and what could be done to promote it. This strengthens the case for transferability of the recommendations.

The Virtual Reality Panorama Tool had been used in a number of projects prior to this one and the campus study further refined the technology in the way that the routes were presented to the participants (whereby routes were laid onto campus maps). In addition, for the first time, the tool was used to record night-time routes and this was an exciting development in exploring campus users' perceptions, particularly in contrast to the day-time routes because it allowed a more thorough and broad examination of campus use and how the issue of light, or lack of it, impacted on perceptions of personal safety. The limitations of the VR include the use of static
images, the lack of other sensory data, such as aural details from a particular scene and the way in which routes were amalgamated.

The main aim of filming the routes around campus and using them as an environmental stimulus was to probe how users felt about the physical environment of the campus as this is a constant; buildings do not change over the course of a day, but of course perceptions of them changed as light levels changed and the number of people around the buildings and landscape altered. Of the three critical determinants of personal safety, the physical environment and related factors were the least dynamic and thus presented a more reliable and standardised indicator of actuality that could be presented to respondents as an accurate indicator of the true campus environment. The focus groups highlighted 14 critical physical determinants of personal safety and more specifically 29 further sub-categories pertaining to environmental design. These provided a valuable insight into what features of the environment impacted on personal safety and further analysis revealed how these could be altered to promote personal safety.

Although this could not be accurately represented in the VRs due to the static nature of the images, the issue of the social environment was discussed frequently in the focus groups, particularly how the presence or lack of, other people impacted on personal safety. In addition the role of security guards was correlated consistently with perceptions of personal safety in all user groups. The focus groups highlighted 16 critical social determinants of personal safety.

Even more complex than the preceding determinants as influences on personal safety are the highly complex and infinite personal factors that influence an individual's sense of personal safety, as reflected in the vast differences in the psyche of human beings. However, this issue was addressed in the focus groups by concentrating on what could be more readily controlled and influenced about individuals to increase their senses of personal safety, such as awareness and risk reduction. Other factors were raised, such as intuition which, although is not a tangible factor or amenable to quantification, is something which should be acknowledged in its role as a determinant of personal safety. The focus groups highlighted 11 critical personal determinants of personal safety. Overall, the University of Glamorgan was found to be perceived as reasonably safe, and common themes emerged as to how to promote perceptions of personal safety on campus.
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The second, smaller study was carried out at Loughborough University as an element of the case study method but also as a result of weaknesses discovered in the pilot study at Glamorgan. It was initially anticipated that routes around the University of Glamorgan campus would be filmed three times a year over a 12 month period in order to capture the effects of seasonal change on personal safety. However, it quickly emerged in the pilot study that staff and students at Glamorgan campus failed to pick-up finer details in the day-time routes either due to familiarity or the positive impact of an abundance of naturally occurring light. As such it would have been a waste of time to explore the same routes over different seasons because the routes would not change dramatically. For example, the issue of vegetation was raised but in a more general context than scrutinizing the height of particular shrubs in each shot, which is what would have been necessary for the original plan to have been fruitful. In addition, because of the difficulty in attracting visitors to Glamorgan's campus to participate in the focus groups, it was considered more beneficial to adopt a 'home and away' approach in which two distinct campuses could be compared and contrasted using the same respondents. Originally, a second campus study was intended time permitting, but now it became an essential element of the data collection. The benefits of carrying out this study were great because the findings not only revealed how potential visitors to Glamorgan perceived the campus but also reiterated the determinants that had arisen in the previous focus groups. This served as a supplementary study to support and verify the findings of the first campus study and the insights drawn from it contribute to the development of a framework of campus safety. Loughborough University was found to be perceived as reasonably safe, and common themes emerged as to how to promote perceptions of personal safety on both campuses.

RO5: To make recommendations of ways in which the two case study campuses can be improved to enhance users' perceptions of personal safety, and provide insights for designers, planners and architects of for the design and improvement of campuses.

The original intention was to develop a generic framework of campus safety recommendations that could be used by any campus. However, the decision to use a case study as a research strategy meant that this could not be validly achieved or supported. Case studies are by definition concerned with the exploration of the context of a given phenomenon and it is difficult to explain how findings can be generalised to other situations because they aim to probe the particulars of a given
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However, the fact that I used two campuses does provide greater leverage in the transferability of the insights, particularly because many of the themes that arose were reiterated in both studies. Therefore, based on interpretation of the focus group transcripts in relation to the stimulus used, key themes emerged which related features of the physical and social environments with feelings of reduced personal safety. These themes were apparent across user groups and across the two campuses. Therefore I would argue that because many of these themes apply to features of many campuses, and not just the ones explored, the proposed recommendations can be relevant to making other campus environments feel safer. Interestingly, many of the recommendations that emerged from the studies are characteristic of the CPTED approach which is used across the world as a crime reduction strategy, which reinforces their appropriateness and soundness.

As discussed above, the recommendations for safer campus environments have been translated into a framework for improving personal safety on campus. These findings can be usefully incorporated into a framework of how campuses can be made to feel safer by addressing the three core elements of the personal safety triangle. While personal safety is an infinitely complex phenomenon there are certain themes that can be drawn from the research to promote perceivably safer environments. The methodology used is highly transferable too, and can be easily utilised on any campus to assess perceptions of personal safety. In addition, the themes that emerged from the focus groups can be incorporated by planners and architects into the design of new campus facilities.

With the data collection stage and focus groups being focused primarily on the impact of the physical environment on personal safety, the research has provided some valuable insights into how the design, layout, maintenance and management of environments significantly influence personal safety. This confirms what other researchers have found and also contributes to others in the field, especially by providing a qualitative, user-led perspective.

**RO 6: To ascertain how underlying philosophical and methodological issues of a perceptual approach can be reconciled with recommendations that focus on changing the physicality of university campuses**

The recommendations presented in Chapter 8 for modifying various aspects of the campus are based on perceptions of personal safety. Any apparent contradiction of
ontological issues was addressed in Chapter 8 by discussing my advocacy for a pragmatic approach to research. The discussion centred on addressing an apparent contradiction in how reality should be viewed and I explained how I chose my research methods based on their appropriateness for addressing the research objectives rather than for any particular ontological stance.

Furthermore, while I have advocated a predominantly interpretative approach to my research, my overall methodology has encompassed both positivist and interpretivist elements. The Delphi study, for example, despite seeking subjective expert viewpoints, also sought a consensus through questionnaires which inevitably has parallels to a positivist desire to seek universal explanations and law-like generalisations. There were also elements of deduction, for example, in the Delphi study and in my interpretation of the criminological literature. The campus study used questionnaires and focus groups, thereby embracing both philosophical paradigms. However, despite the methods I chose having their own associated epistemological and ontological leanings, the basis for choosing the methods were predominantly practical, i.e. what were the most appropriate in answering the research questions and addressing the research objectives? Using a combination of methods might produce conflicting philosophical arguments but on a practical basis, the methods were also used for triangulation purposes, as a method of cross-checking data from multiple sources of data.

**RO7: To contribute to the literature and knowledge-base of campus safety research**

The research has strongly contributed to the literature in the field because it not only adds to the minimal UK research which currently exists but it also adds a new dimension to campus safety research in general by its unique research approach. It can also be added to the knowledge base of campus safety research to support that which has emerged from the Home Office.

**RO8: To identify areas of further research which can strengthen this body of knowledge and provide a focus for future work**

As discussed below, the progression of the study has identified other salient issues that require further investigation, in both the personal safety and campus safety fields.
9.4 THE ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The study represents an original contribution to knowledge in that it presents the first significant study into personal safety and a robust academic definition and conceptual framework of personal safety. It offers into the academic arena a new fledgling subject - how personal safety is constructed and what factors are influential in forming individual perceptions of personal safety. This will assist in future research and practice into personal safety. In addition, three key issues were melded to form an innovative and new methodology: the definition of personal safety, the use of Virtual Reality technology to portray a digital representation of the campus environment and the use of focus groups to probe subjective personal safety concerns. These have merged to form a versatile, insightful and transferable research tool that reveals much about personal safety on campus. This methodology is unique and its versatility provides a new insight for probing perceptions of environmental stimuli. This innovative VR approach contributes to the debate in a number of fields, such as crime and design, as well as to the body of work that exists on environmental psychology and also provides an innovative direction for the exploration of the built and natural environments and how people perceive and decode them.

The research expands on previous work in the field but differs in two crucial ways. Firstly, it explored the experiences of a variety of campus users, and not just students. This was considered important because, although students comprise the majority proportion of campus users' and are indeed at higher risk of experiencing personal safety concerns, it was considered that a thorough examination of campus safety should take into account the range of different campus users, including staff and visitors. Secondly, it eschewed the typically quantitative research approaches of the past and instead favoured a more subjective, experiential and perceptual approach. By exploring perceptions of personal safety in a qualitative way, considerably more meaning and depth could be attributed to users' responses and the reasons behind their views on the relative safety of the campus. This allowed possible improvements to the campus to be grounded in meaningful and profound insights of how users perceive and experience the campus day-to-day. By probing perceptions in such a way, characteristic features of the campus environment that fostered feelings of fear could be clearly identified, proceeded by the development of possible modifications to the campus to improve feelings of personal safety.
9.5 SELF REFLECTION AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

It is also important at this stage to reflect on some key practical and methodical issues that shaped my research approach and the practical application of its findings, while reflecting on the exact efficacy and validity of the methods and the findings:

1. **Defining personal safety**

The Delphi study and the relevance of the resulting consensus of opinion that was achieved can be questioned because of the apparently subjective nature of the expert contribution. This criticism, however, could be levied at many qualitative research methodologies yet they are valued precisely because of their ability to generate rich social data. Indeed, the subjective nature of the process allowed for profound and insightful deconstruction of the topic to transpire. True, each expert respondent brought with them to the Delphi process and their responses their own interpretation of the phenomenon, based upon their own unique and personal life experiences and this could be critically construed as comprising unscientific data based on its intuitive nature. However, I followed a systematic process and the group consensus is still a valid and meaningful collective insight that can be usefully utilised and applied.

I do not contend that this definition of 'personal safety' should be an ultimate or exclusive definition: it is one version of reality, based on the views of a group of experts at a given time. In a similar way, I do not profess that the study identified an exhaustive list of critical determinants of personal safety. However, the findings can be used to provide clarity and meaning to a previously ambiguous term which is ultimately more useful than a term shrouded in confusion. The findings also provide a platform from which to conduct future research in order to obtain a meaningful understanding of how best to improve personal safety, be it in terms of personal advice, more deep-rooted social endeavours or physical approaches. Overall, the definition of personal safety will enhance knowledge, contribute to the wider criminological literature and establish personal safety as a legitimate research concern. Now that a more lucid definition and explanation of personal safety exists and a framework has established the central issues, this knowledge can be utilised to appropriately inform future research into personal safety.

A critical evaluation of the personal safety framework also revealed its limitations. Most evident was that the personal safety triangle of determinants of personal safety is highly simplistic because, although it acknowledges the complex interaction of
determinants, it does not indicate any definitive causal links between the individual determinants or account for the more profound social, political and historical contexts of personal safety at any given time. It is therefore important to value it for what it is: a tentative conceptual framework of personal safety rather than a theoretical model of personal safety. It offers no guidance for how one would operationalise or segregate measures of each of the critical determinants or how personal safety could be in some way quantified, although my research has provided some indications.

Although I was not concerned with testing the Delphi framework of personal safety I found considerable support for it in the unprompted discussion of the focus groups. The study in a sense came full circle, with the responses of the Delphi participants (presented in Chapter 4) 'matching' to a large degree what the campus users felt influenced their feelings of personal safety on campus (presented in Chapter 7), and this strengthens the study's findings.

Furthermore, the definition of personal safety is very broad, referring as it does to a generic concept of 'intentionally motivated harm'. This definition placed the interpretation of the harm element on the participants and it is arguable that this does not adequately scope the term when perceptions of harm were empirically explored in the focus groups.

2. The Delphi sampling process
An inherent problem with using the Delphi study is that it requires the use of experts in the field under investigation as respondents. This was problematic because not only are there few experts in the field of personal safety because of its weakness as a recognised and established research discipline but also, as within any discipline, true experts in a given field are hard to engage with because, by definition, their pre-eminence equals incredibly busy and full workloads, with little time spare for completing a doctoral student's questionnaire. A valid sampling frame was developed from the pilot Delphi study to overcome the problem of lack of experts in the field, by identifying experts in each of the areas that were identified as critical influences on personal safety. Because it was acknowledged that experts may not be readily available to participate then around two experts from each identified subject area were identified and contacted; this meant that 85 experts were contacted in total. Despite this, only nine experts participated in the first round of the study, six in the second and three in the final round; this was very disappointing. At the other extreme, should all 85 experts have responded it is difficult to comprehend the
immense difficulty of managing the large amount of data that this would have created. In retrospect, although I maintain that the sampling frame process of deriving areas of expertise from the pilot study was a valid and rigorous one, the actual identification of experts should have been undertaken more carefully and realistically, perhaps with experts who were more readily able to participate.

3. The campus study sampling process
My second area of concern was with the sampling process used for the main campus study questionnaires and, to a lesser extent, the focus groups. My priority for recruiting respondents was to ensure that staff and students from across the whole geographical area of the campus were included rather than, for example, just those from a certain academic school who only used a minimal part of the campus. However, this meant that a truly random sampling process could not be undertaken; instead I opted to canvas key personnel from each academic school and administrative department and asked them to identify respondents for me. This, in truth, would also potentially ensure a higher participation rate because the personal contact and recommendation from someone familiar to them from their school/department would act as a catalyst for participation rather than a deterrent. I therefore opted for purposive sampling rather than random sampling. The completion rate for my questionnaires was 38.3%, which is below what is considered good, but is adequate. On a positive note, however, my focus groups were initially over-subscribed, which is rare in social research, and I am pleased that my aim of recruiting participants from across the university on a geographical basis was fruitful. I also decided that I would re-use the same participants to view the VRs from the second campus. So, in conclusion, I felt it was more important to ensure that participants were representative of the whole campus than to adhere to a strict random sampling process.

4. Semantic issues in the wording of the focus group questions
Some attention should also be directed at semantic issues. I would also have liked to distinguish between 'perceived risk' and 'fear' in my focus group questions, because I know from the literature that they are distinct concepts. However, one has to reflect on one's own abilities and limitations. Indeed an exciting avenue of research could have been a detailed psychological exploration that focused on distinguishing between affective and cognitive processes, but this is beyond my skills at present. This is a matter of semantics because it affects the use of language and the nature of
the questions asked which I considered far less controllable in a focus group than in a questionnaire.

5. A perceptual assessment of personal safety on university campuses
The campus research can be questioned for its validity and criticism can be levied against it because of its fundamental qualitative approach which, in contrast to quantitative research, is sometimes considered unreliable. However, I ensured that my interpretation of the focus group data was based on logical and commonsensical themes that emerged from the data and I actively sought to remain as unbiased as possible, while ensuring that all analytical stages were transparent. Focus groups, can also be criticised because the resultant findings are said to pertain only to a particular group at a particular time. However, the second study at Loughborough highlighted the issues raised by users of Glamorgan's campus and both sets of respondents had similar concerns, strengthening the themes that emerged.

6. The use of the Virtual Reality Panorama tool and routes as the environmental stimuli
The VR was an extremely effective way of presenting campus users with the environment. The images were clear and the 360° aspect was particular useful in developing a sense of the surrounding area. However the VR can be criticised for providing only a two-dimensional visual image and this mean that there was no sense of the transient social environment in the campus locations: so the lack of social context (no people moving around) meant that the stimulus was unrepresentative of reality. Furthermore, unlike if we had video-recorded the environment, there was no sound, so again this impacted on the actuality of the environment we were presenting. The lack of sound meant that personal safety could only be explored within certain parameters. One issue that was raised a few times in the focus groups with familiar campus users when we presented them with the routes was "I wouldn't use that route; I would use a quicker one." In response to this I had to make clear to the participants that an amalgamation of the routes were filmed for ease of filming and presentation. Consequently the routes were not necessarily the shortest that could be taken (as most people do in real life), but merged to expose participants to as much of the campus as possible. I maintain that this method was the most effective way of presenting as much as the campus to the participants as possible. Another problem was the quality of the images, in particular the night-time ones. Certainly the visuals differed slightly from what I saw when the routes were filmed, especially in terms of the level of lighting at night, when parts of the route looked
darker and the street lights looked more orange-coloured than they did in reality. The important thing, however, is that even if this was the case, the images would have been consistent and thus respondents would be able to judge relative lighting levels with other images and compare them realistically. However, in light of all these limitations, I maintain that the VR was an exciting and valid way of conveying the campus environment to the participants. Some issues may have been unreflective of reality but the key focus of the study was the physical environment of the campus and this is a static constant. It does not change in itself but the dynamic social environment might alter perceptions of it. In summary, I accept that its utility has its limitations but I also believe that the parameters that I wished to explore were depicted realistically, indeed more so than a computer-simulated environment could achieve and the richness and consistency of the findings demonstrate its success.

7. The generalisability of the study findings

This is an important issue to address because of the limitations in generalising the findings of qualitative research. As an exploratory study there is limited scope for generalisation. However the findings can be used as conceptual insights that provide a platform for further research. This is an important consideration because I do not wish to claim that the findings are anything that they are not; they do not, for example, constitute a theory of personal safety on university campuses because they do not predict how all people will respond in all campus environments. Furthermore, despite the small sample sizes, the data provided descriptively rich and valuable information. In addition, because the key themes arose in the two campus studies, then it strengthens the case for the research informing practical guidance in promoting safer campuses. The findings and recommendations are easily interpreted and can be used by campus management to embrace personal safety on campuses.

The study was far too contextual in space and time, as is characteristic of case studies, to provide a set of universal solutions for all campuses. However, it can be argued that some of the issues that were identified in the case studies are shared by the majority of campus universities. For example, the issue of lighting, access control to buildings and building colour can be applicable whatever the location. The insights may be transferable because of common physical features of campus environment and the observation that shared themes emerged not only from different campus users but also from users of different campuses. The study therefore provides meaningful insights into personal safety on university campuses which have aided in
Chapter 9: Conclusions and recommendations for future research

forging an understanding of the issue, although further research in this area is needed.

9.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study can act as a pre-cursor for a wealth of future research. Indeed, as far as future research into personal safety is concerned, the field is wide open. As a subject in its infancy, this is a subject rife for exploration and development. However, this study has revealed a number of salient issues that warrant more attention. Most significantly, further elucidation could be garnered on the notion of intentionally motivated harm, particularly in terms of identifying harmful behaviour because there could be substantial individual differences in the perception of what constitutes intentionally motivated harm.

A second issue for future research is that of the variety of critical determinants at play. In order to develop a theoretical model of personal safety some researchers may like to measure variables. However there are so many variables at play with personal safety perception, for example, that, not only is it problematic to identify the most important but many of the 'personal' factors are simply not amenable to measurement e.g. you cannot readily quantify the impact of 'upbringing' as any attempt to do so would over simplify its true psychological impact. It is also hard to evaluate how this multitude of complex variables would interact and undoubtedly combine to generate perceptions of personal safety. In light of extensive criticisms levied at quantitative research it is also questionable what value any attempts to quantify aspects of personal safety would have. Ultimately, the key question that should underpin future research is whether such studies will usefully inform our understanding and promotion of personal safety.

This serves to address research objective 8:

RO8. To identify areas of further research which can strengthen this body of knowledge and provide a focus for future work

However, beyond its utility in assessing and improving perceptions of personal safety on university campuses, the methodology developed has considerable industrial relevance. It forms a versatile, insightful and transferable research tool that can be used to explore users' perceptions of personal safety in relation to the environmental
facilities of any organisation or environment, including transport nodes, schools, supermarkets, and hospitals. The methodology also translates into a sustainable applied research capability that is cost-effective and based on the premise that user groups can be effectively used in decision-making processes to create better environments. It can also be used to explore issues such as aesthetic preferences, space manoeuvrability, accessibility and the architectural and design requirements of different user groups. For example, it can be used to explore the relatively unexplored issue of how the disadvantaged and minority groups perceive their environments and their specific needs and how this in turn affects how they use facilities and environmental spaces.

Indeed, the methodology will be used in a recently awarded Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) / Strategic Promotion of Ageing Research Capacity (SPARC) grant. The project, due to commence at the end of January 2006, is a nine month research project entitled "Design and community regeneration: investigating personal safety concerns of older people in socio-economically deprived communities in South Wales." The research will use the proven VRPT research capability to investigate crime and personal safety concerns of older people in relation to socio-economically deprived communities in South Wales and will investigate the provision of safe and socially inclusive community environments in areas which currently have EU 'Objective 1' status. The user-led methodology is based on showing interactive virtual reality walk-through scenes of local environments to respondents in a series of focus group sessions. Identifying why fears exist, and how they might be constructively reduced, are central aims of the project. This will help to identify fear generating environments and will facilitate the development of a range of environmental refinements and design solutions intended to contribute to reducing crime and personal safety concerns which will encourage community participation and social inclusion.

9.7 SUMMARY

Overall, the literature review, definition and conceptual framework of personal safety developed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 has enhanced knowledge, contributed to the wider criminological literature and established personal safety as a legitimate research concern. The literature review, campus study and recommendations presented in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 have provided an exciting exploration of campus safety based on the perceptions and needs of campus users in place of more restrictive
quantifiable data-based methods. On a practical level the research findings will hopefully contribute to providing a safer environment on both Glamorgan and Loughborough campuses, but will provide other universities with an incitement to address the issue of campus safety and galvanise them into action to make campus users feel less fearful on university premises. On an academic level, the methodology used will hopefully stimulate discussion and debate on the benefits of qualitative, user-led research in the fields of criminology and campus safety as appropriate and beneficial techniques to ascertain how people construct fears and safety concerns and how these may be successfully reduced.
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Appendices
Appendix 1

Sample transcript from the Delphi Pilot Study
The interview was transcribed and key issues were highlighted. Names are deleted and referred to as xxxx.

Transcript of interview with Respondent 1 (R1) 14th July 2003
Duration of interview approximately 35-40 minutes.
JW - me

JW: Ok, if we can just start with the first question of round one. Which is, please list up to ten phrases, concepts or sentences that sum up what the term 'personal safety' means to you.

R1: Ok, well the first thing is, is kind of feeling safe, so that sums it up in one quick phrase. Umm, but also kind of being safe, because part of it is what you do in order to feel safe so there are certain things that I do in my life in order to help me feel safe. And linked to being certain about what I do - not going out at night and to certain types of areas. But then I have also thought in a bit more detail about it and avoidance of physical harm through crime outside of the home, for example mugging. Because I am a criminologist I read about crime all the time and but then also kind of avoidance of physical harm within the home such as burglary, so closing the windows when you go out, that sort of thing. And then not thinking about crime for a minute, but avoiding physical harm from health and safety related issues, so by having fire in the home, having smoke detectors whatever you call them, car accidents, again taking certain precautions such as putting your seat belt on. Ultimately, I suppose, avoiding death or serious injury. That is ultimately at the back of your mind, concerned about, I have read in criminology about women who are more afraid of certain things like a break in because of the potential for rape which is something a man might not think about, so they're thinking more about the physical sort of things. And that in a sense leads on to another one, which is the avoidance of psychological harm because of trauma or stress. Part of somebody breaking into your home is not what they might take but the psychological trauma of the break in because someone has broken in. So I was thinking all about the physical when I suddenly thought hang on part of what you scared about is the physical, I mean psychological trauma of the aftermath of something if it was to happen to you. And I kind of put down security devices as a general kind of thing as well e.g. my car give it an alarm, a crook lock and the hassle of having your car nicked............which I think is more annoying. It is not quite ten.

JW: Ok, that is fine. So personal safety for you then, like you say, includes whether it is some kind of risk to...

R1: .....to my personal or physical well being I suppose. To sum it up on a personal level

JW: It is interesting that you said personal safety as well, so personal safety to you implies that.....

R1: Yeah, as a criminologist I was aware that I was kind of thinking about crime all the time, so I tried to take a step back and think what else? And I thought "oh yeah" you know other things as well, you know avoiding a fire, a car accident, and I am sure other things that I haven't thought of and things you take for granted that you do to try and make sure that you are safe or that you feel safe. I think that they are two different things, like fear of crime, that sort of thing. I
think they are very different. You know I might be going about thinking I am safe
when in fact I am not or vice versa.

JW: So it's the perception....

R1: Yeah I think they are two different things. Yeah, definitely and just from you live
you know, you get a sense of .....oh my god those people live in an area that is
terrible for crime. I live in a relatively crime free area. The worst thing that
happens mostly is cars being stolen which is less of a personal front, less of a
worry and I am not going to chase someone who nicks my car, they can have it.
So I am not going to get in a violent situation because they are trying to steal
my car. And psychologically it is not really distressing either. The time it is going
to take me to sort things out.

JW: So in that case personal safety covers risk to your personal effects, your
belongings?

R1: Yes definitely. But that would be lower down on the scale of risk to physical
harm to myself......In fact its strange, there hasn't been a car stolen from my
area for a while but it happens quite a lot over the space of time and you do get
immune to it, you just think tomorrow I might wake up and the car might be
gone and you don't worry about it. And I guess that might happen to people
who live in areas where there are other kinds of crime, and they just kind of get
immune to it. Put more locks and bolts on their doors and just take it as part of
living.

JW: That's an interesting point because it then links to perceptions - if you are living
in a certain area then it might be a high risk area but if you are used to it then
you might...

R1: Yeah, some people live in areas where there are lots of fires and I heard it on
the news recently about these fires in other parts of the country and I guess
they take that stuff for granted then, you know.

JW: Because perception can potentially have a detrimental effect on your
psychological well being?

R1: Absolutely. Absolutely. And in criminology they have now said that fear of crime
is actually worse than crime itself for some people. They live in a state of fear
and ...when in reality they are not likely to a victim. Females and the elderly
fear crime the most when they are least likely to be victimised. Young men,
who fear crime the least, are most likely to be victimised and perhaps that
happens with personal safety more generally too, I don't know.

JW: Ok, you also said security devices, can you give me some examples of how this
might tie in with being/feeling safe or not being/feeling safe?

R1: Yeah. I suppose, security devices I only associate with property obviously, I
mean you can't......I wasn't thinking at the time, but it has just occurred to me,
about carrying rape alarms, for example, I wasn't thinking about them but that is
an issue. I have never carried an alarm but if I lived in an area where I had to
walk late at night then I would more than likely get myself one. It is just that I
have got the car and if I broke down I have got the phone. Just carrying a
mobile phone if I was travelling any distance, I would categorise as a safety
device. Because I could phone for help without leaving the vehicle, say. Umm,
but I was thinking more about kind of locking up your home, um, making sure
you have got proper security on your vehicle, that is vulnerable in my area and
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oh you've got to be very careful about that because you don't want people breaking in ... alarms, locks, bolts that sort of thing was in my mind when I said security devices. But that was more about property than personal safety. But like I say I think you can add to that personal alarms. As a student in fact we did, by the Students Union, get a chance to pick up one of these alarms, and I did pick one up, just because they were free. An even yeah...even when I go to London, I am much more cautious and much more alert, umm don't like to leave Paddington when its dark, would rather get back there in daylight hours, so light is another factor in fact, a really big factor, that influences me. I don't take my dog out at night, I only take him out during daylight hours, so when winter comes, when winter is in big time, 3:30 is his last walk, where as its is 7 or 8 o'clock, because the dark makes me feel much less safe.

JW: Ok, something that has come up in that question then was risk. How would you define risk?

R1: I suppose risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm.

JW: And harm being....?

R1: Umm, physically being attacked in some way or, or, and not necessarily the hurt, but the psychological trauma that could follow that. Or you know being burnt in a fire, or crashing my car I suppose.

JW: Ok if we can go on to the next question. What factors influence a person's personal safety? You may like to consider the roles of personal experience and the physical and the social environment. Please list in any order of importance.

R1: Ok, again, probably being influenced by criminology I thought about the factors which kind of in a sense I know influence other people's actions to fall victim to crime. But I think it depends on what you think of, but generally speaking, I think age is critical, gender, social class, and that ultimately effects where you live. Umm, nature of employment, obviously some people's occupations are obviously much riskier than others, and if you are not employed then that has implications for how you might live your life, how much money you have to spend on security and the kinds of places that you frequent. Umm, then I kind of put levels of agility/health. And really I was thinking about the chances of avoiding, say, a mugging and the chances of recovering from something like that, psychologically and physically, would be very much bound up with how physically healthy you were. Umm, and then what I thought about was lifestyle/activities which is obviously a huge category but would include things like where you go to socialise, if you travel back and forth to work, or how you travel generally, drug and alcohol consumption and your hobbies. Kind of anything about what you do other than your job really, how you go about doing it. They were the kind of things that jumped out at me. Say, if just take age as an example, certain extremities, very young people and very elderly people are vulnerable. Children need adults to help them get to places, and give them advice about not talking to strangers and things like that, and the elderly are very vulnerable to things like bogus callers and that sort of thing. Umm, we know that people of a certain age take more risks as well, umm so maybe they wouldn't be so cautious inside the home or outside the home.

JW: So all these factors are inter-related then?

R1: I think they are, yeah.
JW: Do you think some are more important that others?

R1: Umm, Yeah, I think with personal safety gender is particularly important. In terms of perceptions of... and I can't speak for all women obviously but I think that adult females are a lot more cautious about a lot of these sort of things than men might be, and I think even to the extent of feeling more safe in the home. You know, I am more likely to check the doors at night, make sure the oven is turned off, or like to not go out late at night than perhaps my partner might be. Umm, and I am more likely to feel unsafe in the home alone, so I think gender is very important. Umm and health obviously. If you feel very healthy and fit then obviously you just feel mentally stronger there I think. And, going back to criminology again, as most criminals are male, if you are another relatively fit male, then you got a better chance of sort of surviving an attack or staving off an attack where as a young female, generally speaking, most men are stronger than women. So it kind of links to gender again. Also social class is really important as well though because, you know, if you... if you are... perhaps it's not social class but what kind of money you have got, but if you live in a very poor area because you have so little money yourself and you live on a very rough housing estate then there is very little you can do to get out of that. You could go to another housing estate but there might be similar problems, not saying that housing estates are the only places there are problems, but they tend to be associated with more levels of unemployment, youths hanging round and causing annoyance and things like that that make you feel unsafe and, so all of them are important really. And the other thing, what's interesting about age is, I think, as you get older you get more cautious and the younger you are the kind of more carefree you are and the less you think about, oh God I've got to do this... I mean, you still lock the door. And when more people lived in the house with me and xxxx sister lived there and her little girl and all the rest of it, I never took responsibility for things like putting batteries in the smoke detector, locking the doors, because Pam was kind of the surrogate mother for the house and she did all of that and when she moved out I took that over. I think it depends where you are in the household as well.

JW: Interesting point ...

R1: Yeah, I mean, when you live at home with your parents, your mum and dad do it for you, don't they? Some men are more proactive about that, I mean xxxx lets me sort everything out.

JW: I understand that! (laughs)

R1: (laughs)

JW: Um, what about lifestyle activities then?

R1: Yeah. Again, I think really important. You know some people do risky sports, don't they, so that are more likely to get injured, say, and they might have a greater risk of falling harm to something like that. I suppose I was more thinking about night-time activities and the night-time economy and things like that. Pubs, clubs, drugs and alcohol and things like that and that kind of scene. And again, you are much more at risk of being assaulted if you frequent a certain kind of area. When you are drunk, or not even drink if you've had a few to drink, you are more choppy. I will walk home late at night, from my local pub, when I have had a couple to drink. I am still cautious because I am very aware of crime but I will do that where I will never do that whilst I was
completely sober. So I think alcohol makes you take risks and ... other people (tape ends)

JW: Yes, sorry, you were saying...

R1: Yeah, I think alcohol is an example of how lots of people are uninhibited and do things they wouldn't normally do. There are more likely to be arguments, fights to break out, and perhaps you to make your way home rather than my taxi or by car because you can't drive because you've had a drink. Because if you can't find a taxi you'll walk home. I know I've done that quite a few times. Umm, but yeah, just where you go, how you get there, the sort of places that you go to and the sorts of people that you mix with can all have an impact on the chances that you might a) have an accident, again in the home say, or b) fall victim to crime, maybe, or you may get in, you've had a few too many to drink, you put the oven to make yourself, you know, a fried egg sandwich, and you forget to turn the oven off. And up goes everything. I think you are much more likely to fall risk in that kind of environment. And obviously drug-taking... you can die from the effects of taking drugs. There's a lot of people I know who have died already because they have taken drugs, yeah by taking drugs they have either died because they have choked by taking drugs and in other places there are people who are killed because of their connection with drugs and, you know, drug deals gone wrong, and lots of stuff. But then again I am a bit concerned that maybe I am over-focussing on crime maybe, I don't know.

JW: So drink and drugs make you take more risks?

R1: I think they do, yes.

JW: They lower your...

R1: They make you less fearful, so you take less precautions. So in a sense you feel safer when you are drunk, but you actually, I believe, less so.

JW: You are more vulnerable?

R1: I think you are, yes.

JW: So what would you say is the opposite of risk?

R1: The opposite of risk? Hmm. I mean do you mean risk as in risk-taking?

JW: Well, as you mentioned before, the risk to come to some harm.

R1: Well, the actual opposite, the extreme is you have no possibility of coming to harm. At all, I suppose.

JW: So, safety.

R1: Yes.

JW: Do you think it's possible to be completely safe?

R1: No.

JW: Ever?
No. Not really no, because you could lock yourself in a house and not go out but you could still fall victim to something within the house. There are lots of things you can do to make yourself safer, but no. I mean one thing that I haven't even mentioned here is like kind of diseases, something that can just happen to you for no reason. Physically illnesses I suppose, that's another way. I mean you might feel less safe because of that and more vulnerable because of that. Yeah, I don't feel unsafe particularly, it's weird now that you've said that, but I don't go around feeling particularly safe either. I just sort of, you just sort of plod along through your life and you don't think about it, do you. You just do things like lock your doors before you go to bed and don't do anything about it. But if something was to happen then I think I would feel very unsafe for a very long time. I know a house burnt near to where I live and I happened to know the two people who died in the house; a very young girl and her partner who was older. And that made me very, very conscious of fire in the home for a very long time....it still does. You know I still go around checking the batteries on the smoke alarm. It had a real impact, and then about 4 or 5 months after that there was a big sweep of all the houses, they all got delivered this big thing about thinking about fire in the home and having exit routes and making sure that everything was...that played on my mind....the thought of waking up, or not waking up, to a smoky room is terrifying, I think. I probably worry about that, well I was probably more conscious about that more than someone breaking in, but that is because of where I live.

JW: So awareness then has helped you?

Yeah, I think it helps you to think about "God, yeah, is my smoke detector all sorted?" but it also plays on your mind a bit. So it might actually make you feel more unsafe for a while, a little bit paranoid, you know, even though you know it's unrealistic. I know when I worked in London I lived in a big huge 20-storey building and all the people that worked for the health authority lived there and we were shown a video of outside by the medical secretary about fire and you literally saw people jumping off burning buildings, it was in Brazil or somewhere, and that night I was so psychologically obviously affected by the video that I smelt burning in my room. Not in my room, but...I was....because it wasn't even in yours too, because it was whether what you were doing. There was 100 people in a corridor, you know, and what about those nutters that had candles in their room and I was very anxious for quite a while about that. Thinking that someone else, and there was no real way out of that building, you know. So yeah, I think you are alerted to, that plays on your mind for a while and you take some extra sort of safety issues and it all kind of goes away again and you forget about it.

JW: I think that is a good point as well, that you are aware of the other people. I mean, that is a point I was going to raise - is your safety always dependent on another person? Which is like ...

An unknown entity, yeah. It is.

You can't predict what other people are going to do.

Absolutely, I think that is it, yeah definitely. Because if you think about when you are in the car I can be the safest driver that I could be, I can get a car with the airbags, I can protect my vehicle. I could put my seatbelt on to protect myself, but if someone is going to crash into me head on or drive into me side-on into the drivers do or then there's not a lot I can do about that. So ultimately it is down to other people. I know my sister-in-law she passed her test a number of
years ago but won't drive because she fears other drivers on the road. She actually won't drive anywhere. Which is an extreme example of someone who doesn't trust other people on the road. I am sure there is a bit more to it perhaps; her father and her uncle both died in traffic accidents so perhaps it is on her mind more. But yeah, she will not drive. At all. She will come with me though, which is much more dangerous (1).

JW: So do you think that your safety is always dependant on other people?

R1: Yeah, it must be. Because even with a fire in a home, unless you live on your own in one little house, then with someone else living with you from like can doing something stupid to set a fire...starts, or even the next door house....a fire there could ultimately damage or spread to you, I don't know. It is mostly other people and yourself that you are having to think about, yeah.

JW: So mostly other people, but not entirely, because you could cause yourself harm if you, for example, set fire to your own bedroom.

R1: Absolutely, yes. Or you could very much contribute to the potential for your own harm by, for example, by hitchhiking, or walking down dark alleys late at night. In my opinion, I mean I would never blame a victim for their own assault in that instance, but I would not put myself at that risk, just in case just because it would be insurmountable to overcome the trauma of all that. A friend of mine used to hitchhike everywhere and I used to say to her "your crazy, you shouldn't do it, something might happen to you." And she would say "I won't put..., I know there's a risk, but, you know, that's the way I get around, I can't afford to get around any other way," and that is the freedom of choice to be able to travel in that way. She sort of ....was 9½....[undecipherable]. I would be too stressed, you know. I wouldn't enjoy the experience because I would be thinking that the van I got into or the lorry driver was a psychopath.

JW: So it's....a part of it then is taking responsibility for yourself?

R1: Absolutely, and where possible other people when you can. So if there is other people in your house, your children, if you've got children, or your partner, you will, you know, take responsibility for their safety as well, ultimately. But if we are talking about strangers out there that could do you harm, then there is really not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk.

JW: Ok, thank you. Brilliant. If we can now move on to the third question. Please suggest a possible definition of personal safety on which my research could be based.

R1: Ok, well in a way, we have discussed a lot more now and I would probably make changes, but I instinctively put Personal safety could be defined as a person's perceptions of their likely risk of sustaining harm... and we have kind of talked about what harm might be and the kind of thing mentioned in question one and the measures they take to avoid such harm. That's one way of thinking about it, so it's kind of getting at perceptions and what you do to avoid risk, if you like or the actual likelihood that a person will fall victim to harm, which is in part based on the measures they take to avoid risk. So that was the sort of two things that I thought about really. So it's whether, you know, it's that balance between perception and actual risk and they are ultimately connected, because although they might sometimes be opposites, like the idea of you know that you fear crime but you are not likely to be a crime victim, but you might be very conscious of risk and therefore take loads of precautions and be a bit of a
risk fanatic but in reality you are very unlikely to fall victim to harm because of where you live and what you do and the extra precautions that you take. So I don't know that they necessarily go together but they might be kind of opposites some of the time.

JW: But ultimately they both contribute to personal safety to some extent?

R1: Yes, definitely.

JW: So your perceptions and actual risk?

R1: Yes, and actual risk is something like, you know, age gender, social class, what you do and where you go. But to me, if I was doing the research, the biggest thing that I would be grappling with would be that difference between someone's perceptions and the reality. I don't know how you could actually measure... I suppose you could take some measure of the sorts of things that had happened to that person within the last 12 months maybe, you know, what accidents they'd had, any physical or psychological harm that they have come to, if they could chart that for you.

JW: So it's their experiences as well?

R1: Yeah

JW: Previous experiences of personal safety issues?

R1: Yeah, but I was more thinking of if you wanted... I mean I have listed those things that I think make you more or less at risk of harm, and less personally safe but they might be wrong and the only way you could find that out would be to perhaps say "Ok, well what's happened to you over the last two years, have you had a burglary, have you had this, or have you had that, have you come to any harm physically or psychologically? And then, they just might say, well no nothing's happened at all but yet I am still very aware of these issues and I might kind of base the question on 'why'? Someone else might have said well yeah I've had my car nicked twice and I have had a break-in but they don't take any precautions. Why not?

JW: So we have to bring those two together then?

R1: Yeah, I think so, yeah.

JW: So it's about quantifying perceptions?

R1: Yes, and quantifying actual risk. Because who knows whether, you know, those things that I have listed such as age, gender, social class, and what you do are all that important? But I think that some of them might be.

JW: So could it be that there is no true way of measuring risk and that you do just have to live just as safely as you can by adopting various measures?

R1: Yes, yeah.

JW: Can you think of anything else that might be relevant?

R1: Umm, it's weird because it's one of those things that you don't think about but you are really thinking about in a really weird way. It's only when something happens that you think, "oh, yeah, I must adopt, I must do that or not do that."
And I just think that some people are just more aware anyway of their environment and other people, you know. They are more tuned in to the potentially dangerous scenario, you know. Little things like on a train. A lot of people will get up to go to the toilet or the buffet car and say “can you watch my stuff” and I always think they are crackers. Just because they have sat on the same table as you for half an hour they think it is safe for you to watch their stuff. What’s that about? And I end up doing it as well then (!), you know I sit there and think, “oh well, he’s ok.” But then I’m very careful not to, like, accidentally hurt myself. My ***** used to do lots with racing cars and he’d like be leaning over the bonnet of a car that had all jaggedy edges because of the way they do the cars and I remember thinking “you could cut your stomach open now” but he was very unaware of that kind of stuff, you know, he was much more “just get in there.” Like that. I just think that there are some people are more cautious about that. Putting themselves at risk, accidentally.

JW: So when you say that some people are more aware of their environment, what things in the environment do you think you should be aware of?

R1: Well, other people. All the people that are around you. I think you need to be aware of, particularly when you are in an unusual environment that you don’t normally frequent. They were laughing at me in work when I said that when I go up to London to do my Home Office stuff, you know once I leave the building at the Crown Prosecution Service I just go directly back to my hotel and I eat there and I just go in my room. I would not go wondering around London and the guys say to me “but you were right by the London Eye, didn’t you go on the London Eye?”...a) I wouldn’t enjoy just my own company going on something like that and b) I would just always be thinking “well somebody on their own, a young female on their own is a potential target for something. Now I know that statistically the chances are very rare but I wouldn’t feel comfortable. And that is my psyche, obviously. Somebody else, I mean, xxx would go to London just to watch demonstrations, and just to observe from a distance and he feels perfectly safe. But he is six foot tall and about this (demonstrated distance with hands) wide. He is a big fella and he feels obviously that he can look after himself. So it’s strange because I have never been assaulted, I have never been robbed, I have never been burgled, nothing has ever happened to me like that. And I am also aware of not listening to the hype about young females being victimised because I know the reality is very different. But yet I still am very aware of that sort of stuff, I don’t know why. I have always been quite cautious though, even as a kid.

JW: So you take precautions to look after yourself...

R1: Trust, that’s another word. I don’t trust people really, deep down...unless I know them very well. I always think that, well I always look at people and think that they could be bad. Instead of thinking, oh they are probably good. It’s not very nice is it? It’s quite negative.

JW: Do you think that it is a defence mechanism then?

R1: Yeah, and even when I am on the train coming back from somewhere and someone is talking to me, if they were female I would be fine, but if they are male talking to me and asking me a lot of questions then I would start to wonder why they were so interested in talking to me. I would be suspicious. (tape ends)

JW: Sorry about that. So it’s about being cautious?
R1: Yes, and trust, I hadn’t thought of the word trust but I think it’s how much you trust human nature, really, and other humans. So if, you know, you think everybody else is, you know, non-criminal and is not going to set your house on fire then you are not going to worry about anything other than your own things but it’s that sort of thing when you are thinking we can all make mistakes, we can all accidentally set the house on fire, or we can....or we know that there is a lot of people out there who would take an opportunity to say take your bag or....for example when I used to go to London when I was younger my dad always used to say to me to be careful with my bag, my purse, stuff like that, walking around London and perhaps that was always stuck in my mind as well that, you know, if you flaunt an opportunity to someone to grab your phone then they say don’t walk down the street with your snazzy mobile phone in your briefcase. Not that I’ve got a snazzy phone....or a briefcase, but if you did because you are inviting the potential for trouble so it’s that as well, it’s you know yeah. I don’t go talking to ... you know, I wouldn’t go ... if I got off the train and someone said to me “oh yeah, I am going to Ponty[pridd] let me give you a lift.” I wouldn’t go with them. I would wait half an hour for the train just in case. So I am probably not very trusting of other people.

JW: Do you think that that comes, or is it something that you’ve learnt or where do you think...this is not meant to be a really personal question, but if you could give some general answers. I mean, it could be that it’s your job, but were do you think that comes from?

R1: It’s weird because I don’t know because, as I said, nothing has happened to me in any form of crime other than getting my car nicked, which I don’t worry about. Um, so I really don’t know. I mean I think I have always been a bit like that, a bit kind of like “this could be a dodgy situation.” But I just think that some people are much more cautious than others, and much more wary about the potential for something to happen than others. Perhaps its because I know that deep down, if something were to happen to me, it would be so devastating, if I was mugged, assaulted, punched in the head, raped ... anything like that would just be horrendous so perhaps I’m just a bit more forward thinking, I don’t know. So perhaps it is because I do a lot with crime, reading things, it’s playing on my mind without me realising it. It could be that.

JW: So it could be your profession? It could be your personality or learnt?

R1: Yes, it’s certainly not to do with direct experience of any sort. And also I don’t know anyone who has, you know, I mean I know boys who have been in fights, but I don’t know of a female of my age/category or anything who has been robbed or assaulted or beaten up or anything, so it’s not that either. Obviously I listen to the news and watch television and watch some of these junk documentaries but I am not overly influenced by them because I know that the reality is that females are a fairly low risk. I don’t know, I think that some people are just generally a bit more wary about their environment, I guess, I don’t know. But perhaps the job more than I realised, particularly certain things, in, you know... I’ve interviewed people who have killed, I’ve read a lot of files about homicides, and I think it does ultimately, you know ... it’s there in the back of your mind, you can see the terrible things that people can do to other people and over nothing a lot of the time or for no explicable reason anyway, so I think you do begin to realise “oh it could happen to me”. I don’t think I am immune to any of these things, a lot of the time it is just chance, it’s where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation. But again, I’m thinking about crime really.

JW: So it’s about being very, very aware then?
R1: I think so, yes.

JW: Ok, brilliant, just to wrap it up, the final question is what connection do you have with personal safety in your work? This is also a chance for me to ask you, um ... your answers have been very interesting and a lot of them have been very personal, that comes across very clearly, so do you think your, your answers and your views are a combination of who you are and not just your profession, the work, the criminology. Do you think it's more to do with the fact that you're female, you're young, you know?

R1: Yes, definitely. Yes. I think my personal characteristics, socio-demographic characteristics, yeah, the fact that I am a reasonably young female, obviously must have a bearing on how I feel ultimately. I think as a female I'm aware of male danger. Female, as well, you know. Females can be violent as well, or whatever. Umm, in terms of my actual... in terms of my day-to-day job there's nothing in my day-to-day job that, really, makes me especially, umm, attuned to safety issues, because, you know, I get to work easily and my job is not dangerous in any way, it's not as though I am a police officer or anything like that. But some of the things I do in connection with the research for my job undoubtedly have made me much more aware of crime, obviously, particularly all the stuff on homicide, and interestingly, we had a lot of trouble with this building because a set of keys had been lost and there was somebody coming in to this building, which didn't overly concern me because they weren't appearing to nick anything. I think maybe they were just like having a cup of coffee and probably using the phone, so just generally, you know ... and we had all the locks changed and everything, umm, and that ... and a guy came over from the health and safety place here and said ... gave us lots of little tips like, you know, "do you always lock your door when you nip up to the loo," and I said "no I never bloody lock it" and he said "well you should," and also you should do that thing on your computer so that your screen disappears and none can come in and read anything that's on your screen and I sort of do that, mind. But, yeah, you know, that's nothing, that's just like normal working practice. This is not a dangerous environment to work in, at all, so no .... It just makes me think anything to do with it really. My main fear is, you know, would be getting backward and forward and whether I felt safe going backward and forward, which I do. So yeah, there's nothing ... I put here there's ... you know, what connection do you have with personal safety in your work? I mean there's none specifically other than awareness of crime and safety related issues, really. I probably wouldn't, in the winter, I probably wouldn't want to be in this building on my own at night, umm, you know, it gets dark about four, doesn't it, in the winter? Umm, I would probably be a little bit cautious, you know, going out ... I mean ... I would lock the front door, in fact we all do that, except for the blokes. If there's one of us, one of us females, on our own, we tend to lock the front door, because a lot of people just come and go in this building, students will nip in, so we tend to do that. And I did once have an aggressive student, which made me think "God, that could be dodgy", you know, some of them can suddenly go mad if they are stressed out and could hit you over the head or something. But, yeah, that's it really.

JW: That's brilliant.

R1: Is that sort of stuff ok, you know?

JW: Yeah, that's exactly what I need

R1: I'm not rambling?
JW: Not at all

R1: Well you can have that, look (refers to interview questions and answers prepared in advance)

JW: Thank you

At the end of the interview R1 and I continued to talk informally about personal safety and she raised some further points that came to her following our discussion. She gave full consent for these points to be incorporated into the pilot study first round interview stage, the main points of which are paraphrased below.

- Age is very important in a person’s perceptions of personal safety because at different ages you have different priorities in life. You feel ‘invincible’ when you are younger, as a result of evolution, our psyche and hormone levels. When you are younger you are more carefree and more concerned with things like boyfriends and going out rather than more serious things that come with age and responsibility. Perhaps as you get older you become more aware of the fragility of human existence.

- Your parenting and upbringing was also noted as an important influence in one’s views on personal safety because how parents respond to personal safety issues and teach their children accordingly has a bearing on how that child grows up and in turn develops their own sense of personal safety. For example, a particularly anxious parent could instil sensible precautionary behaviour in a child or, at the other end of the scale, paranoia. While a more relaxed and carefree parenting role may cause a child to take more risks and worry less. Our parents’ attitudes to personal safety are in turn influenced by the variety of factors discussed earlier, such as gender, social class, experience etc, as well as their own preconceptions, so it is an extremely complex process.

- Personal life experience and previous exposure to crime was highlighted as vital to a person’s feelings of personal safety, such as if they have previously been a victim of crime or have known someone who was a victim of crime, for example. This could potentially dramatically shape their views.

- Another useful point raised was the national versus local crime statistics debate and the representation that these present. R1 said that the British Crime Survey is routinely regarded by the public as a true depiction of crime when in reality it is generalised across the whole country. In reality, local crime statistics are much more representative about the true nature of crime in your environment. The media frequently uses the BCS to lambaste the government, police and CPS’ failure to deal with crime when in reality they do not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone’s local environment and your true risk of crime e.g. London, where more crime occurs and the preconceptions held about it.
Appendix 2

Delphi pilot study – transcript analysis question one
Question one asked:

*Please list up to ten phrases, concepts or sentences that sum up what the term ‘personal safety’ means to you*

The highlighted sections from the transcripts were grouped together, analysed for commonalities and classified into emerging themes. These can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building block number:</th>
<th>Key themes/building blocks that emerged in analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEELINGS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACTUAL PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EFFECTS OF HARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PERSONAL SAFETY IS TRANSIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WAYS OF INCREASING PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ACTIONS OF OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HEALTH AND SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL SAFETY (see <em>appendix 3</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process for R1 can be summarised as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building block number:</th>
<th>Key themes/building blocks that emerged in analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone’s perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance between perception and actual risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal safety could be defined as a person’s perceptions of their likely risk of sustaining harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People have different perceptions of risk. It’s about getting at perceptions, and what you do to avoid risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference between someone’s perceptions and the reality; hard to measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEELINGS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear or crime v actual crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime worse than crime itself for some people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live in state of fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not likely to be victim e.g. females and elderly fear crime most, least likely to be victimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking I am safe when in fact I am not or vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime is actually worse than crime itself for some people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State of fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females and the elderly fear crime the most when they are least likely to be victimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You feel safer when you are drunk, but you actually, I believe, less so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fact that I am a reasonably young female, obviously must have a bearing on how I feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower down on the scale of risk to physical harm to myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get immune to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You don’t worry about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As part of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take that stuff for granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less precautions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays on your mind a bit. feel more unsafe for a while, a little bit paranoid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You fear crime but you are not likely to be a crime victim, but you might be very conscious of risk and therefore take loads of precautions. In reality, you are very unlikely to fall victim to harm because of where you live and what you do and the extra precautions that you take. Actual risk age, gender, social class, what you do and where you go.

### 3 ACTUAL PERSONAL SAFETY

**Being safe** – certain things you can do to feel safe

Quantifying actual risk

BCS frequently used in media to criticise government, police etc and is regarded by public as 'true' reflection of crime in your environment, but in reality it is generalised across country and doesn't accurately reflect what's happening in your immediate environment, and your true risk of crime.

Balance between perception and actual risk – ultimately connected, but could be opposites, e.g. may be very conscious of risk and take lots of precautions but in reality be unlikely to fall victim to harm.

**Being safe**

Young men, who fear crime the least, are most likely to be victimised.

Avoidance of physical harm through crime outside of the home

Reality is that females are a fairly low risk.

Fall victim to something within the house.

That statistically the chances are very rare.

Somebody on their own, a young female on their own is a potential target for something.

But if someone is going to crash into me head on or drive into me side-on into the drivers do then there's not a lot I can do about that.

Actual likelihood that a person will fall victim to harm, which is in part based on the measures they take to avoid risk.

### 4 RISK

Risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm

A lot of the time (fall victim to crime) it is just chance; where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation.

Just think that there are some people are more cautious about that.

**Putting themselves at risk**

It is just chance, it where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation.

Risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm. Harm is physically being attacked in some way, not necessarily hurt, but psychological trauma that follows or being burnt in a fire or crashing my car.
5  HARM

Mugging
Burglary
Fire
Car accidents
Break in because of the potential for rape
Physical sort of things
Psychological harm
Break in
Physical
Security devices
Mugged, assaulted, punched in the head, raped
Accidents
Physical or psychological harm
Crime
And harm being physically being attacked in some way but also the psychological trauma that could follow that burnt in a fire, or crashing my car
Fall victim to crime
Attack
Getting car nicked – hassle and annoying – vulnerable to this in my area
Risk to personal or physical well-being
Car getting stolen less of a personal front, less of a worry, psychologically not really distressing, won’t get in a violent situation
Risk to personal effects, but lower down scale of risk to physical harm to myself
Harm is physically being attacked in some way, not necessarily hurt, but psychological trauma that follows or being burnt in a fire or crashing my car

6  EFFECTS OF HARM

Trauma
Stress
Psychological trauma
Aftermath
Horrendous
If something was to happen then I think I would feel very unsafe for a very long time
Devastating
Psychological harm
Physical things
Psychological trauma of aftermath

7 PERSONAL SAFETY IS TRANSIENT
(No issues with R1)

8 WAYS OF INCREASING PERSONAL SAFETY

Certain things that I do in my life in order to help me feel safe
Cautious
Awareness of crime and safety related issues
A little bit cautious, I would lock the front door
Avoidance of physical harm within the home
Closing the windows
Avoiding physical harm from health and safety
Smoke detectors
Precautions
Seat belt
Avoiding death or serious injury
Or you could very much contribute to the potential for your own harm by, for example, by hitchhiking, or walking down dark alleys late at night
I would not put myself at that risk
Freedom of choice
There is really not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk.
Flaunt an opportunity
Mobile phone
Inviting the potential for trouble
Some people are much more cautious than others,
Wary about the potential for something to happen than others
Forward thinking
Car alarm, a crook lock and the hassle of having your car
Personal or physical well being
Avoiding a fire
Those people live in an area that is terrible for crime.
Things you can do to make yourself safer
Conscious of fire
Exit routes
Not going to get in a violent situation.
More aware
Tuned in to the potentially dangerous scenario
More wary about their environment
I don't think I am immune
Security devices
Avoid risk
Airbags
Protect my vehicle
Seatbelt on
Responsibility
Avoiding a fire, car accident
Being cautious
Avoidance of physical harm through crime out of home – mugging
Avoidance of physical harm within home – burglary, break-in
Avoidance of physical harm from Health and Safety issues - fire in home, car accidents
Avoiding death or serious injury
You can put yourself in a lot of risk. There are things you can do to make yourself feel safer. About taking responsibility for yourself, and where possible other people eg children. But if talking about strangers then not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk.

Psychologically affected. Alerted to (an issue such as fire, by awareness), plays on your mind for a while, you take some extra sort of safety issues and you forget about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 ACTIONS OF OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An unknown entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimately it is down to other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the people that are around you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal safety is always dependent on other people; an unknown entity e.g. you can be safest driver, with airbags and seatbelt, but if someone is going to crash into me then there's not a lot I can do about that.

Ultimately, it's down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm e.g. by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night. But then it's freedom of choice.

Strangers, bogus callers.
HEALTH AND SAFETY

Locks changed
Accidentally hurt
Health and safety advice e.g. tips like lock your door, lock computer screen – normal working practice

CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL SAFETY (discussed in appendix three and shown in main text, figure 3.2)

This was repeated with the other two transcripts, and the findings from the analysis of all three transcripts are presented below, with quotes lifted from the pilot study interviews that shape and highlight the emerging themes or building blocks of personal safety. These have been colour coded and the R reference refers to the respondent number.

Building block 1: PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY:

Perceptual angle which can be real or imagined R2 PERCEPTIONS

Media statistics – no of old people who die prematurely following burglaries – more to do with stress incurred than physical harm – perceptual issue R2 PERCEPTIONS

People’s behaviour - do and don’t do certain things, borne out of perception issues – exasperated by being dark R2 PERCEPTIONS

Perception of fear – R3 PERCEPTIONS

People have different perceptions of risk, the influences of social factors. It’s about getting at perceptions, and what you do to avoid risk. R1 PERCEPTIONS

Difference between someone’s perceptions and the reality; hard to measure R1 PERCEPTIONS

Three-dimensional – probability and severity (controlled mechanism approach), emotional element (how the individual feels and how they behave), perception of risk taking and there’s a spectrum which says you’ll behave in different ways depending on how you feel. R2 PERCEPTIONS
Building block 2: FEELINGS OF PERSONAL SAFETY

Feeling threatened, is my safety in danger in a particular situation? R3 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Feeling of safety, not feeling threatened, fear and moving about in a non-threatening environment R3 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Feeling of fear – R3 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Perception and perceived safety R3 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Feeling at ease with the environment; pointers, certain landmarks can make you feel safe R3 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Feeling safe R1 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Feeling safe R2 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Fear or crime v actual crime R1 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Fear of crime worse than crime itself for some people R1 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Live in state of fear R1 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Not likely to be victim e.g. females and elderly fear crime most, least likely to be victimised R1 FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Building block 3: ACTUAL PERSONAL SAFETY

Being safe – certain things you can do to feel safe R1 ACTUAL SAFETY

The ability to walk around in your environment without fear of verbal or physical abuse R3 ACTUAL SAFETY

Quantifying actual risk R1 ACTUAL SAFETY

BCS frequently used in media to criticise government, police etc and is regarded by public as ‘true’ reflection of crime in your environment, but in reality it is generalised across country and doesn’t accurately reflect what’s happening in your immediate environment, and your true risk of crime. R1 ACTUAL SAFETY

Quantifying actual risk R1 ACTUAL SAFETY

Measures to improve personal safety – probability and severity R2 ACTUAL SAFETY

Probability R2 ACTUAL SAFETY

Balance between perception and actual risk – ultimately connected, but could be opposites, e.g. may be very conscious of risk and take lots of precautions but in reality be unlikely to fall victim to harm. R1 ACTUAL SAFETY

Personal safety when you cross the road, when you are walking about and interaction with other humans R3 ACTUAL SAFETY
Building block 4: RISK

Risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm R1 RISK

Degree of risk and probability; depends on where you are. Some things, eg tripping over dodgy carpet in office something you can do something about. Violent crime is in theory a more random activity. Crime statistics, able to quantify it. Other factors are potentially more random in their nature R2 RISK

Personal safety not always dependant on other people because people can put themselves at more risk R2 RISK

The opposite of safety is a situation where you were at risk or a very significant risk of something happening to you R3 RISK

Risk is the likelihood that something is going to happen - heightened risk. Can be caused by a person who’s at risk by not following sort of general, common sense rules. But also got risk that you can do nothing about. If other person not giving the same amount of care and attention then you may have reduced your risk, but they are increasing it but at a rate you don’t really know about. R3 RISK

There’s this whole other area of circumstances that you’ve got no control over – the other person’s behaviour. Can try and control them in some way with guidelines but never 100% certainty that you know what they are going to do and that’s the nature of the human beast. You can reduce the risk, but not remove it. R3 RISK

Risk assessments. Longer term view that if you are aware then you can take the necessary steps to prevent that possibility from becoming a reality. R3 RISK

Risk of personal of harm R2 RISK

Probability. R2 RISK

A lot of the time, (fall victim to crime) it is just chance; where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation. R1 RISK

Risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm. Harm is physically being attacked in some way, not necessarily hurt, but psychological trauma that follows or being burnt in a fire or crashing my car. R1 RISK

More ‘at risk’ groups – women, ethnic and religious minorities, tribalism, football supporters – anything which singles you out from the norm or makes you ‘different’, or behaving differently. R2 RISK

Three-dimensional aspect of measures to improve personal safety– probability and severity (controlled mechanism approach), emotional element (how the individual feels and how they behave), perception of risk taking and there’s a spectrum which says you’ll behave in different ways depending on how you feel. R2 RISK
Building block 5: HARM

Getting car nicked – hassle and annoying – vulnerable to this in my area R1 HARM

Risk to personal or physical well-being R1 HARM

Car getting stolen less of a personal front, less of a worry, psychologically not really distressing, won’t get in a violent situation R1 HARM

Risk to personal effects, but lower down scale of risk to physical harm to myself R1 HARM

Harm is physically being attacked in some way, not necessarily hurt, but psychological trauma that follows or being burnt in a fire or crashing my car. R1 HARM

Your well-being; violence or theft against you or your property R2 HARM

Harm R2 HARM

Street crime R2 HARM

Mugging R2 HARM

Verbal abuse R2 HARM

Threats R2 HARM

Intimidation R2 HARM

Risk of personal harm in home, e.g. if someone throws a brick through the window - feel threatened after incident R2 HARM

Difference between intent and threat R2 HARM

Personal safety is physical and verbal abuse, but manifests itself in different ways. Verbal abuse harder to quantify, as in its effects on you – psychological effects. R3 HARM

Bullying or systematic name-calling – would have a knock-on effect. Intertwined with other aspects – human responses are complex. R3 HARM

Safety issues inside the building – fire R3 HARM

Building block 6: EFFECTS OF HARM

Psychological harm R1 EFFECTS OF HARM

Physical things R1 EFFECTS OF HARM

Psychological trauma of aftermath R1 EFFECTS OF HARM

Trauma R1 EFFECTS OF HARM

Stress R1 EFFECTS OF HARM
### Building block 7: PERSONAL SAFETY IS TRANSIENT

Level of risk changes and risk taking exercise - people make judgements and people have different perception of risk. **R2 TRANSIENT**

Risk changes **R2 TRANSIENT**

---

### Building block 8: WAYS OF INCREASING PERSONAL SAFETY

Avoiding a fire, car accident **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Being cautious **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Avoidance of physical harm through crime out of home – mugging **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Avoidance of physical harm within home – burglary, break-in **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Avoiding death or serious injury **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Freedom from physical harm, theft, notions of theft, notions of violence against you or your property. **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

How much responsibility you put on individual for own actions and behaviour. **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

Common sense; inadvisable to wander around in the dark in certain areas of town or city. Can be fed by hysteria of tabloid press **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

People do things subconsciously – make judgements **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

Natural fear of the dark or drummed into some people, something that they learn, you pick it up from childhood eg don’t take sweets from strange men. **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

You can put yourself in a lot of risk. There are things you can do to make yourself feel safer. About taking responsibility for yourself, and where possible other people eg children. But if talking about strangers then not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk. **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Whether you take actions to remove risks. Most important influence would be person themselves taking the necessary precautions. **R2 INCREASING SAFETY**

Psychologically affected. Alerted to (an issue such as fire, by awareness), plays on your mind for a while, you take some extra sort of safety issues and you forget about it. **R1 INCREASING SAFETY**

Instinct & gut feeling. Subconscious alterations of your movements or behaviour, you do things without thinking - we make little adjustments to our actions eg to how we are moving to what we are going to do because, we’ve picked up on a potential risk. **R3 INCREASING SAFETY**

Can be for just a split second. Throughout a normal day there can be a handful of instances where your personal safety can be compromised but you don’t actually think about it. Like a natural reaction. Hard to pin down in a study. **R3 INCREASING SAFETY**
Building block 9: ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Proximity of other people – distance and numbers. R2 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Safer in a crowd up to a point, but more at risk of being pick-pocketed than when a much lower density of people. R2 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Another person interaction. R3 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Feelings and general awareness – lots of people around you. R3 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Personal safety is always dependent on other people; an unknown entity eg you can be safest driver, with airbags and seatbelt, but if someone is going to crash into me then there’s not a lot I can do about that. R1 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Ultimately, it’s down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm eg by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night. But then it’s freedom of choice. R1 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Can never be statistically 100% completely safe – R3 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Risk taking exercise; people make judgements. R2 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Strangers, bogus callers. R1 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

The unknown of the other person. R3 ACTIONS OF OTHERS

Building block 10: HEALTH & SAFETY

Health and safety issues. Legally prescribed set of values or processes, eg fall down stairs, in aeroplane crash. Non-statutory elements more difficult. Log assaults on staff as work-force accidents – assault an affront of someone’s personal safety. R2 HEALTH & SAFETY

Health and Safety at Work Act definition is the ALARC principle which means risk is as low as is reasonably practicable – risk probability and severity – can apply this to personal safety, can be quantifiable – R2 HEALTH & SAFETY

Text book definition of accidents – R2 HEALTH & SAFETY

Personal safety is not distinct from health and safety – both safety of the person involved, very much intertwined. Chemical spills covered by COSCH regulations, the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 R3 HEALTH & SAFETY

Accidental side is covered by Health and Safety regulations eg accidental slips, trips R3 HEALTH & SAFETY

Safety in labs covered by Health and Safety regulations R3 HEALTH & SAFETY

Health and safety advice eg tips like lock your door, lock computer screen – normal working practice R1 HEALTH & SAFETY

ALARC principle which is as low as reasonably practicable – probability and severity of risk – can apply this to personal safety – quantified assessment for a whole range of almost immeasurable number of circumstances and factors. R3 HEALTH AND SAFETY

Risk assessments – potential for injury or accidents. Longer term view that if you are aware then you can take the necessary steps to prevent that possibility from becoming a reality. R2 HEALTH AND SAFETY

Health and safety issues outside – moving vehicles, tripping down the stairs R3 HEALTH AND SAFETY

Avoidance of physical harm from Health and Safety issues - fire in home, car accidents R1 HEALTH AND SAFETY
Appendix 3

Delphi pilot study – transcript analysis question two
This section deals with number 11 of the key building blocks of personal safety discussed in appendix two and refers to the responses to question two of the Delphi study pilot interviews, which asked the question:

What factors influence a person's personal safety? You may like to consider the roles of personal experience and the physical and the social environment. Please list in any order of importance.

Findings: Personal Safety is influenced by three main determinants and two further determinants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical factors</th>
<th>Other factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL SAFETY – analysis from R1 transcript

The process for R1 can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINANT</th>
<th>Quote from focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PHYSICAL** | Night  
Certain types of areas.  
Carrying rape alarms,  
Car  
Carrying a mobile phone  
Safety device.  
I could phone for help without leaving the vehicle  
Locking up your home  
Proper security on your vehicle  
Alarms, locks, bolts  
Personal alarms.  
London, I am much more cautious and much more alert  
Dark  
Daylight hours  
Light is another factor  
The dark makes me feel much less safe  
Winter  
Travel |
| SOCIAL | Personal characteristics, socio-demographic characteristics, |
|        | Government, police and CPS' failure not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone's local environment and your true risk of crime. |
|        | More serious things that come with age and responsibility. |
|        | As you get older you become more aware of the fragility of human existence. |
|        | Parents respond to personal safety issues and teach their children accordingly |
|        | National v local crime statistics debate |
|        | Personal characteristics, socio-demographic characteristics, |
|        | As you get older you get more cautious and the younger you are the kind of more carefree you are |
|        | Pub, clubs, drugs and alcohol |
|        | Alcohol makes you take risks |
|        | You can't drive you can't find a taxi you'll walk home |
|        | Taking precautions - seatbelt on |
|        | Factors that influence other people's actions to fall victim to crime |

| SOCIAL | Male danger |
|        | Very poor area so little money |
|        | Very rough housing estate tend to be associated with more levels of unemployment, youths hanging round and causing annoyance and things like that that make you feel unsafe |
|        | More at risk of being assaulted if you frequent a certain kind of area |
|        | All the people that are around you |
|        | Strangers |
|        | Crime-free area v Areas terrible for crime |
|        | Bogus callers |
|        | Nature of employment, occupations (some riskier than others) |
|        | Ultimately, it's down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm e.g. by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night, I would not put myself at that risk. But then it's freedom of choice. |
|        | The media frequently uses the BCS to lambaste the government, police and CPS' failure to deal with crime when in reality they do not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone's local environment and your true risk of crime. |
|        | Where you live. |
|        | Some people's occupations are obviously much riskier than others |
|        | Kinds of places that you frequent. |
|        | Hobbies |
|        | Very young people and very elderly people are vulnerable. Children need adults |
|        | Social class |

| SOCIAL | Nature of employment, occupations (some riskier than others) |
|        | Ultimately, it's down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm e.g. by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night, I would not put myself at that risk. But then it's freedom of choice. |
|        | The media frequently uses the BCS to lambaste the government, police and CPS' failure to deal with crime when in reality they do not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone's local environment and your true risk of crime. |
|        | Where you live. |
|        | Some people's occupations are obviously much riskier than others |
|        | Kinds of places that you frequent. |
|        | Hobbies |
|        | Very young people and very elderly people are vulnerable. Children need adults |
|        | Social class |
|        | As you get older you get more cautious and the younger you are the kind of more carefree you are |
|        | Pub, clubs, drugs and alcohol |
|        | Alcohol makes you take risks |
|        | You can't drive you can't find a taxi you'll walk home |
|        | Taking precautions - seatbelt on |
|        | Factors that influence other people's actions to fall victim to crime |

| SOCIAL | Male danger |
|        | Very poor area so little money |
|        | Very rough housing estate tend to be associated with more levels of unemployment, youths hanging round and causing annoyance and things like that that make you feel unsafe |
|        | More at risk of being assaulted if you frequent a certain kind of area |
|        | All the people that are around you |
|        | Strangers |
|        | Crime-free area v Areas terrible for crime |
|        | Bogus callers |
|        | Nature of employment, occupations (some riskier than others) |
|        | Ultimately, it's down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm e.g. by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night, I would not put myself at that risk. But then it's freedom of choice. |
|        | The media frequently uses the BCS to lambaste the government, police and CPS' failure to deal with crime when in reality they do not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone's local environment and your true risk of crime. |
|        | Where you live. |
|        | Some people's occupations are obviously much riskier than others |
|        | Kinds of places that you frequent. |
|        | Hobbies |
|        | Very young people and very elderly people are vulnerable. Children need adults |
|        | Social class |
|        | As you get older you get more cautious and the younger you are the kind of more carefree you are |
|        | Pub, clubs, drugs and alcohol |
|        | Alcohol makes you take risks |
|        | You can't drive you can't find a taxi you'll walk home |
|        | Taking precautions - seatbelt on |
|        | Factors that influence other people's actions to fall victim to crime |
Age – young and elderly more vulnerable. People of a certain age take more risks and less cautious in and out of home

Money – how you live your life, money spent on security etc, places you frequent

Agility & health – avoiding a mugging, recovering psychologically and physically

Travel – to and from work, generally etc

Drug and alcohol consumption

Gender, esp. in terms of perception e.g. adult females more cautious. Also men gen. stronger than women

Health – if fit and healthy feel mentally stronger, male who is fit and healthy more likely to survive attack by another male (most criminals are male)

Social class and what kind of money you’ve got – poor area, very rough housing estate – not all problems in housing estates but associated with more unemployment, youths hanging around causing annoyance – things that make you feel unsafe

Age – as get older you get more cautious; younger you are, more carefree – take responsibility, mother figure – where you are in household – when live at home, parents do it for you.

Lifestyle activities – risky sports, injuries, greater risk of falling harm

Night-time activities & night-time economy. More at risk of being assaulted if you frequent a certain kind of area. When you are drunk, more choppy. Walk home from pub when drunk, still cautious but wouldn’t do it when sober.

Where you go, how you get there, the sorts of places you go and the sorts of people that you mix with can have an impact on chances of you having an accident in home or fall victim to crime

Drug taking - makes you less fearful, take less precautions. In a sense you feel safer when you are drunk but you are actually less so.

There are things you can do to make yourself feel safer.

Diseases, physical illnesses – less safe and more vulnerable.

Plod along through life doing things like locking the doors before bed but if something where to happen I think I would feel very unsafe for a very long time, e.g. know someone who died in house fire which made me very, very conscious of fire in the home for a long time – it still does. Had big impact.

Delivered leaflets to all houses, played on my mind, terrifying; more conscious of that than of someone breaking in.

Awareness has helped, but plays on your mind for a bit; might make you feel more unsafe for a while; paranoid, even though you know it’s unrealistic.

Psychologically affected. Alerted to (an issue such as fire, by awareness), plays on your mind for a while, you take some extra sort of safety issues and you forget about it.

About taking responsibility for yourself, and where possible other people e.g. children. But if talking about strangers then not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk.

Age – person’s perceptions of personal safety – at different ages you have different priorities in life. Feel invincible when you are younger as a result of evolution, our psyche and hormone levels.
As get older, more aware of fragility of human existence.

Parenting and upbringing – how parents respond to personal safety issues, teach children accordingly. Anxious parent could instil sensible precautionary behaviour in a child, while a more relaxed and carefree parents may cause a child to take more risks and worry less

Personal life experience and previous exposure to crime. Can dramatically shape views.

It's about getting at perceptions, and what you do to avoid risk. Balance between perception and actual risk – ultimately connected, but could be opposites, e.g. may be very conscious of risk and take lots of precautions but in reality be unlikely to fall victim to harm.

You do things without thinking

Some people more tuned in to their environment and potentially dangerous scenario

Awareness of environment – other people, especially in unfamiliar environment. In my psyche – wouldn't feel comfortable going on London Eye on my own. I have never been burgled, assaulted etc but I am still very aware – have always been quite cautious, even as a kid. Partner feels perfectly safe (in London). Big fella and can look after himself

Trust – I don’t trust people unless I know them well. How much you trust human nature. Know there is a lot of people out there who would take an opportunity to say take your bag.

Forward thinking. Some people more cautious than others

Media – news and television, but not overly influenced by them.

A lot of the time, (fall victim to crime) it is just chance; where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation.

This was repeated with the other two transcripts, and the findings from the analysis of all three transcripts are presented below, with quotes lifted from the pilot study interviews, to highlight what factors respondents considered to influence personal safety. These have been colour coded and the R reference refers to the respondent number.
CRITICAL DETERMINANT: PHYSICAL

Night R1 Physical
Certain types of areas R1 Physical
Closing the windows of your home R1 Physical
Health and Safety – smoke detectors R1 Physical
Security devices for property – alarm, bolts, locks, car alarm, crook lock, locking up your vehicle R1 Physical
Safety device - carrying a rape alarm (picked one up as a student because they were free) or mobile phone eg if car breaks down R1 Physical
London – more cautious and alert – location R1 Physical
Dark, light, daylight hours big factor that influences me. Dark makes me feel much less safe R1 Physical
Winter R1 Physical
Where you live R1 Physical
Time of day, light and dark R2 Physical
How enclosed you are from an environmental point of view – open space or enclosed space R2 Physical
lines of sight – what spatially can you observe, means of escape R2 Physical
Risk of attack in wide expanse very low but ability to do something about it is reduced. Isolated position, nobody for miles. R2 Physical
Prominence of CCTV R3 Physical
Good lighting & visibility – obliterating dark shadows would influence my feeling of personal safety. R3 Physical
‘Not creepy’ R3
Well kept, not derelict; rubbish blowing about R3
Time of day R3 Physical
Exit routes – potential for flight; fly or fight adrenaline response R3 Physical
Weather R3 Physical
Time of night, number of people on campus eg in December – 9pm campus is deserted, lights have been turned off and you can see risk of harm and injury to person increasing quite a lot. R3 Physical

CRITICAL DETERMINANT: SOCIAL

Strangers R1 Social
Crime-free area v Areas terrible for crime R1 Social
Bogus callers R1 Social
Social issues – manifests itself in acceptance of crime R2 Social
Relationship between crime and levels of security R2 Social
Lower socio-economic areas – crime rates higher, fear of crime is lower because it is part of social fabric. R2 Social
Proximity of other people – distance and numbers. R2 Social
Safer in a crowd up to a point, but more at risk of being pick-pocketed than when a much lower density of people R2 Social
Can be in same physical environment but risk changes as a consequence of people around, time of day. R2 Social
Another person interaction R3 Social
Actions of others R3 Social
Nature of employment, occupations (some riskier than others) R1 Social
Unemployment R1 Social
Influences of social factors R2 Social
If you are perceived to be more affluent and you are walking through a particular area, you may be seen as more of a target for a say mugging or robbery. R3 Social
The unknown of the other person R3 Social
Personal safety is always dependent on other people; an unknown entity. Ultimately, it's down to other people, but you could contribute to the potential for your own harm eg by hitchhiking or walking down dark alleys late at night, I would not put myself at that risk. But then it's freedom of choice. R1 Social
The media frequently uses the BCS to lambaste the government, police and CPS’ failure to deal with crime when in reality they do not accurately represent what is occurring in everyone’s local environment and your true risk of crime. R1 Social
CRITICAL DETERMINANT: PERSONAL

Taking precautions - seatbelt on R1 Personal
Gender - women more afraid of a break-in because of potential for rape; men might not think this R1 Personal
Try and make sure you are safe or feel safe are two different things – do things you take for granted
Can get immune to crime in your area eg cars getting stolen, don’t worry about it, part of living R1 Personal
Factors that influence other people’s actions to fall victim to crime R1
Age – young and elderly more vulnerable. People of a certain age take more risks and less cautious in and out of home R1 Personal
Gender R1 Personal
Social class R1 personal
Money – how you live your life, money spent on security etc, places you frequent R1 Personal
Agility & health – avoiding a mugging, recovering psychologically and physically R1 Personal
Lifestyle & activities – where you go to socialise R1 Personal
Travel – to and from work, generally etc R1
Drug and alcohol consumption R1 Personal
Hobbies R1 Personal
Age – more risks, less cautious R1 Personal
Gender, esp. in terms of perception eg adult females more cautious. Also men gen. stronger than women R1 Personal
Health – if fit and healthy feel mentally stronger, male who is fit and healthy more likely to survive attack by another male (most criminals are male) R1 Personal
Social class and what kind of money you’ve got – poor area, very rough housing estate – not all problems in housing estates but associated with more unemployment, youths hanging around causing annoyance – things that make you feel unsafe R1 Personal
Age – as get older you get more cautious; younger you are, more carefree – take responsibility, mother figure – where you are in household – when live at home, parents do it for you. Some men more proactive eg locking doors, checking batteries in smoke detector R1 Personal
Lifestyle activities – risky sports, injuries, greater risk of falling harm. – night-time activities & night-time economy. More at risk of being assaulted if you frequent a certain kind of area. When you are drunk, more choppy. Walk home from pub when drunk, still cautious but wouldn’t do it when sober, R1 Personal
Where you go, how you get there, the sorts of places you go and the sorts of people that you mix with have an impact on chances of you having an accident in home or fall victim to crime R1 Personal
Drug taking – makes you less fearful, take less precautions. In a sense you feel safer when you are drunk but you are actually less so. R1 Personal
There are things you can do to make yourself feel safer. R1 Personal
Diseases, physical illnesses – less safe and more vulnerable. R1 Personal
Plod along through life doing things like locking the doors before bed but if something were to happen I think I would feel very unsafe for a very long time, eg know someone who died in house fire which made me very, very conscious of fire in the home for a long time – it still does. Had big impact. R1 Personal
Delivered leaflets to all houses, played on my mind, terrifying; more conscious of that than of someone breaking in. R1 Personal
Awareness has helped, but plays on your mind for a bit; might make you feel more unsafe for a while; paranoid, even though you know it’s unrealistic. R1 Psychologically affected. Alerted to (an issue such as fire, by awareness), plays on your mind for a while, you take some extra sort of safety issues and you forget about it. R1 Personal
About taking responsibility for yourself, and where possible other people eg children. But if talking about strangers then not a great deal you can do other than avoid places that you feel are a particular risk. R1 Personal
Age – person’s perceptions of personal safety – at different ages you have different priorities in life. Feel invincible when you are younger. As get older, more aware of fragility of human existence. **R1 Personal**

Parenting and upbringing – how parents respond to personal safety issues, teach children accordingly. Anxious parent could instil sensible precautionary behaviour in a child, while a more relaxed and carefree parents may cause a child to take more risks and worry less. **R1 Personal**

Personal life experience and previous exposure to crime. Can dramatically shape views. **R1 Personal**

Reduced anxiety; if you are confident in a situation you behave in a different way that might make you more aware or less of a target because of your outward behaviour patterns. Reassurance. **R2 Personal**

Different people react differently to a set of circumstances. Some people more fatalistic and philosophical. **R2 Personal**

Whether you take actions to remove risks **R2 Personal**

Other environments where fear of crime is higher, and incidence is lower – perception issue again **R2 Personal**

Upbringing **R2 Personal**

Practical experience, ie if you’ve been a victim of crime or know somebody who has, or read about it or see it on TV – much closer to the issue **R2 Personal**

More at risk – women, ethnic and religious minorities, tribalism, football supporters – anything which singles you out from the norm or makes you ‘different’, or behaving differently. **R2 Personal**

Can never be statistically 100% completely safe – risk taking exercise; people make judgements **R2 Personal**

People have different perceptions of risk **R2 Personal**

Personal safety is any activity you take as an individual **R2 Personal**

It’s about getting at perceptions, and what you do to avoid risk. Balance between perception and actual risk – ultimately connected, but could be opposites, eg may be very conscious of risk and take lots of precautions but in reality be unlikely to fall victim to harm. **R1 Personal**

You do things without thinking **R1 Personal**

Some people more tuned in to their environment and potentially dangerous scenario **R1 Personal**

Awareness of environment – other people, especially in unfamiliar environment. In my psyche – wouldn’t feel comfortable going on London Eye on my own. I have never been burgled, assaulted etc but I am still very aware – have always been quite cautious, even as a kid. Partner feels perfectly safe (in London). Big fella and can look after himself **R1 Personal**

Trust – I don’t trust people unless I know them well. How much you trust human nature. Know there is a lot of people out there who would take an opportunity to say take your bag. **R1 Personal**

Forward thinking. Some people more cautious than others **R1 Personal**

Media – news and television, but not overly influenced by them. **R1 Personal**

A lot of the time, (fall victim to crime) it is just chance; where you are, who you bumped into and whether you took that step to put yourself in a further riskier situation. **R1 Personal**

Feelings and general awareness – lots of people around you **R3 Personal** Instinct – gut feeling **R3 Personal**

Has personal safety been intruded on before? – Experience of crime made me more focused on the potential for a physical assault on my safety. Made me more aware of my surroundings. **R3 Personal**

Actions of yourself – you can put yourself in a lot of risk **R3 Personal**

Most important influence would be person themselves taking the necessary precautions **R3 Personal**

Character – individual character and behaviour. Some people take more risks – they perceive risks in a very different way to other people I know. **R3 Personal**

Confidence, upfront bravado, superficial levels of confidence **R3 Personal**

Childhood – moulding in formative years – how you see things, how you approach life **R3 Personal**

Subconscious alterations of your movements or behaviour - we make little adjustments to our actions eg to how we are moving to what we are going to do because, we’ve picked up on a potential risk. **R3 Personal**

Once you’ve got perceived risk it’s down to the individual – all got separate experiences, our own characters and our own way of approaching things – together these make each person approach a particular scenario in a different way. Maybe outcome wouldn’t be unique but impulses and thought processes that goes into coming up with outcome would be unique to that particular moment in time. Same person, different day could get different response. **R3 Personal**

How you are feeling – good or bad mood. **R3 Personal**

Awareness of your surroundings and environment **R3 Personal**
CRITICAL DETERMINANT: OTHER – HEALTH AND SAFETY

Safety measurements - Health and Safety at work Act – ALARC principle which is as low as reasonably practicable – probability and severity of risk – can apply this to personal safety – quantified assessment for a whole range of almost immeasurable number of circumstances and factors. R2 Health and Safety
Risk assessments – potential for injury or accidents. R3 Health and Safety
Health and Safety things, lab work etc. Longer term view that if you are aware then you can take the necessary steps to prevent that possibility from becoming a reality. R3 Health and Safety
Health and safety perspective - text book definition R2 Health and Safety

CRITICAL DETERMINANT: OTHER – ACCIDENTS

Accidental side is covered by Health and Safety regulations eg accidental slips, trips R3 Accidents
Accidents – R2 Accidents
Appendix 4

Delphi pilot study possible definitions of 'personal safety'
These were in response to question three of the pilot study, which asked respondents to:

Suggest a possible definition of personal safety on which my research could be based.

The responses were as follows:

*Personal safety can be defined as a person's perceptions of their likely risk to sustaining harm and the measure they take to avoid such harm.* R1

*Personal safety is the likelihood that a person will fall victim to harm, which is in part based on the measures they take to avoid risk.* R1

*The opposite of risk is when there is no possibility of coming to harm. It is not possible to ever be completely safe, e.g. you could lock yourself in a house and not go out but still fall victim to something within the house.* R1

*Risk is the likelihood that I would come to some harm.* R1

*Harm is physically being attacked in some way, not necessarily hurt, but psychological trauma that follows or being burnt in a fire or crashing my car.* R1

*Personal safety is the freedom from physical and mental harm.* R2

*Personal safety is concerned with any activity you take as an individual.* R2

*Personal safety is being at ease with your surroundings with no fear of accidental harm or abuse, be it physical or verbal.* R3

*The opposite of safety is a situation where you were at risk or a very significant risk of something happening to you.* R3
Appendix 5

Expert sampling frame used to find Delphi expert participants
### Expert sampling frame

**PHYSICAL FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID num</th>
<th>Causal factor:</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City &amp; regional planning</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Architecture &amp; planning/safer city centres</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Urban design &amp; planning</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crime reduction</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental design &amp; CPTED</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Designing out crime</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Environmental Psychology</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Environmental Psychology</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Safety &amp; human performance</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Property management</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Estate management</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Security Devices</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Security Devices</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Security Devices</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Geographer - human</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Geographer - physical</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Geography - landscape</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Transport Providers</td>
<td>SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Climatology</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lighting/ fear of crime/CCTV</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fear of crime, CCTV/surveillance</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Highways and Parks/local authority</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONAL FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID num</th>
<th>Causal factor:</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>View of self, life experience, instinct etc</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>View of self, life experience, instinct etc</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>View of self, life experience, instinct etc</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>View of self, life experience, instinct etc</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>View of self, life experience, instinct etc</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Human behaviour</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Background, social class</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Status, education, employ, comm &amp; family</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Previous exposure to crime</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Gender &amp; age</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Work &amp; gender</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>General management</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Values, family, labour, market &amp; gender</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Agility &amp; Health (ethnicity)</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Personal safety awareness</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Perceptions and fear of crime</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Social &amp; cultural attitudes, risk</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Social identity &amp; cognition</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Social identity &amp; cognition</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID num</th>
<th>Causal factor:</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Society - presence &amp; proximity of others</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Community, everyday &amp; space</td>
<td>Sue Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Human nature - actions of others</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Social psychology of community</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Social psychology - culture on behaviour</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Social psychology - social influences</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Community profile</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Crime &amp; public safety</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Crime &amp; public safety</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Crime &amp; communities</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Crime and developmental criminology</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Community safety &amp; crime prevention</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Community safety/urban design</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Community safety</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Crime and disorder reduction</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Safer cities</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Policing issues of public concern</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Crime reduction</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Policing and community safety</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Security Guards/Services</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Security Guards/Services</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Criminologists</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Criminologists</td>
<td>Lit review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Socio-economic factors</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID num</th>
<th>Causal factor:</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Health and Safety - general</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Health and Safety at work Act 1974</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Workplace health and safety</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Occupational Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Occupational Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Home Safety (trips, falls, fires)</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Accident prevention</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Risk, security &amp; crisis management</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter inviting expert respondents to participate in main Delphi study
Date

Dear (name)

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT OF THE SUZY LAMPLUGH TRUST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

I am sure that you are aware that The Suzy Lamplugh Trust was established by Diana Lamplugh after the disappearance of her daughter, who was working for an estate agency. The central theme of the work of this Trust is “personal safety”, a subject in which it has established an authoritative position. In order to support the work of the Trust with a research capability, The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute has been established at the University of Glamorgan, and I am currently its Director.

The meaning of the term “personal safety” is intuitively obvious, but if we are to conduct meaningful research into the subject, it is necessary to establish its precise meaning in the context of our Institute. This will guide our work and delineate its boundaries. In order to establish this meaning in an informed and comprehensive way, we are inviting a carefully selected range of experts to participate in a “Delphi Study”, and we should be most grateful if you would contribute your expertise and experience to this project.

The Delphi technique is a well-established social science research methodology that seeks the exchange of expert ideas and views about a given issue through a structured communication process - in this case through short but nevertheless demanding questionnaires. These will seek your understanding and views on “personal safety” and your responses will be anonymously fed back to the other participating expert respondents for evaluation and development via successive questionnaires. The aim is to seek convergence of opinion through successive rounds of questionnaires until a consensus is reached. In our experience, three or four rounds will be sufficient, so this is the commitment that we are requesting from you. The resulting definition of personal safety will be the first to be formulated so rigorously, and will not only serve as a basis for our own research, but hopefully for others within the academic and practice communities as well.

This work is being conducted by a research assistant, Joanna Waters, under the supervision of Dr Susan Hutson, Reader in the School of Humanities Law and Social Sciences, and myself. Joanna has recently completed a preliminary study that sought to identify determinants of personal safety, and 45 factors (actual and perceived) were identified. From this we have constructed a “sampling frame” for the range of expertise that we seek, and this has guided the selection of possible respondents.

The attached note is from Joanna, and if you agree to participate in this research, please would you contact her directly.

Yours sincerely

Professor Richard Neale
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Information for expert respondents participating in main Delphi study
THE DELPHI STUDY ON “PERSONAL SAFETY”

The study will be based on an initial open-ended questionnaire followed by two or three shorter and more specific questionnaires. These will seek your views on personal safety and your responses will be anonymously fed back for re-evaluation via successive questionnaires. Your details will be stored in a secure location and you will be identified only by an ID number located in the top right-hand corner of the questionnaires. I have attached the first questionnaire so that you can decide whether you would like to be involved.

These can be returned to me by e-mail or post, as if you preference. The results of the first round questionnaire will feed into the second round questionnaire and so on, with a total of three to four rounds in total. I will ask that each be returned to me within about two weeks. I estimate that responses to each questionnaire will take about 30 minutes of your time. I know that your time is valuable, but I hope that you will agree to participate and contribute your expertise and knowledge. If you do not feel that you can participate please could you suggest someone that could be involved or pass it on to someone with comparable expertise?

If you would like to talk to me about the research design or if you have questions about your participation, please do not hesitate to contact me as detailed below. You can also find out more about the Suzy Lamplugh Trust on their website, www.suzylamplugh.org and details of the Research Institute can be found at www.glam.ac.uk/research/areas/lamp.php

Thank you for your time and consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Joanna Waters
Research Assistant
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
School of Technology
University of Glamorgan
Pontypridd
CF37 1DL

Tel: 01443 483625
E.mail: jwaters1@ glamour.ac.uk
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First round Delphi study questionnaire
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
Enhancing knowledge of personal safety

THE DELPHI STUDY ON "PERSONAL SAFETY"

Round 1 – Initial questionnaire

1. Please list up to ten phrases, concepts or sentences that sum up what the term 'personal safety' means to you.

2. What factors influence a person’s personal safety? You may like to consider the roles of personal experience and the physical and the social environment. Please list in any order of importance.
2. Please suggest a possible definition of personal safety on which my research could be based.

3. What, if any, connection do you have with personal safety in your work?

Thank you. Please return your questionnaires to the address or e-mail below by the 6th January 2004. Your answers will be fed back into the second round questionnaire, which you will receive in early January 2004.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries about the questions or your participation.

Joanna Waters

Address: The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, CF37 1DL
Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: jwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Second round Delphi study questionnaire
THE DELPHI STUDY ON "PERSONAL SAFETY"

Round 2 – second questionnaire

1. Listed below are ten possible definitions of personal safety, which have been derived from Round 1 of this study. Please rate them in the order that you consider to be the most appropriate, relevant and useful by entering a number from one to ten in the 'rating' column below (with one being your most favoured and ten being your least favoured).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible definition</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the ability to go about my everyday life without the fear of psychological harm or threat, emotional harm or threat or physical harm and to be able to live my life without inducing such fear in others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is about feeling safe, for everyone at any time, in any environment, with the confidence to live life to the full and having the freedom to live one's life according to one's beliefs, wishes and dreams, without causing harm to others, and without fear of receiving harm from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is freedom from crime and the fear of crime, feeling secure in one's environment and feeling comfortable and safe in the immediate and wider environment in which an individual is in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is maximised when all reasonable steps have been taken to minimise the full range of threats to which a person may be subject, and to establish and maintain awareness of these multiple dangers to the individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is to feel comfortable, at ease, protected whether at work or at home or at leisure, whether you are in your car or on foot, and to feel that members of your family and friends are equally comfortable and protected. To feel this whether it is the day time or the night time and to feel comfortable whether you are alone or with others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is evaluating your surroundings and demeanour. It means taking responsibility for what you conceive of as a perceived threat and minimising the threats themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the autonomy of bodily control within social encounters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety can be defined as a person's perceptions of their likely risk to sustaining harm and the measure they take to avoid such harm and the likelihood that a person will fall victim to harm, which is in part based on the measures they take to void risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the freedom from abuse (physical, mental, sexual) and recognition of every person's integrity and right to independence and respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the physical and psychological protection of the self from external harm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Please look at the statements below and indicate how strongly you agree with them by marking the appropriate box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your personal safety is always dependent on another person and their behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe is a part of personal safety and personal safety is about a combination of your perceptions of risk and your actual risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is freedom from harm and this includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is distinct from health and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues such as having a chemical spill in a lab or tripping over uneven flooring in the office should be covered by personal safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can never be completely safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety includes accidental harm or injury as well as other people causing you intentional harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk is the likelihood of coming to harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is intentional harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is intentional harm and accidental harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional harm is any physical, verbal or psychological threat or attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please add any additional comments that you may have in the space below

Thank you. Please return this questionnaire by January 31st 2004. Your answers will be fed back into the third round questionnaire, which you will receive in early February 2004. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries about the questions or your participation.

Joanna Waters
Address: The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, CF37 1DL.
Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: jwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Third round main Delphi study questionnaire
THE DELPHI STUDY ON “PERSONAL SAFETY”

Round 3 – third and final questionnaire

1. Listed below are three possible definitions of personal safety, which were the respondents’ three most favoured definitions from Round 2, Question 1 of this study. Please rate them in the order that you consider to be the most appropriate, relevant and useful by entering a number from one to three in the ‘rating’ column below (with one being your most favoured and three being your least favoured).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible definition</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is about feeling safe, for everyone at any time, in any environment, with the confidence to live life to the full and having the freedom to live one’s life according to one’s beliefs, wishes and dreams, without causing harm to others, and without fear of receiving harm from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the ability to go about my everyday life without the fear of psychological harm or threat, emotional harm or threat or physical harm and to be able to live my life without inducing such fear in others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is to feel comfortable, at ease, protected whether at work or at home or at leisure, whether you are in your car or on foot, and to feel that members of your family and friends are equally comfortable and protected. To feel this whether it is the day time or the night time and to feel comfortable whether you are alone or with others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following is a fourth definition, a composite of the above three definitions. Please rate this one against your preferred definition above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Do you prefer this definition or your favoured definition from the three listed above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is an individual’s ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. One word that has recurred throughout this study in an unclear way is the notion of harm. This seems to be a central concept of personal safety and I am keen to explore this in more detail. Please describe what harm means to you in the context of personal safety; for example the notions of accidental and intentional harm.
4. Please add any additional comments that you may have in the space below

Thank you. Please return this questionnaire to me by April 9th 2004. This questionnaire is the final questionnaire. Please contact me if you have any queries about the questions or your participation and many thanks for taking the time to participate.

Joanna Waters
Address: The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, CF37 1DL
Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: jwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Main Delphi study questionnaire results
QUESTIONNAIRE 1: QUESTION 1
Analysis was based on the building blocks from the pilot study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building block number:</th>
<th>Key themes/building blocks that emerged in main Delphi analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEELINGS OF PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACTUAL PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EFFECTS OF HARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[PERSONAL SAFETY IS TRANSIENT - THIS THEME DID NOT EMERGE IN MAIN STUDY ANALYSIS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WAYS OF INCREASING PERSONAL SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ACTIONS OF OTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HEALTH AND SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL SAFETY (SEE BELOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY – NEW ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CRIME – NEW ISSUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers after the quotes refer to the anonymous ID number of the expert participant according to their position in the matrix detailed previously in Appendix 6.
BUILDING BLOCK 1: PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY
It is necessary to distinguish between perceived and realised personal safety, i.e. contrast perceptions of safety with victimisation experiences etc. 24
Our personal safety has been impeded if our actual/perceived well-being has been damaged by a threat (again real or perceived). 24

BUILDING BLOCK 2: FEELINGS OF PERSONAL SAFETY
Not being afraid of going out alone after dark. 70
Not limiting your activities because of fear of being attacked. 70
Personal safety is the ability to go about my everyday life without the fear of psychological harm or threat, emotional harm or threat or physical harm and to be able to live my life without inducing such fear in others 45
Feeling secure alone at home. 70
Feeling comfortable and secure in my house alone at night. 65
I want to feel: Safe in my home, Safe in my workplace, Safe in the streets & Safe on public transport Because this means that if I feel safe to go out and about to do the things I need to do, then I can have the confidence to live my life to the full. 42
I want everyone to feel safe; so that anyone of any age, physical or mental ability, gender, race, religion, sexuality etc can feel confident that they will not be attacked, harassed or otherwise targeted by someone who feels he is part of a majority group. 42
Feeling of loneliness/isolation – in terms of being completely alone, or a lone in an environment in which others make you feel threatened. 10

BUILDING BLOCK 3: ACTUAL PERSONAL SAFETY
Protection from third parties 51
Not being afraid. 70
Being able to feel secure on your own anywhere at any time. 70
Freedom from the threat of violence. 70
A society where no one locks their doors and no one is afraid to walk alone in the streets at any time of the day or night. 70
A secure place where you know you are safe. 70
Respect for your integrity as a person and for your right to independence. 70
Being able to carry a bag or handbag without feeling it will be snatched i.e. not having to worry about having a money belt or concealed belt. 65
Being able to walk down local streets at night, not having to walk on the main street. 65
Personal safety means you taking the responsibility of what you conceive of a perceived threat and minimizing the threats themselves. 49
Security/ feeling secure in one's environment 10

BUILDING BLOCK 4: RISK
Most attacks occur where people have taken for granted a set routine and do not stagger or change their routines. Evaluate the risks yourself of why you are taking the necessary precautions 49
Risk avoidance 60
Risk assessment 60
Evaluating the risks yourself and an evaluation of your surroundings and the people around you 49
BUILDING BLOCK 5: HARM
Safety from harm 51
Personal safety is the physical and psychological protection of the self from external harm 51
Personal safety occurs at physical, psychological and emotional levels. Thus, personal safety may involve numerous threats 24

BUILDING BLOCK 6: THE EFFECTS OF HARM
Personal safety occurs at physical, psychological and emotional levels. ID

BUILDING BLOCK 7: PERSONAL SAFETY IS TRANSIENT
This issue did not emerge in the main Delphi study

BUILDING BLOCK 8: WAYS OF INCREASING PERSONAL SAFETY
Risk avoidance 60
Risk assessment 60
Say "no" to strangers 60
Be prepared for the unexpected 60
Plan ahead 60
Individual and institutional responsibility 60
Awareness of diverse hazards/threats 60
Danger may come from known people 60
Active methods of minimizing danger 51
Recognition that the world is not always a safe place 51
Positively responding to fear 51
Initiative 51
Personal Safety must include evaluation of your surroundings, and a change of posture and attitudes of peoples around you. 51

BUILDING BLOCK 9: ACTIONS OF OTHERS
Evaluation of your surroundings must include the evaluation of persons closest to you, persons whom you've never met before, vehicles, equipment, and baggage and the places you frequently visit that you would most likely become complacent with. 49

BUILDING BLOCK 10: HEALTH AND SAFETY
Intuitively one considers crime, although safety covers a range of other issues, e.g. threats from fire or other injury. 10

BUILDING BLOCK 11: CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL SAFETY
SEE BELOW
BUILDING BLOCK 12: INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Personal safety is evaluating your surroundings and demeanour. It means taking responsibility for what you conceive of as a perceived threat and minimising the threats themselves 49

Individual and institutional responsibility 60
Risk assessment and avoidance 60
Planning ahead and being prepared for the unexpected 60
Awareness of diverse hazards/threats 60
Avoiding being attacked 65
Evaluating the risks yourself and an evaluation of your surroundings and the people around you 49
Active methods of minimising danger 51
Initiative 51

BUILDING BLOCK 13: CRIME

Personal safety is freedom from crime and the fear of crime, feeling secure in one’s environment and feeling comfortable and safe in the immediate and wider environment in which an individual is in 10

QUESTIONNAIRE 1 - QUESTION 2

The critical determinants of personal safety were grouped together into the same three causal groups as in the pilot study. The respondents’ notions of determinants of personal safety were very similar to those given in the pilot study, giving greater weight to the findings.

PHYSICAL FACTORS

Day 42
Night 42
Being out at night 65
Public places 42
Car parks 42
Physical environment 42
Greenery - low bushes and shrubs can create “hiding places” 42
The structure or design of the physical environment 45
Built up areas 65
Isolated rural area if you come from the town. 65
Defensible space 10
The environment 49
Travel 42
Walking 42
Public transport 42
Public transport frequency and management 65
### SOCIAL FACTORS

- Freedom from crime and the fear of crime 10
- Social environment
  - Activities which promote fear or intimidation. 42
  - The make up of the social environment both macro (society) and micro (specific environments – eg. Rowdy pubs) 45
  - Other people – actions and behaviour
    - Alone or with others 45
  - Socio-economic factors
    - Inequality in a society 65
    - Socio-economic status 51
  - Community facilities
    - Public services eg local fire stations, local police stations, local libraries. 65

### PERSONAL FACTORS

- Gender. 42, 60, 51, 24, 70
- Religion 51
- Race 51
- Race/Ethnicity 70
- Physical health 65
- Level of fitness 51
- Physical prowess 24
- Health 70
- Mental health 70
- Age, 42, 65, 51, 24, 70
- Lone working 60
- Personal affluence 65
- Degree of drug and alcohol abuse 65
- Socio-economic status 51
- Social standing 51
- Money 51
- Economic, social and political resources 24
- Area of residence, work 24
- Area/society 70
- Poverty/unemployment 70
- Drugs 70
- Familiar v unfamiliar circumstances, environment and people 45
- Sobriety or under the influence 45
- Previous negative experience (as a predictor for the future) 45
- If you have been attacked or mugged 65
- History of negative experiences 51
- Previous victimization 51
- Experience from friends 10
- Over-readiness to trust others 60
- Social skills 60
- Emotional states 45
- Cognitive and social abilities 45
- Self esteem 51
- Personal ability/ confidence to deal with situations 10
- Training 60
- Preparation of an exit strategy 60
- Anticipation of potential threats 60
- General awareness of dangers 60
- The anticipation of harm 45
PERSONAL FACTORS (continued)

Evaluate your surroundings and social environment 49
Being alert to the environment you are in. 10
Management of the media is crucial: "stories" which can cause provocation or racist or homophobic behaviour need to be condemned by society. 42
Impact (e.g. psychological) of media reports both local and national on crime 10
Your role to society - are you in the position where you can make possible enemies or are you the target of abuse in any form? 49
What type of target are you to society? 49
Misconceptions and stereotypes 45
The attacker evaluates those who they decide are an easy or complicated risk. 49
Male violence against women 70
Loneliness versus number of friends/family/social contacts 51
Number of people around and living in 65
Victim becomes an easy or vulnerable target 49
Not evaluating your surroundings 49
Are you an innocent person to be taken as a bargaining tool or especially vulnerable? 49
Knowledge e.g. knowing an area, a country, a language means that it easier to read whether one is safe or not. 65
Comfort gained from being in a known location 10
QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – QUESTION 3

The definitions from each respondent are presented in this table, along with the rating they scored when respondents were asked to rate their preferred definitions from 1-10. The definitions include one from the pilot study (R1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the ability to go about my everyday life without the fear of psychological harm or threat, emotional harm or threat or physical harm and to be able to live my life without inducing such fear in others.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2, 4, 1, 6, 7, 3,</td>
<td>23 2nd favourite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is about feeling safe, for everyone at any time, in any environment, with the confidence to live life to the full and having the freedom to live one’s life according to one’s beliefs, wishes and dreams, without causing harm to others, and without fear of receiving harm from others.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1, 7, 2, 1, 8, 2,</td>
<td>21 1st favourite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is freedom from crime and the fear of crime, feeling secure in one’s environment and feeling comfortable and safe in the immediate and wider environment in which an individual is in.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7, 5, 4, 9, 3, 5, 23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is maximised when all reasonable steps have been taken to minimise the full range of threats to which a person may be subject, and to establish and maintain awareness of these multiple dangers to the individual.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6, 1, 6, 10, 2, 6,</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is to feel comfortable, at ease, protected whether at work or at home or at leisure, whether you are in car or on foot, and to feel that members of your family and friends are equally comfortable and protected. To feel this whether it is the day time or the night time and to feel comfortable whether you are alone or with others.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3, 8, 3, 2, 9, 1,</td>
<td>26 3rd favourite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is evaluating your surroundings and demeanour. It means taking responsibility for what you conceive of as a perceived threat and minimising the threats themselves.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9, 6, 8, 8, 1, 9,</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the autonomy of bodily control within social encounters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10, 10, 10, 4, 10, 10,</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety can be defined as a person's perceptions of their likely risk to sustaining harm and the measure they take to avoid such harm and the likelihood that a person will fall victim to harm, which is in part based on the measures they take to void risk.</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>8, 9, 5, 3, 6, 4,</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the freedom from abuse (physical, mental, sexual) and recognition of every person's integrity and right to independence and respect.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4, 2, 9, 5, 5, 8,</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety is the physical and psychological protection of the self from external harm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5, 3, 7, 7, 4, 7,</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – QUESTION 1

The three favoured definitions responses were as follows:

1. Personal safety is about feeling safe, for everyone at any time, in any environment, with the confidence to live life to the full and having the freedom to live one’s life according to one’s beliefs, wishes and dreams, without causing harm to others, and without fear of receiving harm from others. (21 points)

2. Personal safety is the ability to go about my everyday life without the fear of psychological harm or threat, emotional harm or threat or physical harm and to be able to live my life without inducing such fear in others (23 points)
3. Personal safety is to feel comfortable, at ease, protected whether at work or at home or at leisure, whether you are in your car or on foot, and to feel that members of your family and friends are equally comfortable and protected. To feel this whether it is the day time or the night time and to feel comfortable whether you are alone or with others. (26 points)

The fourth definition they were presented with in Round 3 was a composite/digest of above three definitions:

4. Personal safety is an individual’s ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others.

QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – QUESTION 2
Based on the group’s modal responses to the statements that can contribute to the framework of personal safety, the following supplementary statements can be used when explaining personal safety:

Feeling safe is a part of personal safety and personal safety is about a combination of your perceptions of risk and your actual risk
Personal safety is distinct from health and safety
You can never be completely safe
Intentional harm is any physical, verbal or psychological threat or attack
Personal safety is freedom from harm and this includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person
Personal safety is not always dependent on another person and their behaviour.
Personal safety does not include issues such as having a chemical spill in a lab or tripping over uneven flooring in the office

However the following four statements are contradictory so a further question was asked in Round Three to clarify this issue:
Personal safety is not intentional harm
Personal safety does not include accidental harm or injury
Personal safety is not intentional harm and accidental harm
Risk is the likelihood of coming to harm – intentional and accidental
QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – QUESTION 3
ID 60 said that some of the definitions in 1 above are problematic because of the undue emphasis that they place on whether or not someone feels safe. People who feel safe may actually not be. Also the definition ranked 10 is not easy to understand.

ID 24 said that section one confuses personal safety as a process and as an outcome. In addition, to encounter uncertainty or a threat is part of the human condition. We need to develop a clearer, less tautological distinction between these elements. The key issue is an individual’s ability to negotiate a safe resolution to that threat. For example, crossing the road poses a threat—as it should do—but it is one that most can negotiate the safe resolution thereof. He did not feel comfortable with any of the definitions in their entirety-- He thought that these should be worked on further (possibly via discussion) and that there is a tendency to mix process and outcome, which is problematic as it prevents the investigation of how we attempt to negotiate our own safety. For example, to be safe, or to secure safety (outcome/process)--this doesn't tell us where to look does it?

QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – QUESTION 1
The preferred definition was the composite. This was agreed by all respondents indicating a complete group consensus. Therefore, this will be used as the definition of personal safety for the purpose of this research and to guide the work of the SLTRI.

Personal safety is an individual's ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others.

QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – QUESTION 2
Harm was viewed to be:

In this context, I believe that the word 'harm' refers to intentional, aggressive harm. I also consider 'harm' to refer mainly to physical danger when viewed in the context of personal safety. 51

The immediate thing that springs to mind is 'physical' harm, in being attacked. There is also what could be termed 'psychological' harm -- perhaps being intimidated, and creating a feeling of being threatened whether this is real or not. You also correctly raise the distinction of intentional and accidental. While we can try to protect ourselves from harm, where it is intentional something may happen no matter what you do, whereas accidental harm is where we have perhaps not been careful in our environment. 10

These add-on statements that contribute to a conceptual framework of personal safety were derived from an overview of all rounds the Delphi process, in particular Questionnaire 2: Question 2 and Questionnaire 3: Question 2:

Harm is intentionally motivated, and includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person. Personal safety is about a combination of perceived risk and actual risk, where risk is the likelihood of coming to harm. Personal safety is not always dependent on another person and their behaviour. Personal safety is distinct from health and safety.
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Ethical approval - Glamorgan
17th November, 2004
Ref: Ethics/letters/Approved/Waters

Miss J Waters

Dear Joanna,

Registration as a Candidate for University of Glamorgan Research Degree – Project
Title: Personal Safety on Universities campus

I am pleased to inform you that the University's Departmental Ethics Committee has agreed that there were no ethical issues attached to your application to register you for the degree of Master of Philosophy with transfer possibility to Doctor of Philosophy.

I should like to wish you every success in your research project.

Yours sincerely,

Bethan Price
Secretary
Departmental Ethics Committee

c.c. Director of Studies: Prof. R Neale School of Technology
Second Supervisors: Prof Sue Hutson, HLaSS
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Ethical approval - Loughborough
Hi Joanna

Looks like this has the go ahead. Abi could you help Joanna in liaising with her about setting up focus groups etc.? Joanna please firm up when you are coming and what you need and liaise with Abi?

Thanks

Barbara

Professor Barbara Bagilhole  
Associate Dean (Research)  
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Loughborough University Leicestershire LE11 3TU UK www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ss

--- Original Message ---

To: "B.M.Bagilhole" <B.M.Bagilhole@lboro.ac.uk>
Cc: Abigail; dick
Subject: Fw: Authorisation for research project

Barbara

Please find below comments from colleagues who cover data protection and Ethical Advisory Committee. In summary, we can't see any problems as long as the usual issues of good practice are covered.

The comments about a previous Human Sciences project are interesting but I'm not clear whether the focus is health and safety or personal safety. Let us know if you'd like us to follow this up. If it is health and safety, then I think the Health and Safety Office should at least be aware of what's going on.

Otherwise, I can't see why this cannot go ahead.

Hope this helps.

Barbara

> SP - there are not likely to be any dp issues about the filming so long as people cannot be identified from the film or that, where they can, they have been told exactly what the film is going to be used for, and ideally, consented. Remember, faces/identifying details can always be removed after the filming has taken place.

> As for the focus groups etc. as long as people know what is happening and what the information will be used for, it should be ok. EAC is probably the best route for approval where all these things will be taken into consideration I am sure.

> One thing that might be of interest - a number of years ago, we looked at a...
> project into health and safety research being run by [redacted] as a
> number of issues were exercising him and the committee (e.g. will people be
> truthful if they think they are going to get into trouble for exposing
> health and safety problems in an organisation, if only a small number of
> safety breaches are identified, you might not be able to anonymise the
> people involved etc etc). In the end we found an acceptable way forward
> but
> it might be worth someone talking through some of those issues with [redacted]
or
> at least looking back at the EAC files. I can’t remember exactly when all
> this happened but would recognise the proposal if I flicked through the
> files [redacted] let me know if you want me to do this.
> Hope this helps
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Campus study - pilot questionnaire
Questionnaire Booklet
Personal safety questionnaire

Personal Safety on University Campuses project
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
University of Glamorgan
Researcher: Joanna Waters, School of Technology
This is an enquiry into your experiences, views and perceptions of personal safety on the University campus. Some of these questions are of a sensitive nature – if you do not wish to complete a question then move on to the next. If you require further information or additional commentary please contact me, Joanna Waters, on ext 3625 or at jwaters1@ole.m.sc.uk.

Please write clearly in BLOCK CAPITALS. There are no right or wrong answers; it is your opinions that are required. All answers will be treated in a totally confidential manner. Thank you for your involvement.

Section 1 – personal details. Please complete the questions below. For each category tick the appropriate box/boxes or enter the data required as requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male □</td>
<td>18-30 □</td>
<td>Single □</td>
<td>White □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female □</td>
<td>31-40 □</td>
<td>Married □</td>
<td>Asian □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50 □</td>
<td>Divorced □</td>
<td>Black □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60 □</td>
<td>Widowed □</td>
<td>Chinese □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61-70 □</td>
<td>Other □</td>
<td>Mixed □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff full-time □</th>
<th>Staff part-time □</th>
<th>Student part-time □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Area of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On campus □</th>
<th>Off campus, in Trefforest □</th>
<th>Off campus, other □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where? □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What is your main mode of travel to the campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car □</th>
<th>Train □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike □</td>
<td>Bus □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot □</td>
<td>Other □, please state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many days per week (on average) do you spend on campus? □

9. Do you come on to campus on the weekend?

| Often □   | Sometimes □ |
|          | Never □    |

10. Are you mainly on campus in the (tick all that apply)

| Morning □ | Afternoon □ |
|          | Evening □   |
|          | Night time □ |
For the purposes of this questionnaire, PERSONAL SAFETY is defined as:

An individual’s ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others. Harm is intentionally motivated, and includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person.

Section 2 - General perception of security on campus Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think the university has adequate security overall?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think there is adequate CCTV on campus?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you think that there is adequate lighting on campus at night?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think there is enough security presence on campus i.e. security guards?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would you feel confident of who to contact in the event of being harmed on campus?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you think the university has adequate procedures in place if you were harmed on campus?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think the trees and vegetation on campus are maintained in such a way as to reduce harm on campus?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>Unsure □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What types of harm do you think are the most common on campus (tick all that apply)?</td>
<td>Mugging □</td>
<td>Theft from buildings or cars □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What parts of campus (if any) do you avoid because of lack of security?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What one thing would you do to make the campus more safe and secure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3 – Personal safety on campus: your views and concerns. Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

1. **How worried are you about being harmed on campus?**
   - Extremely worried ☐
   - Very worried ☐
   - Fairly worried ☐
   - Not very worried ☐
   - Not worried at all ☐

2. **Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus at night?**
   - Very afraid ☐
   - Afraid ☐
   - Not afraid ☐
   - Definitely not afraid ☐
   - If so, where ________________________

3. **Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus during the day?**
   - Very afraid ☐
   - Afraid ☐
   - Not afraid ☐
   - Definitely not afraid ☐
   - If so, where ________________________

4. **How safe do you feel when you are walking on campus alone during the following periods?**
   - Morning (7am-11.59am)
     - Entirely safe ☐
     - Very safe ☐
     - Fairly safe ☐
     - A bit unsafe ☐
     - Very unsafe ☐
   - Afternoon (12pm-4.59pm)
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
   - Evening (5pm-9.59pm)
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
   - Late at night (10pm-6.59am)
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐
     - ☐

5. **Are you afraid when travelling to and from the campus from your home?**
   - Very afraid ☐
   - Afraid ☐
   - Not afraid ☐
   - Definitely not afraid ☐
   - If so, where specifically? ________________________
### Section 3 - Personal safety on campus: your views and concerns (continued) Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

6. Do you feel safe when you are inside university buildings?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. What personal safety concerns are you most worried about on campus?
   - During the day ________________________________
   - During the night ________________________________

8. Thinking of routes that you use the most frequently, what parts of the campus do you think are the safest?
   - During the day ________________________________
   - During the night ________________________________

9. Thinking of routes that you use, or have used, what parts of the campus are the least safe?
   - During the day ________________________________
   - During the night ________________________________

10. Have you ever altered your behaviour in response to fear of being harmed on campus?
    - Yes ☐ If so, how ________________________________
    - No [ ]

11. Have you ever avoided anywhere on campus as a result of concern or fear for your personal safety?
    - Yes ☐ If so, where ________________________________
    - No [ ]

12. How 'at risk' do you think you would be of being a victim of the following harmful behaviours on campus?

   - At risk [ ] Safe [ ]
   - Mugging [ ]
   - Theft from buildings or cars [ ]
   - Assault [ ]
   - Intimidation [ ]

13. Overall, do you feel you are at risk of being harmed whilst on this campus?
    - Yes [ ]
    - No [ ]
Section 4 - Personal experiences of crime and harm on campus. Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months. Remember, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to.

1. Have you ever been physically harmed by someone on campus?
   Yes   [ ] If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No    [ ]

2. Have you ever been emotionally harmed by someone on this campus?
   Yes   [ ] If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No    [ ]

3. Have you ever been psychologically harmed by someone on this campus?
   Yes   [ ] If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No    [ ]

4. Have you been the victim of any other harmful behaviour or crime on campus?
   Yes   [ ] If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No    [ ]

5. Was the harm or crime directed at:
   You   [ ]
   Your property [ ]

6. Do you think the environment played a part in the harm/crime?
   Yes   [ ] If so, how __________________________
   No    [ ]
   Don't know [ ]

7. If yes, how could this be remedied?
   __________________________

8. Was any harm that you have experienced on campus legally classed as a criminal offence?
   Yes   [ ]
   No    [ ]
   Don't know [ ]

9. If yes, did you ever report the incident to the police?
   Yes   [ ]
   No    [ ]
Section 4 - Personal experiences of crime and harm on campus (continued) Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

10. If you reported the incident to the police, do you think you received adequate support?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

11. Did you ever report the incident to university officials or a member of staff?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

12. If you reported the incident to university officials or a member of staff, do you think you received adequate support?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

13. If you failed to report the incident was it because of:
   Embarrassment/humiliation ☐
   Fear of retaliation ☐
   No real damage ☐
   Nothing would be done ☐
   Other ☐ Please state ____________________________

14. Was the person who harmed you or your property:
   A student ☐
   Staff ☐
   Local resident ☐
   Unknown ☐

15. Was the person who harmed you or your property ever caught and reprimanded?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐
   Don't know ☐

16. Have you ever witnessed anyone else being harmed on campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what ____________________________
   No ☐
Section 5 - Routes that you use on campus

On the next two pages you will find a map of the Trefforest campus and a map of the Glyntaff campus. Please draw on the relevant map(s) the THREE most common pedestrian routes around campus that you use on a day-to-day basis. These could include, for example, from the train station to J-Block, or from the car park to the students union. If you use short cuts regularly, then please mark those too. To help in our analysis please could you also indicate here the purpose of the routes you have listed:

ROUTE 1

ROUTE 2

ROUTE 3
Thank you for taking part in this questionnaire.

Please return it to Joanna Waters by Wednesday 6th October 2004

Post it to: Room G717, G-Block, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd, CF37 1DL

Or

Phone me on: ext 3625 or e-mail me on jwaters1@glam.ac.uk and I will come and collect it from you on campus

THANK YOU!
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Information flyer for pilot focus group
PERSONAL SAFETY ON CAMPUS STUDY

Invitation to participate in a pilot focus group

Tuesday 12th October 2004
G204
2-3pm

The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute carries out research into personal safety issues and is currently engaged in a study designed to assess the perceptions of personal safety held by user groups on the University of Glamorgan campus. We would like to ask you to participate in a pilot focus group that uses the 'Virtual Reality Panorama Tool', to present innovative and dynamic representations of environments as the environmental stimuli. Your perceptions of personal safety in response to the standardised 'virtual reality' walk-through scenes of a selection of campus locations will be sought. The aim is for generalisations to be made on a sound empirical base which can be translated into design and management solutions to improve personal safety in these locations.

The data you provide will be analysed and there will not be any identification of individuals. We estimate that the time required of you will be around an hour.

If you would like to discuss the research design or if you have any questions about participating, please do not hesitate to contact Joanna Waters on 01443 483625 or via e-mail on iwaters1@glam.ac.uk

Joanna Waters
Appendix 16

Pilot questionnaire result
**SECTION 1 - Personal details**

**Q1. Frequency table showing gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2. Frequency table for age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3. Frequency table for marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Frequency table for ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Frequency table for employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>staff f/t</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff p/t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Area of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus, Treffores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus, other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Main mode of travel to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot study - transport to campus

Q8. Building based in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot study - buildings based in

Q9. Days per week on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot study - days per week spent on campus
Q10. **Campus on weekend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. **Mainly on campus:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night time</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2 - General perceptions of security on campus

**Q1. Adequate security overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2. Adequate CCTV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3. Adequate lighting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Adequate security presence eg security guards?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there an adequate security presence on campus?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Who to contact in event of being harmed?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you know who to contact if you were harmed on campus?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Adequate procedures in place?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think there are adequate procedures in place if you were harmed?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Trees and vegetation maintained to reduce harm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. What types of harm are most common?

- Mugging: 0
- Theft from buildings or cars: 4
- Assault: 0
- Intimidation: 1
- Other: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>What parts of the campus (if any) do you avoid because of lack of security?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Depends on where parked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>G-Block by labs and main car park - tunnel end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Don't intentionally avoid anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>What one thing would you do to make the campus more safe and secure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Identifiable staff in all buildings - an active presence of porters/security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>More CCTV cameras - with film in!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Walking between campus and train station is a little daunting - patrols just off campus would be good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Better lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3 - View of personal safety on campus

Q1. How worried are you about being harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very worried</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not worried at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus during the night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not afraid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus during the day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not afraid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely not afraid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. How safe do you feel when you are walking on campus alone during the following periods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entire safe</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>a bit unsafe</th>
<th>very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late at night</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Are you afraid when travelling to and from the campus from your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not afraid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Do you feel safe when you are inside university buildings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7.</td>
<td>What personal safety concerns are you most worried about on campus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Some students (rare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>No concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Night</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Strangers on site or those drunk from Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Being attacked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Muggings, inappropriate approachings from dodgy people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8.</th>
<th>Thinking of routes that you use the most frequently, what parts of the campus do you think are the safest?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Area around G-Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Main office (7th floor G-Block)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Most places are ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Near Business School - always busy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9.</th>
<th>Thinking of routes that you use, or have used, what parts of the campus are the least safe?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Back of LRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Main car park - tunnel end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Back roads, back of J-Block, end of car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Night** | |
| R1 | Top end of car park, 7th floor G-Block |
| R2 | - |
| R3 | Back roads, back of J-Block, end of car park |
| R4 | From of LRC on top of stairs – no lighting |
Q10. Have you ever altered your behaviour in response to fear of being harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. Have you ever avoided anywhere on campus as a result of concern for your personal safety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. How 'at risk' do you think your would be of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At risk</th>
<th>safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from buildings or cars</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13. Overall, do you feel you are at risk of being harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. Have you ever been mentally harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15. Have you ever been psychologically harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4 – Personal Experiences of crime and harm on campus

Q1. Have you ever been physically harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Have you ever been emotionally harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Have you ever been psychologically harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Have you ever been the victim of any other harmful behaviour or crime on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Was the harm directed at you or your property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Do you think the environment played a part in this harm/crime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. If yes to Q6 (do you think the environment played a part in the harm/crime) how could this be remedied?
R2 More patrolled security and CCTV cameras

Q8. Any harm classified as criminal offence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. Report incident to police?

n/a

Q10. Adequate support from police?

n/a

Q11. Report to university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. Adequate support from uni?

n/a

Q13. Why failed to report incident

n/a

Q14. Was the person who harmed you or your property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local resid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15. Was person ever caught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16. Have you ever witnessed anyone else being harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 17
Transcript from campus pilot study focus group
Transcript of pilot focus group

**JW**

**Intro**

**Rule 1**

Every one uses route - Park IMPROVEMENTS - walk route in

  R2: Not Darker. Less people but campus not totally unsafe because
  campus wide University.
  R1: (Paramedic) - Within boundaries of walk route in.
  R2: Yes. Pretty much.
  JW: Yes. Pretty much.
  R1: I wouldn’t feel at night.
  JW: I wouldn’t feel at night.
  R2: Off the campus. I wouldn’t feel any safer walking around here
  after dark enough. You have to select places you have to
  select places.

**Rule 2**

**Steps to take**

1. Steps to take
2. L1: I am consistent. Traffic.
3. L2: Go back to steps.
4. L3: Park in Gen. 3s. All around.
5. JW: How to get to campus?
6. R1: (Paramedic) - Within boundaries of walk route in.
7. R2: (Paramedic) - Within boundaries of walk route in.
8. JW: Over the next few months.
9. R1: We are not feeling more of a threat.
10. L1: (Paramedic) - Within boundaries of walk route in.
11. JW: Over the next few months.

**Rule 3**

**Steps to take**

1. Steps to take
2. L1: Never been a problem. Students were not.
3. JW: Never been a problem. Students were not.
4. L2: Not good. You did things on campus all the
5. R1: Not good. You did things on campus all the
6. JW: Not good. You did things on campus all the
7. R2: Not good. You did things on campus all the
8. L3: Good. You didn’t do anything on campus.
10. JW: Good. You didn’t do anything on campus.
11. R4: Good. You didn’t do anything on campus.
12. JW: Good. You didn’t do anything on campus.

**JW:**

No one is these parts of the campus you’d avoid even if one was.

**R7:**

I do not feel unsafe. I might not feel safe. I might feel.

**R10:**

If night. Yes.

**L1:**

What about vegetation.

**R3:**

Too high.

**L2:**

No one. Can see something. No one can see anything.

**R5:**

I see people around. I see people around. I see people around.

**JW:**

Can see. To see or not to see.

**R6:**

I am not sure. I am not sure.

**JW:**

I am not sure.

**R8:**

We are not sure. We are not sure.

**L1:**

I feel safe.

**R9:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R1:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R4:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R2:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R3:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R5:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R6:**

I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe.

**R7:**

I feel safe. I feel safe. I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe. I feel safe. I feel safe.

**R8:**

I feel safe. I feel safe. I feel safe.

**JW:**

I feel safe. I feel safe. I feel safe.
R5 Try and avoid at night
R6 Wild avoid route 2 on campus
R7 Avoid being males
R8 If more security lighting, & CCTV
R9 Not at night.

R14 What pull - how many campus at right?
R15 I saw my co-teacher
R16 Talk little later, hit people around - don't you walk
R17 Keep people around. PC going to bells
R18 Frankly, makes you feel safer.
R19 Always, mainly at 2AM, people hanging around here. I ran
R20 never on campus
R21 I think presence of other people problems before security
R22 I think just place given you a sense of well being, right
R23 As a one?
R24 Yes
R25 Any other use campus experiences
R26 UNC didn't like it at all, not conducive to democracy
R27 Not conducive to people. For chapel, not even any
R28 Not nice place to live, can lead to crime
R29 That, is not a center
R30 Attitudes completely different to people. People all well
R31 Life at Clean UNC of time past people enjoyed
R32 At UNC, if you completely didn't feel which could, right
R33 Friend didn't, didn't; attitude on
R34 Interacting - given idea & philosophy of the or expectation
R35 of well being, but didn't, people went &
R36 Inability, same effect.
R37 R18 Absolutely. Some, but not recently come & clean. E.g., very
R38 completely better. Although campus is covered, safety wasn't respected.
R39 against having a conversation. As you know for authorized
R40 He had them.
Do you guys ever get their learning on this route?
RG: Don't tell me to, just do it.
JG: No.
RG: OK, let's start.
JG: How many do you think we can do in one day?
RG: We're going to do it.
JG: I don't think so.
RG: This is in contrast to what one thought about feelings.
RG: I would be more happy to be in that certain point.
RG: I wouldn't like to become part of that.
RG: I'm not used to being part of that.
RG: The whole point is to be happy and not things like money.
RG: That is not a point that I like, at all.
RG: I don't want to be part of that.
RG: People are sad to see things that are happening.
RG: People are happy and not things like money.
RG: CCTV does not do with CCTV.
of alarm, it was false.

R1 It got like a speaker on it. So I passed by, then I passed by an alarm and someone said, "Are you there?"

R1 What alarm go off, when passed by?

R1 I don't know what it's like here, but obviously my only other experience is university in the states, where they have those big alarms and it's got an alarm bell. And it's an alarm that goes off and there's a slight, flash at the top of it and it's called security, night security, or even worse. When people come in, there's, apparently, among other things, you know, what they do?

R2 How they quite effective do you know?

R1 They really aren't. But you get fitted. You know if you're just moving around.

R2 Have they got CCTV or them as well?

R1 Yeah, not all.

R2 What about a buddy system? If you were walking late or had had a late lecture and had arranged for someone to walk you to your car or to the train station?

R1 But generally you get to know people so you walk together - leave home at the same time or there and they're going in the same direction. That's when you get a buddy system.

R2 If you're leaving a lecture, you'd probably walk with them off campus. So it's when you walk outside that you get split up from them.

R1 Do you feel safer than both groups of people? But does it matter what they're doing and what we were, being a group of kids coming on campus to do...uh...uh...a group of...uh...a group of kids coming on campus to do...uh...u
1. What if you go down into Trenton and don't hear any traffic? 
   2. Is that because it's abandoned? 
   3. It's just further away from the bustle of Trenton. There's a lot of ... a car. 
   4. Do you feel more aware? 
   5. I don't think you should feel safer. 

(- ماذا يفعل طيار ستراتفورد في ليلة عيد الميلاد؟ )
1. People get out of the way when it's dark. 
2. I think only one place we've been was doing security as long as you're walking, when coming on not bothered about back exits. 

(- كيف يمكن للطيارين السيطرة على السماك في الليل؟ )
1. Obviously we got limited control over the stretch here. 
2. I think only one place we've been was doing security as long as you're walking, when coming on not bothered about back exits. 

(- ما هو السبب في عدم وجود حشد في الحياة في المدينة؟ )
1. I think we should consider the possibility of doing security as long as you're walking, when coming on not bothered about back exits. 

(- ما هو السبب في عدم وجود حشد في الحياة في المدينة؟ )
1. I think we should consider the possibility of doing security as long as you're walking, when coming on not bothered about back exits. 

(- هل هناك شيء شيء يشعره الزوار كأنه أكثر أمانًا؟ )
1. If it's something you are familiar with you feel safer.
A lot of people say it's dark, it's horrible.

[Redacted]

I think there's a lot of like, especially if you're in a really dangerous neighborhood, you feel safer. It's not the case that it's dangerous. It's not necessarily the case that it's dangerous.

You should walk with someone. At night, you should never be out alone. It's not safe. It's not safe.

I think you should be in the right environment, in the right neighborhood.
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R1: And probably like something done to those lanes there. That's only place people are bothered about. A bright light shining down each lane.
R2: Or lights that are activated when someone walks past.
R1: I don't think that would make much difference really. It's the fact that you can't see down there.
R2: Maybe if you just had security at the entrance at night then you really wouldn't have to worry about those things. If 2 guys standing there or 2 girls, whatever. If security there I think it would make you feel a lot safer.
R6: Yes actual people not cameras.
R1: A physical presence.
R7: So as real people would make a big difference.
R9: And if they closed those inside entrances at certain times of night no everybody had to go through main door.
R2: I think they do. They shut at 10pm.
R6: It doesn't stop people. I've seen people jump these gates when the gates are shut."
R4: Say if you did leave in Queen's Street there when you shut these gates, people would have to walk out the way next and you might find these dangerous as you'd have to walk through Trefores when they could just climb over the gate.
R8: I think that's petty much everything will make any other people want to raise about 15 on campus. No good. At parties very much for convenience been very much. Please fill in AB.
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Summary of the key research findings from the pilot study questionnaires and focus group
There are some clear concurrences between the pilot questionnaire and focus group findings. Although the two data collection methods are entirely distinct there were similar conclusions; for example, respondents did not generally perceive themselves to be at risk during the day, while the perceived risk increased substantially on campus and off campus during darkness. It was generally felt in the questionnaires and focus group responses that security presence, lighting and CCTV was not currently sufficient on campus.

Analysis of the questionnaires produced the following results:

Section 1 – personal details
75% of respondents were female; ages ranged from 18-60; 50% were married; 100% were white; all were full-time staff at the university; all lived off campus in places other than Trefforest; 50% used the car and 50% used the train to get to and from work; they were based in G, H and J Blocks and were on campus for either 4 or 5 days per week. 50% sometimes used the campus on the weekend, 50% never did; 100% were on campus in the morning and afternoon, while 50% were on campus in the evening. None were on campus during the night-time.

Section 2 – general perceptions of security on campus
- 50% of respondents thought there was inadequate security overall on campus
- No-one thought there was adequate CCTV on campus
- 50% thought there was inadequate lighting on campus
- 75% thought there was an inadequate security presence on campus
- 100% were either unsure or wouldn’t know who to contact if they were harmed on campus
- 100% were unsure if there inadequate procedures in place if they were harmed on campus
- 50% thought that the trees and vegetation on campus were maintained so as to reduce harm, while 50% were unsure.
- The respondents all thought that the most common type of harm on campus was theft, while 25% thought intimidation was a potential problem. None thought that mugging or assault was common.
- 50% of respondents didn’t avoid anywhere on campus because of a lack of security, while one avoided G-Block labs and the car-park (tunnel end).
- The respondents identified more security staff or porters in buildings, more CCTV (with film), security patrols between the campus and the train station and improved lighting as possible ways of improving safety on campus.

Section 3 – views and perceptions of personal safety on campus
- 100% of respondents were not very worried about being harmed on campus
- 100% of respondents were not afraid to walk on campus during the night.
- 100% were not afraid to walk on campus during the day.
- 100% of respondents felt safe walking on campus alone in the morning and afternoon
- 50% of respondents felt very or fairly safe walking on campus alone in the evening, while 50% felt a bit unsafe
- 100% of respondents felt very unsafe walking alone on campus late at night.
- 50% were afraid when travelling to and from the campus from their home (time not specified)
- 100% of respondents felt safe inside university buildings
- 75% of respondents had no personal safety concerns in the day-time; 25% were concerned about some students
- 75% of respondents were concerned about strangers, drunks, being attacked or mugged, or being approached by ‘dodgy people’ at night on campus.
- The routes that were perceived to be the safest on campus during the day (and most frequently used) were all in or near the respondents’ place of work – i.e. the building where they were based.
- The routes that were perceived to be the safest on campus at night were again all in or near the respondents’ place of work – i.e. the building where they were based, or where there were security (gatehouse) or lots of people (LRC, foyers)
- The areas on campus perceived to be the most unsafe in the day were the back of the LRC, the tunnel end of the car-park, the back roads and the back of J-block.
The areas on campus perceived to be the most unsafe in the night were the front of the LRC, the tunnel end of the car-park, the back roads and the back of J-block and the 7th floor of G-Block.

50% of respondents claimed to have altered their behaviour in response to fear of being harmed on campus.

75% of respondents had not avoided anywhere on campus as a result of concern for their personal safety.

When asked how safe or at risk they felt from certain types of harm, 100% of respondents thought they were at risk of intimidation, 75% thought they were at risk of theft, 50% thought they were safe from being mugged and 100% thought they were safe from assault.

Overall 75% of respondents thought they were not at risk of being harmed on campus.

Section 4 – personal experiences

- 100% of respondents had not been physically harmed on campus
- 100% of respondents had not been emotionally harmed on campus
- 100% of respondents had not been psychologically harmed on campus
- 25% of respondents had been the victim of any other type of harmful behaviour or crime on campus. This was directed at their property and they thought the environment played a part in this harm/crime. The respondent though the solution to this was to have more patrolled security and CCTV on campus. She didn’t regard this as a criminal offence so didn’t report this to the police. She also didn’t report it to the university. The person who perpetrated this harm was unknown and was never caught.
- 100% of people who responded had never witnessed anyone else being harmed on campus.

Section 5 - Route analysis

Because there was some repetition of routes and common nodes in the routes listed, it was decided that two routes would be filmed and this would be sufficient to test the methodology for the pilot study focus groups:

**Route 1 – Daylight**

Students Union – shop – front of G-block – under refectory – Bytes (J-Block)

**Route 2 – Night-time**

J-Block – LRC – Brook Street - Train station

This routes was selected as the night time route because this was the one that was more likely to be used later on in the evening i.e. campus users leaving the university to go home on the train.

Analysis of the focus group data showed that, for the daytime route,

- The fact that the route was filmed in the daytime with an abundance of natural light ensured that this route was perceived to be very safe (image 1).
- Familiarity also provided reassurance to campus users
- On this route there are always people around in the day and this social presence (particularly of ‘peers’) enhanced senses of personal safety.
- The route was also within the campus boundaries which provided an almost implicit sense of safety, a sense that you were more protected on university facilities.
- The group revealed that personal pro-active personal safety measures improved their perceived safety, including walking in groups, avoiding risky places and carrying mobile phones.
- The University of Glamorgan ethos was viewed as enhancing personal safety. As a ‘widening participation’ university with a social mission it was viewed as being a ‘caring’ and ‘considerate’ institution that implicitly looked after you and your welfare, and ergo your personal safety.

When asked how they would feel on this route at night the following observations were made:

- The campus landscape figured highly in respondents’ fears and concerns for their personal safety. The steps (image 2) were perceived as the weakest point of the route in terms of personal safety as they could be dark and were surrounded by bushes. The vegetation and bushes were also flagged up as heightening senses of fear and perceived risk. The car park (image 3) was also a feature of the physical environment
that invoked fear for personal safety, particularly in the more remote parts. The smoking shelter (image 4) was thought to be not adequately fitted with lights and there were too many corners where potential offenders could lurk.

- The group generally thought the route would be a lot less safe at night and the lack of lighting dramatically increased perceived risk. The route at night when it was dark would present new personal safety concerns since the lack of natural light conditions would dramatically alter the feel of the route.
- The open access ethos of the university also presented problems, particularly at night, since anyone could come on the campus, and at night there are less people to observe them.
- The number of people, or social presence, in the vicinity had a substantial effect on senses of personal safety. The quieter areas seem to be more of a threat and the participants observed feeling safer as a group.

Analysis of the night time route data showed that:

- Again, the physical environment was perceived to impact on senses of personal safety. The Brook Street entrance when you leave the campus was dark and threatening (image 5). The back lanes by Brook Street entrance – students would avoid walking this route at night; some even in the day. Lighting was a big issue in the construction of feelings of safety and the lack of street lights were seen as a concern. This was particularly heightened when students left the campus (image 6).
- When respondents left the perceived safety of the campus environment they claimed that they experienced different perceptions of personal safety when they left the campus environment and entered the local Trefforest community.
- The lack of security such as CCTV, lighting and security guards on the route, particularly off campus was a concern, particularly off campus.
- The reality for most respondents was that sometimes they had to take risks - after all, if they wanted to get home after a late lecture then they would have to walk this route and there may be no other option.
Table A. Possible security solutions for improved personal safety on and near campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Possible personal safety solution</th>
<th>Aspect of personal safety triangle</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night time/isolation</td>
<td>Alarm points</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Generally thought to be a good idea as long as instant and immediate security response, and not telephone where you have to dial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night time/isolation</td>
<td>Buddy scheme</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Generally not thought to be a good idea. Interesting because this remedies the lack of people instigator for increased anxiety and concern for personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of people</td>
<td>More security guards</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Real people seen as a real boost to personal safety, although lighting and CCTV should supplement this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>More lighting</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Would improve visibility and therefore allow people to be more aware of their environment as they walk the route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and night</td>
<td>More CCTV (with film in and being continually watched)</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Although this wasn’t viewed as the ultimate solution it was seen as part of a possible package of solutions to improve personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and night</td>
<td>Personal responsibility</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Things to make yourself safer: Don’t flash your mobile phone, don’t carry your purse in your hand, telling people when you’ll be home, walking in groups, avoiding the campus at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>Security patrolling Brook Street – train station</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Respondents agreed that it would be better if security were patrolling Brook Street down to the station as perceptions of personal safety changed off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of people responsible for personal safety</td>
<td>Security guards with more visibility and more defined role.</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>There was also widespread confusion over the role of security guards. The group perceived their role as to watch over the car park and book people who had illegally parked rather than be on hand for personal safety matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day and night</td>
<td>Less vegetation</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Improve visibility and reduce opportunities for potential offenders to hide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>Personal safety awareness training</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>No student had received any personal safety induction or guidance during their time at university and this is something that some would have wanted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VR Images

1. By students union; daylight

2. Steps by G-block car park (looking up)

3. Tunnel end of main car park
4. Smoking shelter near H-Block

5. The Brook Street Entrance at night (gate)

6. Dark lanes by Brook Street entrance
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Invitation to participate in main study campus questionnaires
PERSONAL SAFETY ON CAMPUS STUDY
Invitation to participate in research study

The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute carries out research into personal safety issues and is currently engaged in a study designed to assess the perceptions of personal safety held by user groups on the University of Glamorgan campus. We would like to ask you to fill in our 'personal safety questionnaire' as part of our wider study to explore standards of personal safety on campus. The aim is to explore how campus users perceive security on the campus, whether they are concerned for their personal safety and whether they have experienced any incidents on campus. The results will form part of a wider study that aims to identify current strengths and weaknesses in terms of safety on campus and to develop, implement and assess practical solutions to improve personal safety on campus in response to users' concerns.

The 'Personal Safety Questionnaire' is 9 pages long. It consists of a number of separate sections:

- Personal details
- General perceptions of security on campus
- Personal safety on campus
- Personal experiences of crime and harm on campus
- Routes that you use on campus.

The data responses you provide will remain confidential and there will be no identification of individuals in the subsequent analysis. It should take you around 20-30 minutes to complete.

IF YOU FILL IN A QUESTIONNAIRE YOU WILL BE ENTERED INTO A RAFFLE TO WIN A PRIZE OF £25!!!

If you would like to discuss the research design or if you have any questions about participating, please do not hesitate to contact Joanna Waters on 01443 483625 or via e-mail on jwaters1@glam.ac.uk

Joanna Waters
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Information for respondents about main study campus questionnaires
October 2004

Dear participant

You are invited to participate in a study of personal safety on university campuses by completing a personal safety questionnaire which will take around 20-30 minutes to complete. It asks you about your views on security on campus, whether you worry about personal safety on campus, whether you have experienced harm on campus in the last 12 months and for your main pedestrian routes around campus. The material you will provide is part of a wider data collection process to explore safety on campus that will contribute to the main findings of the study. The findings will lead to the identification of a range of practical solutions that can be applied to the University of Glamorgan campus so that all users are and feel secure. The study is due to be completed in December 2005.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential. Your name will not be used in the published study, and only I will have access to the primary data. You will be identified only by an ID number on the front page of the questionnaire and all data will be destroyed once the study is concluded.

Some of the questions in the questionnaire may be of a sensitive nature, but you are under no obligation to answer them and should you require additional support or advice you can contact me as detailed below. You are free to raise questions or concerns with me at anytime during the study, and you may withdraw at any time if you choose. Please be assured that you are under no obligation to agree to participate.

Please contact me if you have any concerns or questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Joanna Waters
Research Assistant
Room G717, G-Block
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
School of Technology
The University of Glamorgan
Pontypridd
CF37 1DL

Tel: 01443 483625
Fax: 01443 482169
E-mail: jwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Informed consent document - main study campus questionnaires
October 2004

This document is to confirm that the data obtained from the completed questionnaire is being collected solely for the purposes of my PhD research project. The information obtained from the questionnaire will be held confidentially and anonymously and will not be shared with any third parties. I am fully aware of the ethical implications of my research and my research approach is underpinned by strict principles of personal integrity. Throughout my research I will treat people fairly, respect people's autonomy and ensure that the utmost consideration is given to potential respondents in the design and application of my research methodology.

The data provided will be summarised anonymously in any report or presentation which may arise from the study and respondents will not be identified by name. All questionnaire answer sheets and subsequent analysis materials will be held anonymously and securely in my office for the duration of the research and will be destroyed when the study is complete.

I will discuss with the respondent any matter related to this research as requested and each respondent has the right of access to any notes and questionnaire answer sheets should they wish to obtain a copy.

Please be assured that potential respondents are under no obligation to agree to participate in this study and have the right to withdraw from the project at any time.

☐ I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE ABOVE STATEMENTS AND I GIVE PERMISSION TO THE RESEARCHER TO USE THE QUESTIONNAIRE MATERIAL FOR THE PURPOSES OF HER RESEARCH PROJECT

☐ I UNDERSTAND THAT I MAY REFUSE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS OR WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY WITHOUT NECESSARILY GIVING A REASON, AND THAT I SHALL NOT BE REPRIMANDED FOR DOING SO.

☐ I HAVE NOT BEEN PRESSURISED IN ANY WAY TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY

Respondent's name:  Signature:  Date:

If you have any questions about this study then please contact:

Joanna Waters
Room G717, G-Block
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
School of Technology
University of Glamorgan
Pontypridd
CF37 1DL
Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: iwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Main campus study questionnaire
Questionnaire Booklet

Personal safety questionnaire

Personal Safety on University Campuses project
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
University of Glamorgan
Researcher: Joanna Waters, School of Technology
This is an enquiry into your experiences, views and perceptions of personal safety on the University campus. Some of these questions are of a sensitive nature – if you do not wish to complete a question then move on to the next. If you require further information or additional commentary please contact me, Joanna Waters, on ext 3625 or at watersj@alam.ac.uk. Please write clearly in BLOCK CAPITALS. There are no right or wrong answers; it is your opinions that are required. All answers will be treated in a totally confidential manner. Thank you for your involvement.

Section 1 – personal details. Please complete the questions below. For each category tick the appropriate box/boxes or enter the data required as requested.

1. Gender
   - Male □
   - Female □

2. Age
   - 18-30 □
   - 31-40 □
   - 41-50 □
   - 51-60 □
   - 61-70 □

3. Marital status
   - Single □
   - Married □
   - Divorced □
   - Widowed □
   - Other □

4. Ethnicity
   - White □
   - Asian □
   - Black □
   - Chinese □
   - Mixed □
   - Other (please state) _______________________

5. Employment status
   - Staff full-time □
   - Staff part-time □
   - Student part-time □
   - Student full-time □
   - Are you undergraduate or postgraduate? □

What are you studying? _______________________
Visitor □

Which department are you visiting? ________________

6. Area of Residence
   - On campus □
   - Off campus, in Treforest □
   - Off campus, other □
   - Where? _______________________

7. What is your main mode of travel to the campus?
   - Car □
   - Train □
   - Bike □
   - Bus □
   - On foot □
   - Other □
   - Please state _______________________

8. Which building are you mainly based in? ________________

9. How many days per week (on average) do you spend on campus? _______

10. Do you come on to campus on the weekend?
    - Often □
    - Sometimes □
    - Never □

11. Are you mainly on campus in the (tick all that apply)
    - Morning □
    - Afternoon □
    - Evening □
    - Night time □
For the purposes of this questionnaire, PERSONAL SAFETY is defined as:

An individual's ability to go about their everyday life free from the threat or fear of psychological, emotional or physical harm from others. Harm is intentionally motivated, and includes harm against your property and personal effects as well as against the person.

Section 2 - General perception of security on campus Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

3. Do you think the university has adequate security overall?
   Yes □  Unsure □  No □

4. Do you think there is adequate CCTV on campus?
   Yes □  Unsure □  No □

11. Do you think that there is adequate lighting on campus at night?
    Yes □  Unsure □  No □

12. Do you think there is enough security presence on campus i.e. security guards?
    Yes □  Unsure □  No □

13. Would you feel confident of who to contact in the event of being harmed on campus?
    Yes □  Unsure □  No □

14. Do you think the university has adequate procedures in place if you were harmed on campus?
    Yes □  Unsure □  No □

15. Do you think the trees and vegetation on campus are maintained in such a way as to reduce harm on campus?
    Yes □  Unsure □  No □

16. What types of harm do you think are the most common on campus (tick all that apply)?
    Mugging □
    Theft from buildings or cars □
    Assault □
    Intimidation □
    Other (please state) ________________________________

17. What parts of campus (if any) do you avoid because of lack of security? ________________________________

18. What one thing would you do to make the campus more safe and secure? _______________________________
Section 3 – Personal safety on campus: your views and concerns. Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

6. How worried are you about being harmed on campus?
   - Extremely worried □
   - Very worried □
   - Fairly worried □
   - Not very worried □
   - Not worried at all □

7. Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus at night?
   - Very afraid □
   - Afraid □
   - Not afraid □
   - Definitely not afraid □
   If so, where ____________________________

8. Is there anywhere you are afraid to walk on campus during the day?
   - Very afraid □
   - Afraid □
   - Not afraid □
   - Definitely not afraid □
   If so, where ____________________________

9. How safe do you feel when you are walking on campus alone during the following periods?
   - Entirely safe □
   - Very safe □
   - Fairly safe □
   - A bit unsafe □
   - Very unsafe □
   - Morning (7am-11.59am) □
   - Afternoon (12pm-4.59pm) □
   - Evening (5pm-9.59pm) □
   - Late at night (10pm-6.59am) □

10. Are you afraid when travelling to and from the campus from your home?
    - Very afraid □
    - Afraid □
    - Not afraid □
    - Definitely not afraid □
    If so, where specifically? ____________________________
### Section 3 - Personal safety on campus: your views and concerns (continued)

Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

6. Do you feel safe when you are inside university buildings?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. What personal safety concerns are you most worried about on campus?
   - During the day ____________________________
   - During the night ____________________________

8. Thinking of routes that you use the most frequently, what parts of the campus do you think are the safest?
   - During the day ____________________________
   - During the night ____________________________

9. Thinking of routes that you use, or have used, what parts of the campus are the least safe?
   - During the day ____________________________
   - During the night ____________________________

12. Have you ever altered your behaviour in response to fear of being harmed on campus?
   - Yes [ ] If so, how ____________________________
   - No [ ]

13. Have you ever avoided anywhere on campus as a result of concern or fear for your personal safety?
   - Yes [ ] If so, where ____________________________
   - No [ ]

12. How 'at risk' do you think you would be of being a victim of the following harmful behaviours on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>At risk</th>
<th>Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from buildings or cars</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Overall, do you feel you are at risk of being harmed whilst on this campus?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
Section 4 - Personal experiences of crime and harm on campus. Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months. Remember, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to.

1. Have you ever been physically harmed by someone on campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No ☐

2. Have you ever been emotionally harmed by someone on this campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No ☐

3. Have you ever been psychologically harmed by someone on this campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No ☐

4. Have you been the victim of any other harmful behaviour or crime on campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what specifically (only a few words are necessary here) __________________________
   No ☐

5. Was the harm or crime directed at:
   You ☐
   Your property ☐

6. Do you think the environment played a part in the harm/crime?
   Yes ☐ If so, how __________________________
   No ☐
   Don't know ☐

7. If yes, how could this be remedied?
   __________________________

8. Was any harm that you have experienced on campus legally classed as a criminal offence?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐
   Don't know ☐

9. If yes, did you ever report the incident to the police?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐
Section 4 - Personal experiences of crime and harm on campus (continued) Your responses are required for the period of the last 12 months.

10. If you reported the incident to the police, do you think you received adequate support?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Did you ever report the incident to university officials or a member of staff?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

12. If you reported the incident to university officials or a member of staff, do you think you received adequate support?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

13. If you failed to report the incident was it because of:
   Embarrassment/humiliation ☐
   Fear of retaliation ☐
   No real damage ☐
   Nothing would be done ☐
   Other ☐ Please state __________________________

14. Was the person who harmed you or your property:
   A student ☐
   Staff ☐
   Local resident ☐
   Unknown ☐

15. Was the person who harmed you or your property ever caught and reprimanded?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☐

16. Have you ever witnessed anyone else being harmed on campus?
   Yes ☐ If so, what ________________________________
   No ☐
Section 5 – Routes that you use on campus

On the next two pages you will find a map of the Trefforest campus and a map of the Glyntaff campus. Please draw on the relevant map(s) the THREE most common pedestrian routes around campus that you use on a day-to-day basis. These could include, for example, from the train station to J-Block, or from the car park to the students union. If you use short cuts regularly, then please mark those too. To help in our analysis please could you also indicate here the purpose of the routes you have listed:

ROUTE 1

ROUTE 2

ROUTE 3
Thank you for taking part in this questionnaire.

Please return it to Joanna Waters by Wednesday 20th October 2004

Post it to: Room G717, G-Block, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd, CF37 1DL

Or

Phone me on: ext 3625 or e-mail me on iwaters1@glam.ac.uk and I will come and collect it from you on campus

If you would like to be entered into the prize draw to win £25 then please put your name and department here (this page will be detached from the questionnaire when it is received to preserve your anonymity)

Name ______________________________________ Department __________________________

THANK YOU!
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Invitation to participate in main campus focus group at Glamorgan University
Invitation to participate in a focus group study

Wednesday 9th February in room G204
10am to 1pm

- You will receive £10 for participating.
- There will be a 10-15 minute break half way through
- Light refreshments will be provided.

The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute carries out research into personal safety issues and is currently engaged in a study designed to assess the perceptions of personal safety held by different user groups on university campuses. We would like to ask you to participate in a focus group that uses the 'Virtual Reality Panorama Tool' to present innovative and dynamic representations of pedestrian routes across campus as the environmental stimuli. Your perceptions of personal safety in response to these standardised 'virtual reality' walk-through scenes will be sought, with a focus on features of the physical environment. The aim is for generalisations to be made on a sound empirical basis which can be translated into design and management solutions to improve personal safety on campus.

The data you provide will be analysed and written up as part of a PhD thesis and as a number of journal and conference papers but your anonymity is guaranteed – individuals will be referred to only by ID numbers.

To confirm your attendance, or if you have any questions about participating, please contact Joanna Waters on ext 3625 or via e-mail on jwaters1@glam.ac.uk or call in to room G717.

Thank you

Joanna Waters
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Information letter for participants about focus groups at Glamorgan University
INFORMATION LETTER

Personal safety on university campuses research study

October 2004

Dear participant

You are invited to participate in a study of personal safety on university campuses by participating in a focus group. The aim of this focus group session is for us to explore your perceptions of personal safety in response to a number of virtual reality walkthrough scenes of the university campus. This will lead to the identification of safe and unsafe locations that exist on the campus. Possible practical solutions to personal safety concerns will be considered in the form of the design and maintenance of new facilities and alterations to existing facilities. It is anticipated that the discussion will last for around 1½ hours.

You will also be asked to fill in a brief questionnaire to record your personal details. These are completely anonymous and are to help me identify whether factors such as gender and age influence perceptions of personal safety. I would also like to film this focus group for the sole reason that it will help when I come to transcribe the discussion. The tape will be destroyed as soon as I have transcribed the discussion.

The material you will provide is part of a wider data collection process to explore safety on campus that will contribute to the main findings of the study. The findings will lead to the identification of a range of practical solutions that can be applied to the University of Glamorgan campus so that all users are and feel secure. The study is due to be completed in December 2005.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential. Your name will not be used in the published study, and only I will have access to the primary data. You will be identified only by an ID number on the front page of the questionnaire and all data will be destroyed once the study is concluded. You are free to raise questions or concerns with me at anytime during the study, and you may withdraw at any time if you choose. Please be assured that you are under no obligation to agree to participate.

Please contact me if you have any concerns or questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Joanna Waters
Research Assistant
Room G717, G-Block
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
School of Technology
The University of Glamorgan
Pontypridd
CF37 1DL

Tel: 01443 483625 (ext 3625)
Fax: 01443 482169
E-mail: iwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Informed consent for participants of focus groups at Glamorgan University
October 2004

This is to certify that the responses generated in the focus group will be held confidentially. No data that is attributable to the discussion will be made available to any other third party. Your name will not be identified in any report or presentation which may arise from the study and only anonymous summaries of the data will appear in any publications in which the research results may be published. The transcription of the discussion and subsequent analysis materials will be held anonymously.

The data is collected solely for the purposes of a PhD research project undertaken by the researcher. In undertaking the project, the researcher has agreed to comply with the highest standards of ethically correct research practices, to act with integrity, treat people fairly and respect their autonomy.

The researcher will discuss with the respondent any matter related to this research as requested and each respondent has right of access to any notes and questionnaire answer sheets should they wish to obtain a copy. This data will be stored securely in the researcher’s office for the duration of the research and then destroyed on completion of the study.

Each respondent has the right to withdraw from the project at any time.

☐ I ACKNOWLEDGE THE ABOVE STATEMENTS AND GIVE PERMISSION TO THE RESEARCHER TO USE THE QUESTIONNAIRE MATERIAL FOR THE PURPOSES OF HER PHD RESEARCH PROJECT

☐ I UNDERSTAND THAT EACH FOCUS GROUP WILL TAKE AROUND 1½ HOURS AND THAT THE FOCUS GROUPS WILL BE FILMED USING A VIDEO CAMERA IN ORDER THAT ALL THE RESPONSES CAN BE TRANSCRIBED IN LINE WITH WHAT IS BEING VIEWED ON SCREEN.

☐ I HAVE NOT BEEN COERCED IN ANY WAY TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY AND I UNDERSTAND THAT I MAY REFUSE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS OR WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY WITHOUT NECESSARILY GIVING A REASON, AND THAT I SHALL NOT BE PENALISED FOR DOING SO.

Respondent’s name: Signature: Date:

If you have any questions about this study then please contact:

Joanna Waters, Room G717, G-Block, The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute, School of Technology, University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd, CF37 1DL
Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: iwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Invitation to participate in focus group at Loughborough University
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A FOCUS GROUP

You are invited to take part in a focus group as part of a wider study being carried out by the University of Glamorgan that focuses upon personal safety on university campuses. A key component of this study is to assess the perceptions of personal safety held by different user groups on university campuses. A number of focus groups will be held at Loughborough University to explore how people unfamiliar with the University of Glamorgan perceive its campus in terms of personal safety.

The focus group will involve you being shown 'virtual reality' walk-through scenes of pedestrian routes across the University of Glamorgan campus. In response to these environmental stimuli your general perceptions of personal safety will be explored, as well as possible solutions to any personal safety issues that arise, with a particular focus on features of the physical environment. The aim is for generalisations to be made on a sound empirical basis which can be translated into design and management solutions to improve personal safety on university campuses. The data you provide will be analysed and written up as part of a PhD thesis and as a number of journal and conference papers but your anonymity will be maintained constantly.

The focus group will last around 2 hours and you will receive £10 for participating. The focus group will take place sometime in the week of 18th-22nd April and the time and location will be confirmed shortly.

Abigail Powell has kindly offered to be my contact point at Loughborough University so to confirm your attendance, or if you have any questions about participating, please contact either Abi or myself, Joanna Waters, at the University of Glamorgan, on 01443 483625 or via e-mail on jwaters1@glam.ac.uk

Many thanks

Joanna Waters
Research Assistant
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
The University of Glamorgan
Pontypridd
CF37 1DL
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Information letter for participants of focus group at Loughborough University
March 2005

Dear participant

You are invited to participate in a study of personal safety on university campuses by participating in a focus group. The aim of this focus group session is for us to explore your perceptions of personal safety in response to a number of virtual reality walkthrough scenes of the University of Glamorgan campus. This will lead to the identification of perceived safe and unsafe features of the campus environment. Possible practical solutions to personal safety concerns will be considered in the form of the design and maintenance of new facilities and alterations to existing facilities. It is anticipated that the focus group discussion will last for around 2 hours.

You will also be asked to fill in a brief questionnaire to record your personal details. These are completely anonymous and are to help me identify whether factors such as gender and age influence perceptions of personal safety. I would also like to film the focus group with a video camera for the sole reason that it will help when I come to transcribe the discussion. The tape will be destroyed as soon as I have transcribed the discussion.

The material you will provide is part of a wider data collection process to explore personal safety on university campuses that will contribute to the main findings of the study. The findings will lead to the identification of a range of practical solutions that can be applied to the University of Glamorgan campus so that all users are and feel secure, as well as a generic framework of solutions to apply to any university campus. The study is due to be completed in December 2005.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential. Your name will not be used in the published study, and only I will have access to the primary data. Your focus group contributions will be identified only by an anonymous ID number and all data will be destroyed once the study is concluded.

Although the focus group will be centred on discussion of the physical environment of the campus, the issue of personal safety is a potentially sensitive subject. You are under no obligation to answer any questions that you do not wish to and should you require additional support or advice please do not hesitate to inform me. You are free to raise questions or concerns with me at anytime during the study, and you may withdraw at any time if you so choose. Please be assured that you are under no obligation to agree to participate.

Please contact me if you have any concerns or questions. Thank you for your assistance.

Joanna Waters
Research Assistant
Room G717, G-Block
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute
School of Technology
The University of Glamorgan
CF37 1DL
Tel: 01443 483625
Fax: 01443 482169
E-mail: iwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Informed consent for participants of focus group at Loughborough University
March 2005

This document is to confirm that the discussion data from the focus group is being collected solely for the purposes of my PhD research project. The responses generated in the focus group will be held confidentially and anonymously and will not be shared with any third parties. I am fully aware of the ethical implications of my research and my research approach is underpinned by strict principles of personal integrity. Throughout my research I will treat people fairly, respect people's autonomy and ensure that the utmost consideration is given to potential respondents in the design and application of my research methodology.

The data provided will be summarised anonymously in any report or presentation which may arise from the study and respondents will not be identified by name. The transcription of the discussion and subsequent analysis materials will be held anonymously and securely in my office for the duration of the research and will be destroyed when the study is complete.

I will discuss with the respondent any matter related to this research as requested and each respondent has the right of access to any discussion notes should they wish to obtain a copy.

Please be assured that potential respondents are under no obligation to agree to participate in this study and have the right to withdraw from the project at any time.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE ABOVE STATEMENTS AND I GIVE PERMISSION TO THE RESEARCHER TO USE THE FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION DATA FOR THE PURPOSES OF HER RESEARCH PROJECT

I UNDERSTAND THAT EACH FOCUS GROUP WILL TAKE AROUND 2 HOURS AND THAT THE FOCUS GROUP WILL BE FILMED USING A VIDEO CAMERA IN ORDER THAT ALL THE RESPONSES CAN BE TRANSCRIBED.

I HAVE NOT BEEN PRESSURISED IN ANY WAY TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY AND I UNDERSTAND THAT I MAY REFUSE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS OR WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY WITHOUT NECESSARILY GIVING A REASON, AND THAT I SHALL NOT BE PENALISED FOR DOING SO.

Respondent's name: Signature: Date:

If you have any questions about this study then please contact:

Joanna Waters,
Room G717, G-Block,
The Suzy Lamplugh Trust Research Institute,
School of Technology,
University of Glamorgan,
Pontypridd,
CF37 1DL

Tel: 01443 483625
E-mail: iwaters1@glam.ac.uk
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Main study questionnaire findings
### Q1. Have you ever been physically harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>per cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2. Have you ever been emotionally harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>per cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q3. Have you ever been psychologically harmed on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>per cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Have you ever been the victim of any other harmful behaviour or crime on campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>per cent</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Was the harm directed at you or your property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Do you think the environment played a part in this harm/crime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. If yes to Q6 (do you think the environment played a part in the harm/crime) how could this be remedied?
R15 More patrolled security and CCTV cameras
R77 No response

Q8. Any harm classified as criminal offence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. Report incident to police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Adequate support from police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100

Q11. Report to university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100

Q12. Adequate support from uni?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100
Q13. Why failed to report incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no real damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. Was the person who harmed you or your property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local resident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of harms experienced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User group:</th>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>Respondent ID and type of harm experienced:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically harmed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotionally harmed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R37 - abusive e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychologically harmed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R13 - malicious phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R15 - car damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically harmed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R55 - hit by car (accident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotionally harmed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R71 - shouted abuse at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychologically harmed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R74 - Homophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R77 - threatened with knife in Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically harmed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotionally harmed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychologically harmed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R111 - barriers and obsessive security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Main study questionnaire analysis
Questionnaire analysis - Main study

The respondents consisted of a representative sample of three user groups; staff, students and visitors. 120 questionnaires were distributed (40 to each user group). Of these, 46 responded with the following breakdown from each user group: 21 staff; 17 students; 8 visitors.

1. All respondents combined - overall findings – aggregated response

Section 4
- 2% had been physically harmed, 9% emotionally harmed, 2% psychologically harmed and 4% had been a victim of another harm
- Of those that had experience harm, 25% thought that the environment played a part in the harm
- 63% reported the harm to the university
- 60% received adequate support from university
- 13% classed as criminal offence and reported to the police.
- 100% received adequate support from police
- The perpetrators of the harm were 38% students, 50% unknown, 12% no response.
- Of these 75% had not been caught and reprimanded
- 17.4% had witnessed others being harmed on campus

- There were few reported incidence of harm on campus – 8/46 in total, representing 17% of respondents
- 100% of those who responded across all user groups felt safe inside university buildings
- 24% of users thought there was inadequate CCTV yet only 13% cited better CCTV in an open-ended question on what one thing they thought would improve personal safety on campus
- 24% of users thought there was inadequate lighting yet only 17% cited better lighting in an open-ended question on what one thing they thought would improve personal safety on campus
- 35% of users thought there was adequate security presence yet only 33% cited a better security presence in an open-ended question on what one thing they thought would improve personal safety on campus
- High percentage in all user groups thought trees and vegetation maintained to reduce harm
- All groups cited busy areas, such as the main road, the safest part of the campus in the day
- All groups cited well lit and busy places safest on campus at night
- All groups thought theft was the most common harm, followed by intimidation
- Mugging and assault were perceived as low risks to harm across all user groups
- Low numbers in all groups felt not at risk of being harmed overall on campus
- All groups showed a general increase in risk perception over the course of the day (from morning, afternoon, evening to night)
- Of the victims of harm, only 13% of perpetrators had been caught and reprimanded.
- Few had witnessed others being harmed on campus
- A reasonably high number of victims had reported the incident to the university, and received adequate support from the university.

Those who had experienced victimisation reported the following:

Physical harm
R55 - Accidentally hit by car

Emotional harm
R37 – abusive e-mail
R71 – shouted abuse at
R77 – threatened with knife in Halls of Residence
R74 – homophobia
Psychological harm
R111 – barriers and obsessive security personnel

Other harm
R13 – malicious phone call
R15 – car damaged

2. Breakdown into user groups

STAFF
- 0% had been physically harmed, 5% emotionally harmed, 0% psychologically harmed and 10% had been a victim of another harm
- Of those that had experience harm, 33% thought that the environment played a part in the harm.
- 66% reported the harm to the university
- 50% received adequate support from university
- 0% considered the harm a criminal offence and so could not respond as to whether they received adequate support from police
- The perpetrators of the harm 100% unknown
- Of these 100% had not been caught and reprimanded.
- 0% had witnessed others being harmed on campus

- Staff were most worried about their personal safety during the day and night.
- Staff were most afraid at night.
- 76.2% of staff hadn’t altered behaviour; those who had moved their car nearer buildings before it got dark
- 90.5% of staff hadn’t avoided anywhere on campus
- Staff felt most at risk of theft and intimidation

STUDENTS
- 6% had been physically harmed, 18% emotionally harmed and 0% either psychologically or otherwise harmed.
- Of those that had experience harm, 25% thought that the environment played a part in the harm.
- 75% reported the harm to the university
- 66% received adequate support from the university
- 2% considered the crime as a criminal offence and of these 100% reported the harm to the police
- 100% received adequate support from police
- The perpetrators of the harm were 50% students and 50% unknown.
- Of these 75% had not been caught and reprimanded.
- 12% had witnessed others being harmed on campus

- Students were the user group most at actual risk, accounting for 5/8 incidents of harm.
- Students were the user group who most feel that there is adequate security overall on campus.
- Students were more knowledgeable about who to contact
- Students were the youngest demographic age who felt safer but were actually more at risk
- Students were the group most proactive in taking measures to reduce risk
- Students travelled to and around campus mainly on foot (58.8%), more than the other user groups.
- Students were most concerned about the car park, prayer hall and Brook Street as hot spots of fear at night
- Students felt that the university provided a high level of support
- Students were more fearful travelling from home
- 5.9% students have avoided somewhere on campus in response to personal safety concerns
VISITORS
- 0% had been physically harmed, 0% emotionally harmed, 13% were psychologically harmed and 0% were a victim of other harm.
- Of those that had experienced harm, no response was given as to whether the environment played a part in the harm.
- No response reported the harm to the university
- No response reported the harm to the police
- No response received adequate support from police
- The perpetrators of the harm were 100% no response.
- 0% had witnessed others being harmed on campus

- Visitors were the group least at actual risk
- Visitors felt the safest
Appendix 31

Sample focus group transcript – Staff at Glamorgan
FOCUS GROUP 1

Introduction. General - what are your general feelings about personal safety on this campus? Is it a big concern for you?

I think it is at night-time. I don't think it's particularly well lit in certain areas at night. Not so much in the day as night. I'm a bit worried, especially if you come out of the building alone you have to go through dark bit to get to your car or whatever.

Is that something that many of you think?

Yes I agree.

I think the surrounding areas particularly like the student car park and down the road that goes to the station. Walking down Brook Street, Within the campus I don't feel so vulnerable as I do in the immediately adjacent streets.

So is there a difference between being on campus to being in the adjacent community?

Yes, I feel that way as well. I think unless it's dark and there is no-one else around, generally I don't feel too bad specifically on campus but as soon as I come off it.

KM You've mentioned the night-time but does anyone have any issues during the day?

There's usually a lot of people about in the daytime.

So having people around makes you feel safe?

Yes

The only time on campus I've felt insecure or not safe is when I'm the last person in the office because it's an open plan office and I always make a point of locking the door whereas if normally there's others there I don't feel unsafe.

Well that's an interesting point because it's not just outside on campus that you're saying that it's also inside buildings too.

If it's dark outside and I'm on my own.

Because they can see in.

I wonder how many do work in open plan offices then because it's a bit of a change.

I know I work in the room adjacent to yours (xxxx) and it's open plan but the doors got a lock on it but at 4 o'clock unless you have a card you can't get in through the main door. I only work there two days a week. Three days a week I work in a different department where the door is left open until you physically lock it with a key. I feel much safer on my own working in the room with a timed lock on it than I do on my own in the other office, definitely.

Is that something that people would like to see spread over the whole university?

Yes, our office is an open plan office and it used to be open to everyone and we're just adjacent to the main toilets that people use before they go to the car park so you did feel very vulnerable when you were there alone but they have put a pad on there now that you have to tap into to get into the office in the night so you can lock it. But it was an issue before that, yes.

So it is an issue for the university to consider how to reconcile open access.
ethos with safety and how they get a balance so people generally feel that in certain circumstances things like a swipe card would be efficient.

Is there anywhere on campus that you avoid at night?

Down by the railway arch, the bottom end of the long carpark is not very well lit and very creepy in the dark because it’s not a through ..., unless you’re going down there for your car there’s no real reason for you to be down there, I try to avoid it as much as possible.

And also umm the hill leading up to the crèche at night. We have to work until 9 pm and what we’ll do about 5 p.m. is we’ll move our cars so that we don’t have to ... We can avoid those areas.

So it’s taking positive responsibility for your own personal safety.

I was wondering how well people think they know the campus. How well do you think you know rest of campus? Are there areas on campus that you’ve never been, for example?

I’ve only worked here since September so I don’t know it very well.

I don’t know where the hill to the crèche is for example.

I would feel comfortable because of working at the back of J-Block I would be comfortable with my car being parked at the back of J-Block to go out in the night because it’s something that I am familiar with, I know where the doors would be to go back inside probably more easier access than you would so it’s people’s perceptions of it.

I work in B-Block and usually park down that end but on a Wednesday when I’m on my course until 9 o’clock I park up under the Refectory so when I come out at 9 o’clock the car is there rather than having to walk all the way through the campus and I’d rather walk down in the morning than walk down in the dark at night.

Is everyone aware of the Gatehouse policy of walking anyone to their car?

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

And does anyone work in Glyntaff?

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

Just another general question. What do you generally think about levels of security on this campus?

I wish there were more cameras around the back in J-Block area. The only reason I know there are no cameras there is because someone damaged a car of mine a fair while ago and I asked to see the security footage and apparently there are no cameras around that back area of the campus.

I think some cameras aren’t in use even though they are there.

Because when you ask they’ve never got footage of the area.

I think it would be nice to see someone visibly walking round and just keeping a general eye out perhaps would be better.

I think that would be a much higher impact. Yes, patrolling security guards with high profile clothing so everyone is aware of what their certain responsibility are. I think the thing with the security cameras is they are all fixed as well. I don’t think any or very few are able to scroll because I asked about whether cameras could move around and they said no.

There are a few on campus that are 360° but they’re in the minority at the moment.

What about security guards? What are your thoughts on an actual security patrol?
ID2 I would regard them as traffic wardens rather than security. It seems to be their main role.

ID9 We had the incident of someone actually kicking a door panel in to steal computers from a room and it was actually the porters that chased after. The security person was way behind. It actually took a porter to chase after him.

ID10 I know we've been having problems with local children coming into the Library and causing havoc on late nights and I just think that what you were saying about having somebody walking around might deter them a little bit. So yes, perhaps more visible security around might be helpful. Because even though you've got signs up saying no people not associated with university must come in or anything or something like that, I've seen skateboarders outside HLaSS and they are never challenged. So I think something visible ought to be done otherwise there's no deterrent and the sign is worthless then.

JW Just out of interest, how many of you have had any personal safety training? Just two of you.

ID11 Do you mean through the University?

ID3 It was a different employer.

JW OK, so only one of you. Is that something you would like to have when you join the University? Some kind of session raising awareness?

ID11 I did get an alarm from the Union a long, long time ago, something like that I would be happy to have. You know something quite general whenever you want to.

ID1 I think the H&S Officer has got a few. I got one from him during the Good Health at Work day and he said he had loads and help yourself sort of thing but maybe it just needs promoting or maybe they should have certain events.

JW How would you feel if it was mandatory as part of your induction?

ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to Health and Safety like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

ID1 The bad side of having some sort of personal safety thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

ID2 I think if it was given in a general manner though.

ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

ID6 Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good. Even if they give you just a brief do's and don'ts really.

ID2 As part of their "duty of care".

ID1 I think the H&S Officer has got a few. I got one from him during the Good Health at Work day and he said he had loads and help yourself sort of thing but maybe it just needs promoting or maybe they should have certain events.

JW How would you feel if it was mandatory as part of your induction?

ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to Health and Safety like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

ID1 The bad side of having some sort of personal safety thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

ID2 I think if it was given in a general manner though.

ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

ID6 Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good. Even if they give you just a brief do's and don'ts really.

ID2 As part of their "duty of care".

ID1 I think the H&S Officer has got a few. I got one from him during the Good Health at Work day and he said he had loads and help yourself sort of thing but maybe it just needs promoting or maybe they should have certain events.

JW How would you feel if it was mandatory as part of your induction?

ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to Health and Safety like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

ID1 The bad side of having some sort of personal safety thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

ID2 I think if it was given in a general manner though.

ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

ID6 Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good. Even if they give you just a brief do's and don'ts really.

ID2 As part of their "duty of care".

ID1 I think the H&S Officer has got a few. I got one from him during the Good Health at Work day and he said he had loads and help yourself sort of thing but maybe it just needs promoting or maybe they should have certain events.

JW How would you feel if it was mandatory as part of your induction?

ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to Health and Safety like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

ID1 The bad side of having some sort of personal safety thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

ID2 I think if it was given in a general manner though.

ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

ID6 Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good. Even if they give you just a brief do's and don'ts really.

ID2 As part of their "duty of care".

ID1 I think the H&S Officer has got a few. I got one from him during the Good Health at Work day and he said he had loads and help yourself sort of thing but maybe it just needs promoting or maybe they should have certain events.

JW How would you feel if it was mandatory as part of your induction?

ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to Health and Safety like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

ID1 The bad side of having some sort of personal safety thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

ID2 I think if it was given in a general manner though.

ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

ID6 Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good. Even if they give you just a brief do's and don'ts really.

ID2 As part of their "duty of care".

KM I wonder how many of you are aware of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust? (Around 5).

JW We work alongside them .........

JW One final question is what specific risks do you think you'd experience on campus, if any in terms of intentionally motivated harm.

ID5 Robbery, mugging.

ID2 Drunkenness from the Students' Union: not intentional perhaps.

ID5 At night-time I think what would be most obvious would be sexual, especially under car-park at top of ... there is a horrible pathway between buildings which has horrible bushes on either side - up towards Sports Centre, alongside shop.

JW Move on to 1st route. Go through quickly and then stop at specific nodes.
00.14.40 ROUTE 1 K-Block to Student car park at night-time.

JW So overall perceptions of that route? General thoughts.
00.18.50 ID2 Longest route you'd take.
KM Leap of imagination - amalgam of routes. Any particular parts of routes that would make you feel unsafe?
ID3 My first perception was that it was very dark walking around mini roundabout down sweep into car park
00.19.38 STILL 1 JW So general agreement it's the street lighting.
JW General agreement.
ID11 [Can't hear] You can see how bright it is there compared to background of car park.
ID1 One by crossing seems lighter. Seems lighter in comparison. More buildings and things.
ID5 And with lots of bushes too - lots of places for people to jump out at you.
ID9 I didn't realise that until I looked at that. You think they are nice and green and whatever. You don't realise how many things they shade,
ID6 And there's a little building there too.
ID3 It's that old toilet.
ID6 When I parked there I tended to run in with key in hand. Get in the car and lock the doors and then come out then.
ID2 And me.
ID6 But then you've got to wind down the window to put the swipe in and someone could grab your hand. There's a lot of issues there really.
JW So would many of you prefer not to use this carpark?
ID's 2, Yes
5,6&9 ID6 It's all right during the day and everything, it's just in the evening or when you get the dark nights.
ID10 Particularly if you are parked quite a long way down there. There is quite good lighting but when you are on your own the second part of the carpark is probably worse a bit further.
ID6 Up Llantwit Road,
ID9 The extra bit.
ID6 The overspill, that's probably worse STILL 2
00.21.24 ID5 The other bit is on the central avenue as you come out towards the Gatehouse there - you don't actually walk on the road do you. the path is underneath by the big bank and that's pretty scary. STILL 3 You've got all the trees on one side and the bank on the other. Drops down onto the steps under a little bridge. STILL 4
ID6 That's a bit hairy in the day that is. I don't like that in the day. I tend to run through it.
JW So you'd use that rather than the road?
ID2 I wouldn't at night on my own, no but during the day I would, yes.
00.22.08 JW So are these just issues when you are on your own?
ID6 I think it highlights it when you are on your own. When you're with others you're choping and just get on with what you need to do but I think when you are on your own it just heightens the fear. I think, that's all. That's quite a dark area there as well. STILL 5
ID10 Even when there's people around I don't like it.
ID6 That's a bit dark.
The thing about being on your own is that I feel a bit more vulnerable and I don't know if other people serve as a distraction or if I feel more confident and less of a target cos I'm with somebody.

Can you always get a signal on your mobile?

There are certain spots on campus when you can't black spots.

Do you know where they are?

I only know from trying to contact people. Around sort of cafeteria/refectory there is a very poor signal.

In this department too, such as being in the basement.

There's a problem in the tunnel still.

There's a few dark spots when you park up on campus. It's quite dark behind HLASS. It's quite dark behind there and by the Health Centre and under gallery.

Also behind Estates Dept where minibuses park.

Going down Forest Grove as well - when you get to the bottom of the hill it's fine but even when there's people in the buildings it's - that route down there - there's not that many people walking up and down there; in the dark anyway.

Still 7

Does proximity to the main road have any bearing on your sense of personal safety?

Yes, once you get to bottom of the hill if there's traffic there's not a problem and I suppose even if it was dark at rush hour I wouldn't mind that. But if it's quiet ......

It would just be nice to see somebody walking around up there purely because people from anywhere can walk in and they're never apprehended at all so you could be anybody - nobody knows who is actually on campus and who is not. I think that's quite a big issue. That anyone can walk in any out at will.

Isn't there a community policeman charged with walking the campus?

He is on my list to liaise with.

Just wondering if part of his remit is to walk through campus from time to time.

I've seen police walk through but I don't know if they're on their way to somewhere specific.

Probably going to Union for a pint!

Is there anything that you'd do to this route to make it safer?

More lighting

Some visible security person.

More cameras.

More security and cameras.

Maybe a couple of signs telling people 'if you do feel worried phone the Gatehouse'. If they are charged with a duty of walking you to your car, just half a dozen signs just equally spaced saying 'phone this number'.

That leads on to another possible solution - that's panic points - a little plaque or pole with a button on it that when struck connects you straight to security.

How would you feel about things like that?

You'd need to trust that security would respond first.

Yes, definitely and wouldn't be abused.

Yes, they've got similar things at train stations.

You don't want a cry wolf scenario when people just hit them for fun.

Students would do it just to wind everyone up.

Good idea but ......

I find students have a bit of a weird nature but that's just their way.

Cos anyone can come on campus; kids and stuff. They're bound to abuse it.
I wouldn't want that and find it just raises people's fear levels and to be honest I don't feel any of these safety concerns when I'm walking around and I'd be surprised if there was much evidence of people being mugged and attacked and robbed on campus so it worries me a bit that people have got this fear and wonder how helpful it is to raise people's fears really.

It's getting the balance right between education and awareness - that's what this is all about.

But it's the society we live in these days isn't it.

Some of the feelings are not just down to this - if I was anywhere in similar situations I would feel exactly the same.

It's a bit like people's fear of paedophiles, everyone thinks they are everywhere and they're not. I think it's over emphasised personally.

JW It's getting the balance right between education and awareness - that's what this is all about.

ID6 It's the society we live in these days isn't it.

ID5 Some of the feelings are not just down to this - if I was anywhere in similar situations I would feel exactly the same.

ID4 It's a bit like people's fear of paedophiles, everyone thinks they are everywhere and they're not. I think it's over emphasised personally.

JW So once again; overall impressions of that route?

ID2 I'd feel exposed there cos there's only offices there STILL 8 that close at 5-6 00.28.15. pm so if you have a late lecture there's no-one around there even though it looks well lit.

ID6 It's quite dark from the exit gates down

ID2 Yes by Brook Street.

ID6 But there's no-one there (by train station) at all.

ID1 Brook Street stands out particularly because I know there has been some problems there and that's a route I walk every day after dark so yes I'm already aware of that bit.

JW How many of you actually use this route to get the train? (Around 3).

ID9 I use the exact same route all the time. You know where the exit gate is, back around December time, the street lights were all out and the one on campus was out - it was extremely dark - not so much from someone attacking you point of view, but things like over stepping the kerbs and pavement were tricky. It wasn't scary, even by lanes there STILL 9.

ID1 Yes, you could be dragged in there.

ID9 I mean there's always people hanging about, the majority I assume are students so I don't feel threatened by them but it would be better if lights could be put back il it - even on campus. Looks like you have taken it when some of the lights are out cos it's extremely dark by there.

JW I remember that.

ID7 At the train station as well there's a little shelter. Where you can sit inside but apparently it shuts at about 5, half-past 5 so if you come out any later than that then you have to stand around on your own.

ID9 If you're going in to Cardiff you're OK cos you've got the push button thing but I catch the train going up the valley and that one, obviously under construction there STILL 10 but it's just totally open now; it's just a shelter.

ID1 I am just the opposite I think cos I feel I get the train to Cardiff on the other platform usually after shelter's closed so what I normally do is wait on North bound platform or in the well lit shelter which is open cos I feel like I can get away rather than sit in the closed shelter. Well it's normally locked but, when you do get there you feel that if someone came along causing trouble you'd be trapped. The other one I like cos it's very well lit and you can get out. The ticket office on the other side is quite imposing really - all boarded in.

ID9 The ticket office on the other side is quite imposing really - all boarded in.

ID3 There was an accident there - a train went past and the vacuum caused by the train going too fast pulled the whole ceiling down.

ID9 I think the campus is quite well lit in that area as well - behind the Learning Resource Centre (LRC). I never have cause for concern.

ID1 They are quite wide areas, with wide pavements.
Even though you are at the back of the LRC and technically no-one could come out and help if you needed assistance, I've never felt unsafe there. So does it make a difference when you can see quite far in front of you? Possibly, yes. When you first came on campus, how did you find your way around? I just walked. I had a tour and then I just found my own way really but I think it would be helpful if there were maps up - "you are here" notice boards. There are a few.

ID7 They've got one by the gate by HLaSS and they are multilingual as well.

ID3 There are four talking maps on campus.
ID4 I have seen that one, sorry.

KM When we filmed there were quite a few kids around shouting and we just watched them. Cos of camera they mooched.

ID1 I've had to phone the police from the station before because of kids causing trouble just moving about in the shelter. Then I felt vulnerable because I was supposed to be getting on the train but the Guard said 'oh no I can't stop it now actually' so I had to just stand on the platform which was horrid.

JW So did you use your mobile?

ID1 Yes, I phoned the local police.

KM I know it's off campus but there are panic buttons on all Valley Lines Stations that are patched in to CCTV so if you press the panic button I think they can see you.

ID9 Are they actually on the platforms themselves?

KM Yes. Information point same thing.

JW Quite subtle.

ID4 Is that the recording that tells you when the next train is coming?

KM I don't know.

ID1 On South-bound, bottom of stairs.

KM Knowing that does it make you feel safe?

ID9 Not if I'm standing on the wrong platform, no.

ID1 If they can see you straight away then I suppose maybe.

ID4 Issue of trust.

JW Do you think your perceptions would change the minute you left the campus?

ID For me it does.

JW Do you feel more protected when you are on the campus because it is University property.

ID's 9, 6, 4, 1

ID10 Generally speaking though in the community of Trefforest there is always quite a lot students around but yes, still feel safer on campus.

JW Is there any one thing that you'd do to make this route safer?

ID4 I think better lighting by that Brook Street gate STILL 11 because of that lane, it's a bit scary innit!

ID6 The lane should be lit really so you can see right down there.

ID4 That lane goes right down. I work in Student Services and my window faces onto that lane and I've got a really big window and I've often thought it's not very secure really because someone could get over the fence quite easily.

ID6 Is that gate ever locked?

ID4 Yes, it closes at 10 or 11 p.m.

ID1 It says it does but it doesn't always.

ID4 There's a sign saying it does.

ID10 I got locked out once. This was a while ago and it might be different now but they wouldn't let me in.
JW How would you feel if there were university security guards patrolling Brook Street?
ID4 I wouldn't like that really.
JW You wouldn't see any need for it or....?
ID5 Well I think the university should be part of the community and if you've got a security guard you're not giving the right message really.
ID4 But then if you've got them patrolling on campus why not have them just off campus as well if it's part of the community.
ID1 What about having one just inside the gate there cos they would just be within earshot.
JW Before we move on to next one, we've been just thinking about the physical environment. What about the social environment; how do social dynamics affect personal safety - if there's lots of people around or?
ID6 I think it's highlighted if you're on your own. If you're in a group you just go with the flow. When you are on your own your self preservation kicks in and you start to think about things that aren't there, like shadows - it just heightens your awareness really.
ID7 But I think even when you are on your own even if there is a lot of people around, even if you don't know them you are likely to feel more safe than if you are the only person walking down the road.
ID6 Yes, that's right.
ID2 It depends on how many people are around. Like if it's a small group of boys. It depends who they were as well.
ID10 I think during vacation I don't tend to work late cos everyone disappears, there's nobody around, particularly at night when it gets darker.
JW It completely changes the atmosphere on campus?

ROUTE 3 Glyntaff - Night Time

(Two participants work there and one now and again).

JW For this route it might be useful to get responses first from those that use the Glyntaff route and then those that don't. So how do you feel about it (ones who use it)?
ID2 I feel those steps; I know it's a new building; I felt you were very exposed on those steps there STILL 12 and then having to walk through that (arch) and that was during the day. There are very steep steps.
ID10 That really big carpark is horrible even in the daylight. At night it's very dark. I've only had to park there once but it was winter and dark at 5 pm. It was a Friday and everyone finished early so we finished later and it's not very nice.
JW So even though it's an open space where you can see a distance....
ID10 Even though you still can't really see.
KM Do you know what's behind the carpark?
ID10 I've never been that far!
KM Just the issue of boundaries.
ID11 I'd never park there.
ID4 I went there once and the carpark was full and I had to go and park over by the cemetery and it was light actually but it wouldn't have been very nice if it was dark.
ID10 I'm fine with Glyntaff but it does seem to empty out quicker than Trefforest does. It does get very, very quiet, very, very quickly.
ID2 Because there's only teaching over there. There's no Students' Union or anything like that so there's no need for people to stay there. They tend to come across here.

KM So what about people who don't work in Glyntaff?

00.51.57

ID7 I've been to Glyntaff a couple of times but I would feel a lot less safe doing that whole route cos I don't know it. When you were taking us through it, it looked like there were alleys all over the place and steps and cos I don't know ... Whereas on this campus I know where the corridors are - that whole route to me looked a lot less safe.

ID3 The main problem and it's not the fault of Kevin or Jo, is that it was under refurbishment so that top plateau was handed over to the contractor. Lots of fence due to redevelopment - contractor's portacabins. Just a temporary measure. Site will actually open up again.

ID2 Yes, but people still have to work there and experience that kind of situation.

ID9 You mention portacabins are going - contractor's or site's?

ID3 Both.

00.53.13

ID5 You said there was an alleyway by the tram sheds - I wouldn't want to go down there.

ID2 No, nor me.

KM Converted tram sheds.

ID5 Yes, I wouldn't want to go down there. STILL 13 It's quite well lit but it's still ... phew, no ....

00.53.30

KM I don't even know what's down there.

ID3 Two fire exits! What he was going there I don't know.

ID2 Up to no good.

ID3 Does everyone know Caxtons run security on Glyntaff and they have a presence on site from 6 am to 11 pm.

ID11 I worked late last term until 7 pm and that's two female staff on their own and the only time I saw them was then they came around to lock up. You don't see them walking around at all.

ID2 How do they manage wheelchair access with those steps?

ID3 Good question.

JW So the people who don't use this campus that often, would you say you had a heightened sense of awareness?

ID5 Definitely, judging by those picture.

JW What kind of personal measures, if any, would you take to improve your personal safety?

ID5 With someone else, don't go by yourself.

ID11 Don't park car behind LRC. STILL 14

ID10 The only place I really feel safe is right opposite the entrance.

ID3 Do you have to tell them you are working late?

ID11 No, it can change every week. You generally find it could be two of you. They, they come along about ¼ hour before you close to make sure everyone has left.

ID11 Really there should be someone that's based in there all the time.

ID2 Because you are really exposed.

00.57.25

ID11 And it is very quiet over there cos unless there is a lecture on there is no ....

KM I wonder if you think that quietness is always worse than .... do you ever think.. it is worse over there because you are so isolated.

ID11 Sometimes, maybe. If it is quiet you know everyone who is around and someone who shouldn't be there really stands out. Mmm.

ID3 It's very odd when you come in to the University. Sometimes I come in at weekends if I've got people working here and the oddest feeling sometimes
Is when you walk along B-Block corridor, along where the old ***** used to be. It's a long corridor and you sometimes hear just the old heating system go 'clunk' and it's a very odd feeling being in this place when there is nobody here. You don't realise how big it is and how noisy it is. What's really odd is when the students go away if you're walking along just during the middle of the day that noise of chatter isn't there. It's a very odd feeling. It's very odd. I can't say I feel nervous or frightened because I don't but you do suddenly become aware of noises and a perception of space and sound.

Yes, I'm aware of the fact that if you work here past 5 o'clock and my office is sort of out on a limb so to get anyone to **** you? You'd have to go around to the main reception and even if I want to go to the loo I've got to come out of my locked area, go to the loo and go back into my locked area and I feel exposed then because I think anyone could come along that corridor, nobody could hear anything at all cos it's out on a limb and you do feel exposed then and that's when it's quiet and you are listening ... even when you're in the loo you are listening, anyone can walk into the loo cos the loo is not locked and the main loo area is not locked so because it is not inside your office environment where you do feel safe if it's locked.

Do you think that there should be access controls to the main entrances? I don't know if it would be feasible. We've got access pads on all ours but then we're in Prospect House down by the railway station anyway - the first building - and we've got pads on four doors, five doors sorry but I think they're only used when Caxton's lock up at night. I think if you stay late anybody could still walk in, you know we've got chiropractic students downstairs and their lecturer and then we're upstairs but they are not locked unless we are all out or it's when they lock up in the night so anybody could walk in there I suppose and we are out on a bit of a limb there as well so the pads are there but they aren't used.

If you had any perceptions of being in a room with lots of valuable equipment, does that make you feel more or less safe? We did have an incident in the media reception last term when somebody opened one of the doors, ran in and grabbed an LCD projector and legged it. Now it was lunchtime, it was a very busy time so the lady who was in there at the time she went after him but it would have been a completely different story if it had been 7 o'clock at night and only the staff on. So yes it does cross your mind a little bit when things like that happen but we've had other incidents like that but then most rooms in the University have got something valuable in them. You've got to be careful about pursuing people as well haven't you, sometimes it's just best to let them .... Just ring whoever you need to ring and tell them about it because otherwise you could end up getting injured anyway you know.

Before Christmas they collared someone who had tried to steal ... A-Block and they trapped him in a room and he jumped from the second storey window to escape.

There was a car there waiting for him and off he went. I suppose that's the problem in a place like this 18,000 students, 1,200 staff. You don't even know who half the staff are and .... Perhaps the staff should have some sort of security ID. We do in Estates. Well we haven't. Even staff don't know other staff. Which would be quite good like E-Colleges wear them so you just need a tag.

You see someone walking around with a laptop and you don't know if it's his or hers or if it's been stolen.

Just need a staff card with a picture and an ID number on it that's it.

So you think that's a good idea?

I think so.

Yes.
We had a problem in the LRC cos I used to work in the LRC.

There was a problem - we used to have name tags and one member of staff was being harassed and of course, they know your name so there's that element as well. Perhaps just an ID number would be OK.

Just to say you're staff and a picture you know and either on a chain or attached somewhere.

At Bristol University you've got those sort of cards that operate all those swipe cards open doors, bike sheds...

I think it's a good idea cos I wouldn't know unless its people I deal with on a regular basis then I wouldn't know who was staff and who wasn't.

Unfortunately it all comes down to cost doesn't it really. Swipe card - I think it's £200 to put one swipe card on per door - how many doors in this university? You know, this block alone we looked at it last year just for disabled access - trying to price up door entry for disabled people - it came to half a million pounds so where do you .... do you just put it on main entrances? In Fforest Hall we put them as you go up the main stairwell but obviously there's door entry systems off each floor and they sort of time different things to open between 8.30 a.m. and 5 o'clock and then you sort of have to update everyone to the system. I suppose it's a question of going back to theft - do you stop the sort of joy theft; someone who sort of walks around and there's a chance - maybe you can stop those but if there's a professional gang who probably come on to this campus: know certain people's movements, then - its difficult I suppose we have to write in the cost of say half a dozen laptops being nicked every year.

Cos it's cheaper!

And as you said - do you chase after them? If you're a 6'1" hairy bloke you might have a chance but if you are a 5'1" little girl maybe you might not have a chance. You know it's not being sexist it's just being sensible - and what do you do when you get there?

I don't think I would chase anybody. I'd just highlight it and report it cos you could get really hurt.

Oh yeah - it's also a question as you said of not just Uni stuff being stolen but personal stuff like handbags or kit bags and things.

But if you limit too much access as well like last year I had to visit a tutor after 5 o'clock in H-Block but the door closes at 5 o'clock so if you haven't got a card to get in you can't have access to the building to get to your lecture. There's no telephone there to be able to ring him to say "well you know I'm downstairs, can you let me in?". So you're just stuck outside thinking well how do I manage? Do you just wait for someone else to come down and open the door or do you go? You know, so it's restricting access in that instance so you have to be very careful how you balance it.

But I think a basic ID card would be a good idea just basically so you could know if it's staff so not necessarily the swipe card.

Just a plain thing.

That's what we have in Estates - one of those (shows card).

And with these then they should be worn so that everybody knows. You've got to wear it.

It's no good keeping it in your pocket.

We've had those for about two years and I've never been asked for it, nobody's asked me.

How about contractors that come on site, do they have to have ..... Yes. We try and make sure they sign in and try to make sure they wear their company logo. If you know they are from Cowlin Construction, they wear Cowlin clothes or something, um the problem is there's not just the main
contractor but various subcontractors as well. The more rules you impose - they'll say they have to go out and buy 50 sweatshirts so they'll say "you pay for it". It's a balance.

ID6 It would help students as well cos they could approach people they know who are staff and it's just easier. Cos you have mature students who are on site as well so you don't necessarily know who's who. So that would be quite good for both sides.

ID1 Would it be obligatory for students to wear their ID as well though or just carry their ID?

ID6 They should always have it on them shouldn't they?

ID5 They don't though do they?

ID6 No they don't. Half of them lose it.

ID3 Then it's the argument that it's an infringement on their civil rights. It's difficult. Saying that we did a conversion job of halls of residence last year for disabled people to make it easier for access. We put swipe locks on instead of people in wheelchairs having to operate key systems. People complained cos someone said "do these record who comes in and out?" "Yes" "We don't want it cos you can check up on me - I'm saying "no, it's not for recording purposes it's for your own personal safety" so I bet you could check up if I came in at 2 am". I said "It doesn't matter if you come in at 2 o'clock at night" - you know it's that kind of question in their minds, umm, are you infringing on their rights? Are you big brother checking up or not? Eventually they did accept that it was for the benefit of the greater community rather than as a check on individual people.

JW So it's getting a balance?

ID6 And apart from that I go to Ystrad College and I've got an ID card and students have got to wear them irrelevant of whether they're full-time or part-time you've got to put your ID on somewhere so that they can identify you so that they haven't got strangers walking around the place and you do get stopped if you haven't got it on or if they don't know you or they're not familiar with you - they will actually stop you and say "Where's your card?" or whatever. I think it does work sometimes. I know this campus is a lot bigger.

JW Well it's certainly something for the Uni to consider in terms of possible solutions. Would you say that this route in Glyntaff is the one that generates most concerns for you?

ID6 I don't like it at all. I wouldn't fancy walking down there.

ID5 No.

JW Would you be happy there in the daytime?

ID11 Yes. It's either very, very busy over there or completely quiet, even during the day. There's a lot of little tunnels and nooks and crannies. It's a very strange site.

ID2 Even though it's term time they're out in the hospitals. Because nurses spend a lot of time on site but ...

ID11 I suppose at least in the day time we can deal with people parking on site because they are either students or staff cos you've got to have a swipe card to get out or you've got to pay to get out. You're not likely to come in as just somebody off the street without thinking "Oh, I'm not going to be able to get out of there then" so I suppose there's that - you're not likely to have people over there who shouldn't be there cos of where it is cos Trefforest campus is obviously in the middle of Trefforest you're more than likely to get people from there that shouldn't be there.

JW OK if we move on to the next night-time route.

JW Light refreshments should be arriving about 3.30 p.m., which I'm sure you're all desperate for so that should tie in with when we finish this route.
01.11.24 Gatehouse outside H-Block.
ID2 It's quite dark up by GBC. 
ID6 There they are! When nobody's about! (Security Guards).
01.12.23 Was there a lorry coming or something - ha, ha?
KM The only reason they are there is because it's the VCs leaving do.
ID4 When the cleaners were protesting.
ID5 And they never smile. They are so miserable you wouldn't want to approach them anyway I don't think.
ID4 Ooh they were lovely to me when I couldn't start my car. They were... fantastic.
ID2 Yes they're very helpful actually.
ID4 That's dark isn't it? STILL 15
KM The step up.
01.13.16 ID6 It's a bit dark down to the old railway tunnel as well isn't it?
01.14.16 JW So what are your first perceptions of that route?
ID2 The steps going up the side of the GBC - I mean that is the main route I would say the students use to walk up to the Halls of Residence. I mean that is quite creepy. I'd do it quite happily in the day, you know I wouldn't think anything of it, but I don't think I'd like to do it at night.
JW Is that because it's enclosed or lighting?
ID2 Well because you've got the bushes and it's quite dark.
ID5 Yes.
ID10 I always feel because it's quite a dark and narrow area there being close to the refectory I always feel fairly safe cos there's always people around any of the refectories if they are open so I mean when I first saw that it struck me as being dark and narrow but from my own experience of walking around that area I don't ever feel too bad around there.
ID3 The thing is if you were walking from the gatehouse to H-block I wouldn't use that route.
ID2 No.
ID3 I'd go along the main avenue.
ID2 Yes, I would.
ID3 The first shot you took there was a path going off to the right - I'd walk along there and then the front of G-Block to H-Block. That's a far better route.
ID2 Yes.
ID6 And it's flat.
KM That's one of the problems of amalgamating the routes.
ID3 Yes, exactly.
3&2 ID3 I'd go that way if I was going for a Kit-Kat or something.
ID2 Exactly.
JW What we wanted to do in these focus groups is show you as much of the campus as possible - parts that you might use.
ID2 Yes, I do use all of it. It is a different perception in the day to the night. The only thing you haven't shown is right across from the main entrance is behind Fforest Grove - the lane - because I'm doing a course 2 until 9 so people coming on the course at 2 o'clock park in the student carpark because there isn't any room and they have to park up there so - and a couple of them are women so when we come out at 9 pm their car is all the way up there so they've got to walk that route on their own so I usually give them a lift across. It is quite dark so that's I think another area that needs looking at.
JW That's the lane?
ID3 Directly opposite the main entrance.
01.16.00 ID2 Yes, the other side then. If you go up to your car rather than to the station. Yes, straight across there. It's not well lit at all.
That's made me think of other modes of transport as well. People coming in by bus. Does anyone come in by bus?

Sometimes. It drops me off at the roundabout and I know that going home I live down that way, waiting at the bus stop in winter in the dark I feel exposed particularly because there's just fencing and bushes behind you. I mean generally, as I've said before, there's always people around but if I work particularly late or ....

I think it's worse if people are watching you as you say you know, you're not doing a regular commute that gives you a little bit more vulnerability doesn't it.

Do you feel differently on this side of the campus because you're away from the bulk of the academic and support departments STILL 16 (By SU).

I feel closer to students really.

Is that a good thing?

Because you've got the students' shop.

And the Union and Leisure Centre.

So this would be characterised as the student part of the campus?

Yes, I mean I use the health centre sometimes a little bit later but there's always - and often my car is parked just below there but I always feel, even though it's dark, I always feel safe because there's, there's the union. There's always people around the union and inside the union. It's really only students.

And the fact that the union's open until 11-12, is that positive?

Yes. They are quite low though there as well STILL 17 it's not as if you wouldn't be able to see someone there cos they are quite low. Then it's open there to the main carpark area.

We'll do a survey now!

I'd say that's one of the safest spots at night. STILL 18

Estates carpark or visitors carpark being unsafe. That first bit is OK but then it goes around the corner, around the back and there's only probably a dozen spaces so I don't go there but I know that it is dark and there's trees on one side and it's just dark.

The thing at night outside the union - there are security guards there and I suppose if someone did shout then they would possibly come running - I don't know.

Generally speaking though, in all of them, from what you were saying normally you would take another route and out of all of the routes really there's always an alternative. You know if you feel unsafe you know there's another way of getting there - where you want to be.

Is that something that everyone agrees with? You'd try and go another way if you felt unsafe?

Yes

I never put myself at risk if I can help it. There's occasions when you have to but I always look at the alternatives. Not just here but in my daily life.

I never think about it.
If I know I'm working a late night then I always consider where I'm going to park my car and if I have to I'll move it.

I think what xxxx just said - you just don't think about it - but then the thing is - it's on levels - you say you consider where you park your car but that's one small thought but you don't think about it then it's fine.

Yes, I don't usually work late at night.
And it's different working at night here and it is quite different to working between half past 8 and five. To be working from 5 until 9 there's not many people about at all so you do have to think about it.

But generally speaking I never - I can't say I've ever felt threatened on the campus even working until that late and I think that's probably cos students are around - there's a lot of night owls out there.

This route then - there's not many improvements you would suggest?
That it's a bit dark there.
Is it reasonably well lit do you think?
No, that needs a bit more lighting there (by shop).
There is a light there isn't there? A light on?
But the undergrowth is generally cut back and quite low and the lighting's OK although it could be better I suppose. And all that grass, it's quite open.
That hedge is usually cut back a week before graduation.
Yes.
I suppose what you could put there are bollard lights or something - a small white light on top. Four or five across there. They'll stop you falling off the kerb and breaking your ankle!
It's not too bad though is it?
During the day time this is a busy area (outside H-Block). Do you think it changes much at night time - this particular area?
It's always bright, it's well lit isn't it?
And it's open - it's quite a big space.
Yes.
But then your favourite carpark there - you can't park there.

From there down to the arch.
It's actually a tunnel.
Yes, it is yes. It's not eerie but it is quite quiet when you come out at 9 o'clock (under Refectory/H-Block) because that's where I park by there cos I park there in the morning to walk down to B-Block to walk back up so I can just get into my car to go home at 9. I work in B-Block but I park by there the night I'm here until 9 cos I know rather than walk down through the campus.

And it's better to walk the distance in the day than a short distance at night.
It's funny how you perceive the danger in the night whereas you don't necessarily perceive it in the day.

So that's your personal safety strategy?
Yes, exactly.
What about things like the weather - does that have a bearing on your sense of personal safety?
Yes - I hate getting wet so I go the shortest possible route.
My perception of the campus changes in October when the hour goes back.
You work in Estates, look out and it's 6 o'clock and it's still light and all of a sudden it's 5 o'clock and it's dark. And it happens overnight.
It's not gradual - it's just like that (clicks fingers). And the campus does look different when it's dark.

because I come out of the back of B-Block which is by the main hall up by the steps to the carpark there and that's a light that goes on and off as you go down - A sensor light that doesn't always work. So sometimes you can be
walking up the steps and it's quite dark and then other times it can be lit because - but I think they are going to replace it with a permanent light.

ID3 It's a balance of lights on campus - umm do they come on on a time basis or are they photo sol which means that as it gets darker they get brighter - it's a balance between umm it's this (makes money sign with hands) which dictates it unfortunately. Which gives you best value for money?

ID2 Money, yes.

ID3 It's maintenance ..... you see.

JW Well I think we should stop for a break. I don't know where our refreshments are. So if you all want to come back in 15 minutes.

END
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Appendix 32

Sample focus group transcript – Staff at Loughborough
Staff at Loughborough university - Glamorgan VRs – April 24th 2005

JW  We'll show you the first route
KM  Night-time?
JW  Yes, night-time

ROUTE 1
ID5  Wow that's a bit fast
JW  This was filmed in December
KM  Round about 8 o clock, 7, 8 o clock at night. As you can probably tell the
00:05:05 University of Glamorgan is on a hillside, on a valley; that's the rest of the
 valley. There's you go; that's that
JW  So that's the route all together – first impressions?
ID2  Sorry *** sort of walked from there to there – the car park and back through that
 kind of bit up there?
JW  Yes, it's like a circular route
ID2  Right
JW  It's really your first impressions of that route in terms of your personal safety.
 Consider whether you'd feel safe there or not.
ID3  It's quite well lit so I'd feel quite safe in that respect umm I'd probably feel
00:09:14 safer in a group umm because obviously it just looked really quiet so I think if
 I was on my own I'd be a bit ... ID1  If there were more people about ...
ID5  There's some dense shrubbery
ID2  Yes
ID3  Yes
ID3  I suppose it's somewhere for people to hide
ID6  Are the light levels that we've seen there umm typical of the reality?
JW  Umm
ID6  It seems extremely bright – looking at the glare from some of the lighting I'm
 just wondering if that was or something to do with how you've taken the photos
KM  There is an element of that – you obviously get some distortion but relatively
00:10:06 for example the relative light levels are fairly accurate in terms of the
 difference between say this part of the campus and this part – the relative
 difference is pretty accurate
ID6  Well it struck me that there were certain places that were very bright – wide
 open spaces where most people would feel reasonably comfortable; I'd
certainly feel quite comfortable and at other parts during the route umm you've
00:10:52 got dark areas, you've got shrubbery which at times is very close to the path,
 quite high and I think they often there's this battle between the
 concept of personal safety and the work of the estates department making
 everything seem pleasant – it can be quite pleasant during the day but at night
 time there's a concept of risk maybe in that certain area – is it dangerous in
 itself? And I think the perception will vary – I feel I am the token male here
today – but my perceptions of personal safety might be very different to a
 female student's and staff purely on a gender basis.
KM  I wonder how severe or how real the danger people think the idea of people
 jumping out of bushes is?
ID2  Quite real!
ID3  Yes
KM  Do you think very differently about that?
ID5  Especially where – there was a bit where the bushes were right on the edge
00:11:38 there, where you've got a wall through and it's sort of enclosed spaces where
 like an alleyway umm where you'd feel vulnerable perhaps
KM Down there?
ID5 I think it might have been
KM The steps down?
ID5 Yes because that's fairly dim isn't it
ID2 But the car parks are quite open and - apart from there
ID6 Yes they are close to the other one
ID5 But sort of the feeling of somebody could be there, especially, you know, like
ID6 It's probably the perception of umm the problem rather than the reality of it,
ID2 Yes
ID6 I wouldn't have any problem whatsoever - if people don't feel comfortable
ID5 00:12:21 than that's a concern isn't it?
JW That's what this study is all about
ID2 Sorry, I was just going to say, I do feel generally safer on university campuses
ID6 00:12:34 more secure- that there is security there even if there isn't always a 24 hour
ID2 porter. I feel if that was an ordinary car park in town then I might be a bit more
ID6 I wouldn't have any problem whatsoever - if people don't feel comfortable
ID2 nervous than on campus
ID6 I think it would vary from the environment that the campus was situated in -
ID4 But it's about having choice as well - I mean if you want to walk across a car
ID6 00:14:04 park you can walk across the middle - you don't have to walk along the side
ID4 where there is a path but it's next to a hedge. I think there are a
ID6 some places where there wasn't much choice - you had a wall and a hedge
ID4 and even walking in the middle of that you could still be grabbed at from out of a
ID6 and I think it was very well lit and looked very safe but just in a couple of places that I would perhaps choose not to go
ID4 hedge so there were a few but generally I thought it was very well lit and looked
ID6 along at night.
JW Ok, just out of interest - how many of you have been to Glamorgan?
ID1 Yes
JW Just ID1 then? So you might have a different perception then, having been
ID1 there.
JW You've got a bit more familiarity with the environment. What would you do in
ID1 00:14:10 advance, to plan ahead, if you were going to a different campus to make
JW yourself safer?
ID1 I would look at the maps to make sure I know exactly which buildings I needed
ID2 00:14:10 to go to, how to get from one place to another so I wasn't just wondering
JW around getting lost and things like that.
ID2 And where to park so I'd be nearest to where I needed to be
JW Does everyone tend to do that?
ID5 Yes.
ID6 Yes, I think I tend to take into account where it is - before I go somewhere like
ID5 Manchester, you know, what steps I might take would be quite different than if I
ID6 00:14:59 was going to Leicester University or Nottingham Trent - the difference - you
ID1 know my perception of personal safety might vary tremendously and I don't
JW know enough about where Glamorgan University is situated to be honest err but
ID6 it looks fairly rural.
ID6 And I guess it's not dissimilar to see this place, you know on the edge of a
JW conurbation and so on that basis I probably wouldn't do a great deal other
ID6 than make sure I know where I'm going to and where I can park my car - and
ID6 00:15:39 umm obviously going somewhere and arriving in the middle of
ID6 the day is a lot different to arriving at 8 o clock at night.
ID2 I wouldn't be that... if I was going during the day I wouldn't be that worried but I'd take, I'd be more precautious about finding where I was going if I was going in the night definitely.

JW Ok so there's a few things that you've raised there – the issue of night time, vegetation, you've mentioned there aren't many peopleumm

ID6 I didn't like the umm – there was a container right at the first umm - images that we saw and err

ID2 That looks quite dark STILL 4 00:15:46

ID6 Yeah that there

ALL Yes

ID6 You don't know what's behind that in any direction and umm it's typical of

00:16:02 what happens in universities – you just STILL 5 plonk a container exactly where you don't want it and you know if that would be a concern to walk by that.

ID2 There was an off-license as well – I might be a bit wary around there. ha ha

JW Now I deliberately didn't name the buildings when we walked you through that route and I'm just wondering if that uncertainty in your minds about what the buildings were had any bearing on your personal safety because you didn't know whether they were academic blocks there or Students' Union and so on

ID1 I know what they were!

ID3 I think some of them had lights in which made me think there'd be people

00:16:51 around because that made me feel a bit safer just seeing you know other people could be quite close by sort of thing but yeah not I don't really think about what sort of buildings but I suppose if they were in complete darkness and there was nobody around it might seem like more of a threat to me

KM I'm just thinking so what kind of cues do you use to kind of guess what a particular kind of building..

ID4 What a particular kind of?

KM Building on campus is – facility buildings or academic?

ID6 I think signs helps.

ID5 The number of windows.

ID2 Yeah.

ID6 That's right – yeah windows, signage, umm for anything like this the one thing we don't do is indicate what happens in the buildings.

00:17:40 *********************** I didn't notice any CCTV around.

JW There is...

KM There is some...

ID5 But it wasn't very obvious – I didn't notice any. In the car park it was just the lighting that you noticed

KM I don't believe there's any particular reference made to it on the signs – obviously not a problem

ID6 No signs, I didn't notice any cameras

JW There is a camera on the building here (G-Block) - a 360°, digital one

KM It's a bit higher.

ID6 Oh there it is, yes.

ID2 That makes me feel a bit safer but not massively because they....

00:18:25

ID3 Get switched off.

ID2 Yeah, is it switched on, is there any camera in it, is anyone looking?

ID1 Going back to the vegetation thing – and CCTV – before I actually had my bag snatched at Nottingham university campus and there was CCTV but they'd let the trees grow too tall so they couldn't see anything.

JW So there is a bit of cynicism towards CCTV and its' effectiveness?

ID2 Yeah.

ID1 Yes.

JW But you mentioned that you did look out for cameras?

ID2 Yeah I did kind of look in car parks and things – I think I'm aware and it

00:19:00 makes me feel a little bit better but I do look out for them.
KM Do you try and relate yourself to where — get a picture in your mind of where the cameras might be and kind of what’s covered and what’s not?

ID5 Well yes ***** feeling safe.

KM There’s an interesting thing in Australia apparently where they mark on stations what’s covered by the CCTV

ID1 How would you feel about that — if you were in or outside the CCTV?

ID6 Standing well within

ID2 Can I ask as well — there were two men right at the beginning in uniforms — who were they and what would they have been?

JW They were security

ID6 Are they?

JW But they were there for a reason

KM They were there because the VC of the university was leaving and that is the refectory so his dinner was in there so

ALL Oh right

ID6 As an outsider the uniforms don’t scream security STILL 6 00:20:04

ID3 No

ID5 I thought they might have something to do with the container

ID6 I thought they might have something to do with the container as well. I mean obviously if you were related to the university you’d know what your security

00:19:00 looks like what — but umm a visible patrolling presence be it on foot or in a vehicle, marked quite clearly as security is — there’s a feel good factor about that

ID5 On the back of the uniform they could have ‘security’ or something

ID6 Yes I mean they have some writing on the front?

KM He’s got Q-Park written on the front which is

ID6 It has, hasn’t it?

KM That’s the contractor

ID6 Oh right

KM They are primarily a parking management company

ID6 Right

ID1 But also it would be quite umm interesting to know like whether it’s an open access campus and whether anyone can get on or whether it’s likely to be just students

KM Well we’ll see more detail of the campus ...

ID6 You’re doing a good job actually because *************

ALL Ha ha

ID6 It’s a bit labour intensive

KM Yes

JW So just to sum up quickly, a security presence, an obvious security presence

00:21:12 with security written on the back of the jackets

ID6 I think I’d be reassured

ID2 Yes

JW Because we’ve noticed since we’ve been on this campus that you’ve got a strong security presence; you know you’ve got vans that go round — do you think that’s positive?

ID3 Yes

ID4 Yes

ID5 I think especially at night-time you’d feel more secure

ID3 Because you do see them going round patrolling don’t you at night

ID6 You know my background I presume — I’m the security manager

ALL Oh right!

ID6 For what it’s worth I came here three years ago and the security staff had

00:21:53 plain, unmarked vehicles and I had them marked and a number of people have said it’s the best thing done; purely from the fact that it makes them visible and you know you can wave one down if you’ve got a problem and they can be
seen which is again – it’s alright having a security presence but it needs to be seen and it needs to be balanced as well because you don’t want it to be like a prison.

JW Right, let’s move on to the next route – this is a day-time route.

00:22:36 ROUTE 2

KM Beginning from; we won’t tell you any of the buildings or where you are; see if you can pick up any cues that will tell you. That’s that one – quite short.

JW So first thoughts on that route?

ID1 I think that car park felt quite safe – it had the barriers and also the vegetation around the car park was quite sort of low and while it still looked nice so that’s better.

ID2 The fact that it’s day time is a big factor for me – I just feel safer in the day anyway so.

JW Is that the over-riding influence?

ID2 Yeah probably well err not always. I mean I guess there’s some places where I’d feel more nervous than others but if I was maybe if I was in a town and I kind of got waylaid down a street that I felt was very deserted that I’d feel nervous then but I think sort of round the campus generally in the daytime when there’s people around then I’d immediately feel safer in the daytime.

IN Is this on the edge of the campus this?

JW Yes – it’s the main vehicle entrance.

KM This road is the main entrance.

ID1 I think I’d feel less safe as you sort of come off the campus.

JW Right.

ID2 Yeah that wall that – the wall seems a bit strange to me still I don’t know why because there’s like an alleyway that goes down.

JW Yes.

ID2 Yeah I might not feel very safe going down there still I might think twice about whether I needed to go down there or not.

KM But that’s outside the campus so cars could slow down and grab your bag and zoom off. I suppose to being on campus and not being able to go very much faster.

JW This side of the campus is open as well – we’ll come to the other side after but there’s many ways to get on the campus this side then.

IN But there’s no barrier at that entrance?

JW There’s security further up where there’s a barrier.

KM That’s the security – the main gatehouse for the security.

ID5 Security barrier.

KM And that’s a security car entrance.

ID4 But there’s no barrier across the road – nothing to stop people.

KM The barrier is ...

ID4 Oh there is a barrier. Oh I see.

KM This car park is actually the visitors’ car park so it’s so any visitors can park in there.

ID6 The design of the campus roads is very good; they are sort of very wide compared to ours. Wide pavements, broad open vista to the side from a personal safety point of view is very positive. And low as well. It looks very pleasant and you can actually see through it.

ID3 It’s almost like a bit of a contrast because the campus buildings look quite pleasant but then you come to the other side of the road and it kind of looks...
very different and possibly if I was walking along the road I'd probably stick to the campus side a bit more to feel a bit safer I think.

JW  Down the main road?

ID3  Yes

KM  Also, an interesting aspect of ours – the majority of those buildings are actually university buildings anyway. There's various academic departments or units so...

(Fforest Grove)

ID1  I think it'd just maybe feel safer rightly or wrongly on campus because you feel more like – who – maybe who is on campus is controlled slightly more but in reality that might not be the case in the reality but that's what you'd think and then going off campus to where there could be absolutely anyone

KM  So I'm interested as to how you'd pick up the cues from being off campus and on campus – what are the things that tell you whether you are on or off campus?

ID1  I think it's just because they look like residential buildings; they looked like residential buildings they looked like; it felt like a residential area

ID2  Yeah because my first university wasn't a campus university, it was a town university so the buildings did look like university buildings but I think those are the cues I guess that if the building has got lots of labels on then or maybe just the landscape is kept quite neat and it's a university property or if it's not so you know if it's residential everyone has their own tastes and what they do – so little cues like that – obviously that's very landscaped and the campus is all very controlled.

JW  Any other thoughts on that route?

KM  One thing about the end of it was the bus stop – we talked about people arriving on campus in cars but

ID1  I didn't notice a bus stop

ID2  Nor me

ID3  Neither did I

KM  Because we're also thinking about other modes of transport and how you'd feel about other ways of getting to the university – you'll see the train station, pedestrian routes in

ID2  It's good if it's clearly marked – when I've....

ID1  * * * * * * * * * *

ID2  Yeah because sometimes I've got buses to other universities and if it's not clear where to get off that's quite worrying because you don't want to get off at the wrong place and end up where you can't get onto campus easily and you going to be kind of wondering around

KM  The bus stop is there

ID2  Yeah so that – I wouldn't really know to get off there – if I realised it's the right stop and

ID1  Need a big sign as well

ID2  It was a bit like that when I went to Uxbridge I think it was like that – it was just an ordinary road and you couldn't really tell – you could kind of guess that the university was coming up but it wasn't clear. I guess there you could see

KM  There is a university sign there

ID2  Yeah so you can see it when you come up – it's just like an ordinary road. And also is that a map? That makes me feel better – there was a map in the previous shot and if there's a map when you arrive on the bus it's great to have a map there straight away, so you can go right I know where I'm going you don't have to kind of wonder around every place looking kind of for a cue where to go.

JW  Again that's something that we've noticed on this campus is there's a lot of maps

ID1  That's quite new isn't it?

ID2  Yeah I was going to say

ID6  If you'd come 12 months ago you wouldn't have found any
JW So are maps quite important then?

ID2 Yes and a bus timetable so you know when you can get back, get a bus back 00:33:25 without having to be standing around and

ID1 It's quite good here on bus stops that tell you when, how long the next bus is going to be before it arrives

ID2 Yeah that's quite good as long as they are working!

KM But another thing is — talking about a different campus or different locations umm — we asked yesterday whether people would do some research before hand to try and perhaps download maps from the website, whether that's the kind of thing you'd do?

ID3 Yes

ID2 Yes

ID6 Usually you'd go to the university's website you'd usually find you can print it off

ID2 Yeah

KM Would you perhaps do that before you go?

ID4 Yes

ID2 Yes

ID1 Yes

ID2 And I use the travel websites as well, like there's travel transport direct or 00:33:25:something and I use that to plan my route to get to the university and which place I need to get, to get the train or whatever so I would use that

JW So the internet comes in handy in planning ahead?

ALL Yes

KM One thing you said earlier about locations of campuses, in particular towns and cities — I was wondering how you say if you went to Manchester perhaps — you wouldn't feel quite as safe in Manchester perhaps — location — I was wondering how you form opinions of cities, and the locations the campuses are in?

ID6 In my case, professional knowledge — you go to Glamorgan is very different to going to South Bank University in London umm again because of the locality, 00:34:21 because I've got an interest in crime generally — I've got a general feel for levels of crime in inner cities or in

KM Like specialist knowledge

ID6 That's right so it's probably not fair to take ... but then again I don't think there is a great deal that I'm aware of that's not really in the public domain, if people are interested in going through reading a newspaper or different articles

KM So crime reputation on a location of a campus

ID6 I think ************

ID3 Yeah, I'd agree with that. Because I think one of my choices for coming to Loughborough umm rather than picking an inner city campus was on that sort of basis in terms of levels of crime and things like that so I think it would influence my decision.

ID1 When I told people I'd had my handbag snatched at Nottingham I don't think 00:35:25:people were that surprised because Nottingham hasn't got a particularly good reputation

ID2 Yeah and Manchester always seems to have had that reputation. I just had friends who were there and like the location of some of the residence blocks seemed to be quite sort of interesting areas so people were a bit nervous but then I went to Durham and loads of people got attacked in Durham like and you'd think — there was a perception that...

ID1 The reality

ID2 Yeah there was a perception that that would be safer. If I was driving 00:36:01 somewhere I think I'd feel better with one of these out-of-town ones because you don't have that worry about getting lost in a one way system and ending up where you don't want to be and you know you'd probably be able to find it ok

ID6 Yeah I think the city reputation — I remember going to Liverpool university and getting lost in Toxteth and I locked all my car doors; it was, you know, an
extremely threatening environment to be in ***** and I wouldn't usually
their fear would be far higher and again linking it in with the
reputation of the city, sometimes the reputation of certain areas of a city -
***** in Bristol, Toxteth in Liverpool – quite simply areas like that they do and
certainly the city campuses are different beasts to non-city environments.

And it is where I'm familiar with – if I know the city; if I know the city generally,
somewhere like Newcastle, I'd feel happier there even if I don't know the
university campus – it's just that familiarity. Maybe it's you just the area that
I'm from – cities in that area I'm a bit more familiar with so I'm less worried
about that.

Right before we move on to the next one I'm just wondering what you think
about the social environment in this route because again there's not many
people that have come up on these VRs

What time of day is it did you say?
This was about
Was it about two-ish?
Yeah, two, three
And it was in term time
Mmm, it seems quiet
But the social environment was an issue on the night-time route but is it as
much of an issue on this one because it's in the day so it's not so much of an
issue?
I'd feel it was slightly less of an issue personally umm because it was day
but it does strike me as being quiet still so
But there's traffic there as well – I know you umm said about traffic in terms of
someone could stop and pinch your handbag or something but I think having
traffic about makes me feel safer
It does?
Just the ***** with the people
It's more if there's no traffic and suddenly one car comes then you start to
panic, if you've got your back towards it – I always try and walk towards the
traffic. Things like that – just cars milling around makes you feel a bit better
And the people issue – it doesn't really bother me as much – what I feel about
having people around me is if someone was too close to me – in my personal
space, like if I'm in a busy high street and there's loads of people then that is
a normal environment but if I was in an empty space like that and someone
was really close to me then I would feel scared and uncomfortable
That's a good point that – that's something that hasn't come up before, it's
always ....
It's probably because of my personal experience
So personal experience contributes to perceptions generally?
Yes
Next one?
Yes, we'll go onto the next one

This is our second campus – it's across the valley from the main one – you can
see the lights in the distance – that's the – over here is what we've been
showing you – this is the law department
That's actually the big white building on the other campus. I've just come
through there. We've come from there. The weather was quite extreme – so
there's a little bit of rain on the camera. That's essentially going from one side
of the campus to the other. It was taken about...... Go through to the main
entrance to the campus. The side of the buildings. We've just come from there.
this is the last part of the campus; the most extreme end of the campus. We started up those steps. So?

JW A very different environment ....

ID2 You wouldn't get me down those steps. Ha ha!

ID1 I was familiar with the other area but I'm not with that and even the well lit areas I didn't feel

ID2 No there's no-one around either

ID5 And some of it was really dimly lit

ID2 Even the light bits look a bit ...

ID5 Is there building work going on there?

ID3 Yeah it looked like a building site

ID6 That fencing there on the right hand side - is that a perimeter fence?

00:44:22

KM This particular fence - there is a very steep drop down there so that's why it's there

ID1 That's a bit prison-like STILL 10 00:44:30

ID6 It's almost as if that fencing area indicates there's a problem there - you know - either going to keep people in or keep people out

ID2 Yes

ID6 You know it's a physical safety issue - in case of than a drop

ID2 It's funny that because it's not the sort of fence that I'd imagine somebody

00:44:50leaping over to get in yet it makes me feel unsafe just from the look of it; it just makes me feel ....

ID6 Yes

JW Is it the height of it?

ID2 Mmm

ID6 And the kind of fence, you know - it's hard, a very hard fence

ID1 It just looks quite aggressive

KM Very industrial

ALL Yes

ID2 Yeah, I think it just gives the impression of somewhere that is, yeah that is

00:45:05industrial and I think that kind of building site feel that it's got - even just the cones look threatening! STILL 11

ID1 The cone bit, the coned bit in the last section just looked untidy and that nobody really cared about that area

KM You see because that's actually the perimeter fence

ID1 Right

ID6 You've got housing at the back there

KM Yeah. There's no way in other than the main entrance on the other side of the campus

ID5 It's not very ********** is it really?

ID2 Yeah like you say it's almost as if that kind of feel that it's not much cared about or it makes you feel unsafe

ID6 We did mention it but I think it's important because I noticed there didn't seem to be any graffiti in place you know on the previous photos that you showed

00:45:58us so you've either not got a problem with it or its cleaned up pretty quickly erm and it - if you do get it and it's cleaned up quickly then you get that perception that people care therefore it's a safe environment or there isn't any. Although when we get graffiti here, which is unusual, it gets cleaned up almost instantaneously and I think that's important. Again you go to environments where you've got lots and lots of it and whilst there's nothing

00:46:25threatening about graffiti itself, the very fact it's there - it feels bad.

KM It's interesting with this campus - one of the reasons it feels so industrial is that the site was a gas works, stone been cleaned up ***************

ID2 Even things like the portocabins make me feel nervous, just a temporary thing maybe not insecure

ID1 That archways a bit
So if something's temporary you assume then not as much care has been taken?

Maybe if you knew the environment and knew that thing were doing work and knew it was only temporary but because you don't know the environment those portacabins could have been there years and years

And would you think security wouldn't be so stringent in terms of safety and access? When the campus has a lot of work going on? Do you think that would be the case?

Can you say that again please?

Do you think that they take sort of lower standards when temporary work is going on in terms of safeguarding routes and thinking about how people are going to get round the campus – do you think that gets pushed out to the side or do contractors have to take special care- what's your experience about that?

I know there's a lot of work going on at York campus and you often find that you'll go so far down a route and then it'll be blocked off and you have to double back – things like that make you quite nervous like you know you might not be able get round a certain way or - that makes me nervous so I do think it doesn't seem to be as stringent when building work is going on

I don't think it would necessarily make me think that standards are lower and I can't really explain why – it's just something about it makes you less comfortable

I think it's because it's not permanent - yet. It's like there's no guarantee that there'll be someone around if you need somebody in a hurry

Building sites generally sort of have – a building site seems like a safe place so if a university looks like a building site you feel safe, you wouldn't go running around a building site so I think it sort of has those connotations and it might not be justified but ...

Also there's no windows - almost something ***** about it

So lack of windows then you feel you can't be observed?

Well yeah, it's more threatening without them but that's quite badly lit as well wasn't it? The lighting is not brilliant there.

The bits where there that looked like the entrance and things like that where there were a couple of people still there and they looked like a permanent building – I'd be heading towards there definitely. That looked like a safe bit yeah STILL 12 places like that looks quite safe.

But the lighting doesn't seem as well thought out as the other campus.

Certainly I think two of the car parks looked well dodgy; not just because they had cones over it, it was very, very dark

Because even though there were cars there that made you think there were people around it just felt really isolated like if you were walking through there on your own you'd be the only person possibly on the whole of that campus. It just seemed very isolated.

One thing about lighting – do you have any preference about the different kinds of lighting, you know sodium lighting, light spilling out of buildings – do you think that makes a difference?

I guess I don't really know the difference. I only sort of well you've got the overhead lights and

Well I think that's quite reassuring where you've got the glass front door and you can see people in there STILL 13

So you can see for example that the light that spills out from here is very different to the light here – those lights

Only because light spilling out of a building suggests it's kind of habitable – there's people in there and that's nice

But that light from the buildings feels more natural light
But I do like to have proper light; like in the daytime I can see there are lights there so when I come out when it's dark and it reassures me that they are there if you see what I mean.

I know as in car parks types of lighting that those in car parks might in some ways do as much damage as good because it creates shadows when you ....coming on and things like that.

ID2

Is lighting different at the other campus — like is it actually different lighting?

KM

ID2

But there seems to be less of it here.

ID4

I think the thing is with outdoors you can always see that it's dark — you're going to go into the dark at some point but with a building you're going in — there's light beyond whereas where you are going there it's dark beyond so permanently not knowing what's round the next corner.

ID3

Yes

ID2

When I'm inside looking out I'm always quite nervous — if I'm about to head out and I look out and its dark even if even when I get out and my eyes adjust and I'm used to the light I feel safer but it's that kind of looking out like you're not sure where you're going next...and if it's say still going to be ....

JW

Based on what you've been saying about this route at night; would you feel happy doing it in the day?

ID2

Happier than at night.

ID1

There'd still be all the building work. I think you'd probably feel safer but not totally comfortable.

ID4

No. Were there more smaller spaces it seemed — my memory of it is that there were more places that it umm it wasn't as open as the other two we've seen. Perhaps that's just because it's a smaller area or

KM

More ***** as well.

ID4

Yes, yes.

JW

So openness is better for your personal safety?

ID4

For me, yes.

ID2

I think generally apart from things like commons and parks and things — those kind of ... in some ways if I was faced with crossing a well lit kind of park in a field or going down a well lit street I would go down the well lit street, so it does ... maybe university wise it does seem safe because

JW

We'll move onto the next one.

KM

I've got to change the tapes.

KM

We're ok.

JW

This is the fourth route now.

KM

Some steps in the day outside.

JW

Back on the other campus now.

ROUTE 4

KM

We've just come that way. That's just outside the entrance — there's a pathway down there but we decided to go through the building because that's the way that most people seemed to go.

JW

This is the main pedestrian entrance now.

KM

There's the bus stop. We've just carried on — you come to a bridge. Just a small one.

JW

So; initial perceptions?

ID5

I wouldn't like to walk down there even in the day light on my own!!

JW

Off the campus?

ID5

Yeah this bit STILL 14 here with the overhanging and the bridge down there — potentially threatening.

JW

Is that because specifically it's off campus?

ID1

It's very.

ID5

Well it's very.
It feels very enclosed

Yeah and isolated as well – there’s no-one, there’s narrow pavements. It just looks if someone’s coming the other way and you know

Considering that it’s like the route from the main university and like where students are living for – like if you walked into Loughborough from the university you would see lots of people along those routes

Well funnily enough, this particular route is probably not the main pedestrian route – the pedestrian route is – the student car park is across the road there so a lot of people walk in that way and then most of the student houses aren’t on campus – it’s just up *** students

Ok

So you wouldn’t really have to go down

That’s the way people tend to go into the village for there’s a few pubs down there, some shops and a café so it is quite a busy road for pedestrians and cars

Is there any other way apart from going under that bridge to get back from the village?

You can go over the railway bridge – and we’ll be showing you that on the next route – so you can get a picture of where you are

But yes there is an alternative

I think you were saying about things look well maintained ***** overgrown tree, bit you know, that indicates it’s a bit wild, not very well kept

It’s the use of – you know how we were saying how you distinguish between what’s the university and what’s not? I was thinking of colour, like the use of colour; you know that entrance bit they had the blue G and then the blue carried on and you showed us the entrance and it was all kind of blue and nicely painted and yes this is there and then it kind of stops and you go oh great – do you know what I mean? It’s almost like colour co-ordinating

I think it’s a recent thing they’ve just done – they’ve painted all the bollards all around in the university colours

It does kind of make it look nice

Are there lights in the bollards as well – are they lights?

No they are just bollards

Nice to see **** quite keen on those

Ha ha. They do look nice. Just gives you a little, tells you, you are still on university property.

Because it’s almost like a campus, that fuzzy ‘almost campus’ zone

Yes

Is there a similar thing on this campus? So they know that they are nearly there?

Yes, sort of, in front of the roundabout ***** by the university has flowerbeds **** statues **** not university property so it’s not actually obvious

The boundaries of the actual campus are very clear

And the road as well serves as a boundary – the main road, especially across the front – you get a feeling of a boundary

Yes but the real boundary is only the side – it’s one of those owned by a local authority, not actually owned by the university, umm. Certainly on this side of Ashby Road towards the motorway all of those roads belong to the university but the boundaries are a certain distance from them. But you know we’ve got some bollards, just black bollards *** so a hotdog van can park there! ***** students’ parking

What about the bit that went through the building? Did you feel safer?

I feel safer in the building

Do you automatically feel safer?

I thought that was quite interesting – doing it in the daytime but back here if I’m – in the daytime I feel safe but at night and even in the winter if it gets to 4 o’clock it’s dark and I’m in the office on my own – my office is a bit out of my department so I don’t really know people around me, well there might, I
don't really know if there's people around me because we're in little offices and I
do sometimes feel "oh I think I should go home now". Like we can come in and
work at night if we wanted to but I definitely wouldn't – I do feel in winter I would
go home earlier

KM Well I think that's something that is very interesting to our staff in the groups
we've previously done. I was wondering how you think about lone working
because we've primarily looked at external bits of the campus but in a building
at night-time like you say if you're working, if you know you're the only person
in that building how would you kind of respond to that?

ID1 Partly for me it's not knowing if you're the only person - there could be
someone in like the office three doors down but I don't know

JW So a system to indicate who's there?

ID1 Maybe, yeah

ID2 Yeah, the building we're in is quite old as well and it's got very small corridors
and lots of rooms off and I'm kind of under some stairs and it's very - it
doesn't feel very safe when you're in there - I don't really like working in there
when I'm by myself. Also you get the porters saying make sure you lock the
doors if you're on your own and that kind of freaks you out!

KM So you do get advice?

ID2 Well a friend of mine

ID1 When I started we were told to lock the door just if you go to the toilet, that's not
from personal safety that's a theft - but the technicians also said if you're
working late at night lock the door even though the actual door - you have to
get into the building you need a card and to know the code after I'm not sure
what time it is but they still tell you to lock your door behind you

ID2 But that kind of building that we walked through then just feels a lot more open
and a bit more - it was very well lit - it felt a bit more open plan even though
a bit more of a public space wasn't it? Whereas where our offices are, you
wouldn't go there unless you had a reason to.

ID2 Yeah it's not really a walk through.

ID1 I wouldn't feel unsafe say in the Students' Union.

ID2 But there's a route on York campus just like that when the alternative is to go on
a night is to go round the outside where it's really, really dark and by the lake or
there's through the building which was well lit and you kind of had that
moment of contact with humanity and then you go out again into the scary
world - it's kind of reassuring.

ID5 There were a spate of thefts and things last year wasn't it some in broad
daylight, some at night-time? Took some computers or whatever so anyone
really could if they wanted to

KM I was just wondering on that sort of subject do you - when you all started work,
did you get any specific advice about personal safety? **** do you think you
need some more or do you think that would be a negative thing or a positive?

ID2 I can't remember actually. I don't think we did when I was a student; you got
your attack alarm and that kind of stuff.

ID3 No I didn't. I think it might have been useful - not to the extent that it would
make you really anxious but just so that you would know if there was a
procedure umm because my manager told me that if I came in on like the
weekends or stayed late to ring the security office but nobody who come in in
my office actually does that so it's not something that's been built into me to do
and I must admit I don't do it if I come in on the weekends but

ID2 If you're the only person who's doing it you'd feel like a pain

ID3 Yes

ID6 You would, wouldn't you?

ID3 Yeah I mean I don't know, I don't know where they got that from in that case to
tell me but

ID2 Security might just go 'yeah?'

ID3 Yeah - stop ringing me!
And I think like a positive thing to do would maybe make sure people know the other people in the offices because even if I knew there was someone in one three doors down from me I don’t know who they are because well I don’t know people in my department but it’s even less likely now that I’m going to know people.

Yeah something like the business school.

Yeah **** to work around.

Yeah the business school seems clearer because business people know people.

In this building, there’s so many different things you don’t really know everyone.

***** different levels.

Many people aren’t wearing their badges.

Yeah.

So anybody can open your door if you’re working late – just going down trying doors and as happened to one of our members of staff – they just said oh they were looking for umm but we found out later that they – something had gone missing at the same time but in our department we do have a huge set of erm best behaviour that everyone is given and its very important that they read about safety and working alone and that sort of thing and we have umm.

we are meant too let somebody else know even if they are not on campus if you are working on campus.

When you mentioned about entrances, do you have ID badges?

Mmm.

Does everyone have ID badges?

I notice this chap has his on.

Yes.

Are you supposed to wear them?

I’ve got ***** open.

Of course.

 Personally I leave mine in the car all the time because I need it to swipe.

Mm, me too.

If I didn’t leave it in the car, if I had to wear it half the time I wouldn’t be able to find it when I came to get through.

Maybe we should have round-the-neck ones.

Yeah.

Mm.

We are all given clippie things and where do you put that?

But the students are – don’t wear them – the students don’t wear them so.

No the students don’t wear them, they usually like.

So staff thought it was a bit silly.

Are students supposed to wear them?

No I mean there’s two different policies umm – presently staff are supposed to wear them at all times on university property with certain exceptions.

You see I didn’t even know that we were supposed to.

I think I did read that and then I was like nobody is wearing them!

I mean it varies – some people do wear them all the time and as we’ve heard other people leave them in cars. Students have them and are required to produce them on demand and it’s a hanging offence not to produce it **** but they don’t have to wear them but that’s largely because umm to arrange that sort of, to amend the university system to do that you’d need to negotiate with the Students’ Union. It changes every 12 months and it depends on the view of the individual and you know you might get it through and you might not and you know it’s **** it doesn’t really seem to create any great difficulty to be honest. But like I say with the staff, most staff seem to have them on and as you say, some don’t.

Sorry.

Mine’s in my pocket!
It's interesting talking about new staff because we have a very structured personal safety input for students but they are quite easy because they come in one great dollop but staff come throughout the year.

We went on a staff induction and I don't think there was anything about personal safety.

There was stuff about Health and Safety which the people do in the umm induction — weren't very impressed because we hadn't been told and I think I'd been here maybe three months by the time I went on my staff induction and I didn't know what to like if there was like a fire because you don't phone 999 when you're on campus do you? There's another number and like within the department I hadn't been told that and I didn't know that but we weren't told things like that on our induction but I don't recall being told anything about personal safety.

I have said that I would be quite prepared to go along to induction courses but not everyone goes on them because like you say you could be here for months before you have an induction course which is pointless really.

Because like you say you could be here for months before you have an induction course which is pointless really.

I think one was cancelled sorry I was going to go on one but it was cancelled because of lack of numbers.

And it's where personal safety sits as well — does it come under Health and Safety or a separate.

Well I think its sits with both really — here it's with Health and Safety and with security and I'd probably say security would have a lead on it rather than Health and Safety in the context that we are talking about umm when we talk about accidents and other hazards that's very much a Health and Safety issue.

Ok so has everyone said what they wanted to say about that route?

This is actually a 24 hour computer lab ....feels like ********

Is this the main campus again?

This is the main campus but it's the other side of the campus.

Right.

So that's the gate on campus that — you're actually leaving the campus there. These are the kinds of streets that are predominantly student.

This is the quickest way to the station — there's no other way is there really?

It doesn't take long.

That's the station and these are actually university buildings too — those two. That's it.

That's the route.

Sorry did you show us the main sort of station — where's like the entrance to the station?

That's just it there. It's quite a small station. You just walk on; there's no ticket barrier or anything.

Oh right.
You can see the bridge going across – that's the shelter on the other side

Oh I see, ok

And this shelter is under construction

So the shops and pubs are just behind the station – just down the road so that's one way if you want to go that way – I think a lot of people do.

So it's an unmanned station as well?

It's just manned in working hours

And I know you had the gate at the entrance to the university- there I thought

where it was well lit and all of a sudden it was kind of into darkness

Do you want to look at that?

Yes

If you say that's like a student area and if I knew that and knew the area I'd probably feel ok round there but as a first time visitor I'd feel quite wary. yeah sort of round there

Yeah the lighting is very poor there isn't it? STILL 15

Yeah – if this was my first time walking to the station I'd probably be quite wary. yeah sort of round there

This is **** kind of street lamps – pedestrian only access

Right

This gate is the only way on, on this side of the campus

And it's locked at 11 o'clock at night

Even the little one?

Yeah the whole thing

Right

And it opens at five in the morning

So if you were on campus late you'd have to go out the other – go around?

********

Yeah

********

And that's only to keep cars out is it?

No it's to stop students walking down Ashby Drive at 3 o'clock in the morning and lifting up windscreen wipers on the resident’s cars and pinching garden gnomes

There's graffiti there

This is actually the university perimeter

Is that an alleyway?

It is, it's a lane

There's one each side

Yeah there's another one

Where do they lead to?

They're just at the back of the houses

My God that's even worse and you've got to go by both of those to get out or in? STILL 17

Do you go down them or past them?

Yeah if you want to walk out you've got to walk

They could so with some lighting on the walls or something

Mmm

I'd be a bit wary about that especially if it was round about 11 o'clock because you'd know - you know after 11 it's probably less likely that people will be around as well so if it got to around that time I'd be quite anxious I think
This is an interesting one because it goes back to what we were saying about if you're on campus you're on campus but this buffer zone this is where the campus ends and you know - sort of ************ unlike the main entrance where you can see start to see when you get close.

It's quite ************

Yes - having said that it's quite a busy route because it is really the only way down to the station.

Yeah if you get off the train you just follow the masses - you know which way to go!

Yeah - I think once I'd done it a few times I probably would be ok if I knew that was quite a busy area. I don't think I'd worry too much but it would be the first few times.

How long does it take to walk - is it actually like 10 minutes or something?

10 minutes max

It seems really close so that's reassuring as well

And the actual station seemed quite well lit

Does the fact that it's unmanned have a ....

Yeah that would probably be a worry at night-time

I would be wary about a train station at night if it was unmanned

Yeah I would

Would a panic station

Would a ?

Panic station

A panic button

I quite like things like that except that I never trust that they are going to be working all the time! It's always a worry

Because all the stations on the network have information points which are also panic buttons

I think that's a really good idea

I'd be less worried about that railway station because I get the feeling you know that your perched on the side of a small town, almost a village even, I don't know, but ***** railway station the one in Tottenham purely for ************

I always think Loughborough train station feels isolated

But there's always people there

I've not been really late at night but yeah there are people milling about aren't there?

******

Mmm, but to walk there feels very cut off. When you first arrive you feel you're in the middle of nowhere - you can't really see a city or a ... What's that?

They are building a bike rack there

Ahh

As part of the new travel plan initiative

**** what about the campus - is there anything that is worrying or not worrying?

I think maybe there was some earlier bits that were similar to before - I think - yeah like there STILL 18 with the foliage and things

Yeah very high conifers, weren't there?

Mmm

And pushing it onto the footpath as well

I think maybe they are obscuring the lights in places, sort of dark shadows

I think one aspect of that is that it's on a slope so that the conifers ...

Oh so it's growing

So they kind of grow - they actually start higher than the path anyway

Yeah that feels a bit sort of a bit overbearing somehow STILL 19.01:20:10
JW We do have students at our university, honest!
ALL Ha ha ha
KM This side is a bit different ... but what's interesting is that this building here used to be Halls of Residence but it's now offices
ID1 Yeah that's different to before -- it seems very empty at night-time
KM This is the LRC, the library
ID2 It's funny with Halls of Residence because I think I do feel kind of safer
01:21:09 especially with students around but I also feel that maybe they are a bit of a target as well for people to loiter around and so it's kind of a mixed thing in some ways
KM That's actually the edge of the campus on the other side
JW They've got a big fence there
ID1 It's looking quite dark towards the edges STILL 20 00:21:33
ID2 But that looks so bright STILL 21
ID3 Yeah
ID1 Like lighting is a signal of how -- where you are on campus and even if there weren't fences to tell you that you weren't on campus anymore you could maybe guess because all the lights have suddenly like disappeared
ID2 Yes
KM I was wondering how you'd feel about that because if you -- would it make a difference for example that they are very tall bushes but there is also the grey industrial fence about 9 foot tall so there is no way on other than to climb it. So whether that makes you feel any differently knowing that it's a very secure perimeter rather than just a case of bushes. What do you think?
ID2 It's funny with a perimeter
ID5 It could work both ways because if someone was running after you, you wouldn't be able to get out
ID2 I just think if you want to get on there is always a way, you know, probably 01:22:42 there's a way for them to get on
KM I was just wondering how much store you set in security of the perimeter? Whether you think that that's important -- a very heavy perimeter?
ID2 I don't think I do you see
KM Or just a clear perimeter
ID6 I don't think universities can go down the level where you've got perimeters totally secure. At the end of the day you are trying to sell the place to people and you want it to be welcoming and it's supposed to be like a university not a prison erm and you might have parts where you've got very good perimeter security but even that if you've got an open campus secure enough purely because you've got your perimeter secured at one point doesn't stop somebody coming on from a different direction, lurking down there and it's possibly not the perimeter security that's the issue there; it's the overall look of it -- it's dark, it's a bit foreboding, you can't quite see what's happening down there
ID2 Yeah
ID1 It's very inviting
ID2 Yeah I really didn't like the other campus - that very big fence -- you know nobody's going to jump over it but it doesn't make you feel safer -- I think ..... ID1 It just feels harsh and quite aggressive
ID2 Without making you feel especially safer
ID5 ********* spikes
KM So it's perhaps heightening your anxiety without any benefit
ID3 Yeah
ID2 Yeah probably because you feel to keep out like; it just heightens your anxiety
01:24:14 like you say -- you know if someone's got security dogs you don't want to go in -- it's not a very welcoming environment -- as long as you know it's secure -- well for me it's more of a security presence; like you see the cars going round, things like that -- that makes me feel safer than a big fence
Especially when you've got a big fence on part of it but if it's not all the way around you know - it's ***** is that where the steep bit is or something?

Yeah

*****

Yeah you just can't see it. The campus continues round...

Is there anything else jumping out at you?

That bit looks nice and safe for some reason STILL 22 - I don't know whether it sounds silly but I don't know whether it's to do with the grass and stuff - it just looks nice so it makes you feel a bit safer I think than the bit before when you just saw this fence then this massive dark behind it and it was there so

KM

So this is about some of this is about lines of sight - you're reassured if you can see that bit further?

ID1

You know there's no-one lurking about as well

But I don't like to feel too exposed - and I think somewhere like that where it's kind of got open-ness but it's also got a feeling of people being there and err in the buildings - you don't feel exposed - you feel like - you don't feel closed in but I don't know if you've got markers or something. I'm not sure

KM

This is quite different from our campus umm because it's on a hill and the buildings tend to surprise you - you go round corners - it's quite different here - you can see everything laid out in front of you and it's quite a different experience.

JW

There's lots of pitches here as well - and open spaces where you can see around. Well ok. That's it for the routes really. I'm just wondering overall - how safe would you say our campus is or for each one in turn? First impressions?

ID2

The main one I'd say looked pretty safe

ID1

Yeah

ID3

Yeah

You don't have to be polite!

JW

You'll still get your money!

ALL

Ha ha

The main one I would say is pretty safe. Fairly safe - bits that could be improved, like they could on any campus - like with some of the walkways were a bit enclosed and at the front with trees but generally very well lit generally

Cut the shrubs down

Yeah - the lighting I was impressed with - it feels very well lit and it feels like there'd always be somewhere that you could feel safe - you don't have to go down dark paths

There was a first impression which is why I asked the question right at the beginning - lighting levels I thought were very good - I guess you're not faced with the same problem that we've got but our neighbours love to complain about light pollution. Whether you do I don't know

I think that might be some of the reasons why the perimeter is fairly...

Around the edges

But like I say it appeared to generally be a very bright campus at night which I think was very positive. Obviously there were certain areas where it was very dark but the fact that so much of it was so light. Where there was no lights it felt a bit odd. Umm, my gut reaction - it seemed on the face of it to be a reasonably safe campus - it certainly looked **** I wouldn't be particularly worried about going there - I would say and the part on the other side of the valley it looked a bit like a building site but that was probably in transition and
perhaps I shouldn't, there's not a great deal to do about that until it's completed umm but I don't like the skips and you know the temporary buildings on either side; I think they seemed to be a bit of a problem but generally speaking it didn't feel particularly unsafe. When I saw the housing around there umm I think it did look a little bit studenty and quite rural as well. It didn't feel like an area that would raise a lot of concerns. But that's my perspective.

ID3 Yeah I'd agree with that. I think I'd possibly feel safer on that campus than this one (Loughborough) if I obviously came on as a stranger or a visitor umm because of things like the lighting, the openness of some of the areas

ID2 Do the lights stay on all night?

JW As far as I'm aware they do

KM It does tend to dominate the village. You've got the campus that's grown over the years and the village – you can see it from the motorway or the A470; you can see the campus lit up

ID2 The most important bit for me is that the walkways are lit up umm so that if – there's set routes around campus that you know where you're going and you know that they'll be lit that's what's kind of important to me so if there's clear routes around and they're lit that's the most important bit if you see – so I don't know if there are kind of clear routes around campus. I know some

01:30:16 Campuses more than others have kind of – it's very clearly marked 'this is the route you take to get to this'; it's all very signposted and there's obvious ways around campus that are obviously marked – you know that makes me feel safer. It'd kind of difficult in this situation because obviously I'm not wondering around by myself so yeah.

ID4 There didn't seem to be many signs on the routes that you photographed

ID1 Well actually from being there, there are actually a lot of signposts

JW *********

ID2 I have got lost on Loughborough campus quite a lot – I don't know why but I always seem to get lost. I don't get a sign so far. I think it's the East Park and the West Park and all that kind of confuses me – I need a building that I'm aiming for – I can't remember if it's in the East Park or the West Park but that makes a difference to me when I'm going places

KM But on the subject of kind of naming buildings, how important do you – I know you mentioned the fact that the function of the building is often not very clear on signs – do you think that's – is that a personal safety issue? Knowing that you're near a particular kind of building?

ID6 Possibly not a personal safety issue but it sure as hell helps if you know what the chemistry department building is called; umm you know Loughborough and other places name buildings after people umm and in a multiple use building like this building – how do you actually get from A to B? Like you were saying – it actually took me the best part of a year to find my way around the place

ID2 Yeah

ID6 And there's still buildings that I've never been in

ID2 Yeah

ID6 So how strangers are supposed to

ID2 I think it was the music umm place, the concert place or something and I was looking for that and there I felt like I was kind of really getting lost in amongst

01:32:07 buildings and I didn't know a clear route and I was kind of like 'ooh', I felt a bit strange here because I was kind of in between buildings that were in and that worried me – I don't feel like there's a route that I'm supposed to be following – it was kind of, I was feeling my way a little bit

ID6 Yeah I think perhaps the development of the site has not helped – it's a little bit piece-meal. In fact last year they actually knocked a building down – it was the first time Loughborough had ever knocked a building down and demolished it and there's been a couple since then but I think as it gets developed it will be a lot more clarity about how to get to places
ID1 I think it's probably more important at night you know, knowing whether buildings are academic or social buildings. Because an academic building wouldn't necessarily help me feel safer because you think it would be empty at night whereas um there's the Students Union but there's also like the Edward Herbert building and I think that's probably open at night.

ID2 Yeah

01:33:05
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Staff Focus Group - Night Time Routes

JW Introduction. General - what are your general feelings about PS on this campus? Is it a big concern for you?

ID2 I think it is at night-time. I don't think it's particularly well lit in certain areas at night. Not so much in the day as night. I'm a bit worried, especially if you come out of the building alone you have to go through dark bit to get to your car or whatever.

JW Is that something that many of you think?

ID6 Yes I agree.

ID1 Within the campus I don't feel so vulnerable as I do in the immediately adjacent streets.

JW So is there a difference between being on campus to being in the adjacent community?

ID10 Yes, I feel that way as well. I think unless it's dark and there is no-one else around, generally I don't feel too bad specifically on campus but as soon as I come off it.

ID5 There's usually a lot of people about in the daytime.

ID1 The only time on campus I've felt insecure or not safe is when I'm the last person in the office.

ID9 I feel much safer on my own working in the room with a timed lock on it than I do on my own in the other office, definitely.

ID2 Yes, our office is an open plan office and it used to be open to everyone and we're just adjacent to the main toilets that people use before they go to the carpark so you did feel very vulnerable when you were there alone but they have put a pad on there now that you have to tap into to get into the office in the night so you can lock it. But it was an issue before that, yes.

JW Is there anywhere on campus that you avoid at night?

ID11 Down by the railway arch, the bottom end of the long carpark is not very well lit and very creepy in the dark because it's not a through ..., unless you're going down there for your car there's no real reason for you to be down there. I try to avoid it as much as possible.

ID10 And also umm the hill leading up to the crèche at night. We have to work until 9 pm and what we'll do about 5 p.m. is we'll move our cars so that we don't have to ... We can avoid those areas.

ID9 I would feel comfortable because of working at the back of J-Block I would be comfortable with my car being parked at the back of J-Block to go out in the night because it's something that I am familiar with. I know where the doors would be to go back inside probably more easier access than you would so it's people's perceptions of it.

ID2 I work in B-Block and usually park down that end but on a Wednesday when I'm on my course until 9 o'clock I park up under the Refectory so when I come out at 9 o'clock the car is there rather than having to walk all the way through the campus and I'd rather walk down in the morning than walk down in the dark at night.

ID9 I wish there were more cameras around the back in J-Block area. The only reason I know there are no cameras there is because someone damaged a car of mine a fair while ago and I asked to see the security footage and apparently there are no cameras around that back area of the campus.

ID7 I think some cameras aren't in use even though they are there.

ID2 Because when you ask they've never got footage of the area.

ID7 I think it would be nice to see someone visibly walking round and just keeping a general eye out perhaps would be better.
I think that would be a much higher impact. Yes, patrolling security guards with high profile clothing so everyone is aware of what their certain responsibility are.

What about security guards? What are your thoughts on an actual security patrol.

I would regard them as traffic wardens rather than security. It seems to be their main role.

I know we've been having problems with local children coming into the Library and causing havoc on late nights and I just think that what you were saying about having somebody walking around might deter them a little bit. So yes, perhaps more visible security around might be helpful.

Because even though you've got signs up saying no people not associated with university mustn't come in or anything or something like that, I've seen skateboarders outside HLaSS and they are never challenged. So I think something visible ought to be done otherwise there's no deterrent and the sign is worthless then.

Just out of interest, how many of you have had any personal safety training?

Just two of you.

OK, so only one of you. Is that something you would like to have when you join the University? Some kind of session raising awareness.

I think it would be good idea to make people aware cos if they are new to the campus they wouldn't have a clue anyway of the areas that are highlighted or they need to be aware of.

A good idea. It could be linked to H&S like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area.

The bad side of having some sort of PS thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be.

Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear.

Just to be aware that's all. I think it would be the same wherever you went, it would be good.

As part of their "Duty of Care".

One final question is what specific risks do you think you'd experience on campus, if any in terms of intentionally motivated harm.

Robbery, mugging.

Drunkenness from SU (not intentional perhaps).

At night-time I think what would be most obvious would be sexual, especially under car-park at top of ... there is a horrible pathway between buildings which has horrible bushes on either side - up towards Sports Centre. Alongside shop.

it was very dark walking around mini roundabout down sweep into car park

And with lots of bushes too - lots of places for people to jump out at you.

I didn't realise that until I looked at that. You think they are nice and green and whatever. You don't realise how many things they shade.

When I parked there I tended to run in with key in hand, get in the car and lock the doors and then come out then.

So would many of you prefer not to use this carpark?

Yes

The overspill, that's probably worse STILL 2

The other bit is on the central avenue as you come out towards the Gatehouse there - you don't actually walk on the road do you, the path is underneath by the big bank and that's pretty scary. STILL 3 You've got all
the trees on one side and the bank on the other. Drops down onto the steps under a little bridge. STILL 4

ID6 That's a bit hairy in the day that is. I don't like that in the day, I tend to run through it.

JW So you'd use that rather than the road?

ID2 I wouldn't at night on my own, no but during the day I would, yes.

JW So are these just issues when you are on your own?

ID6 I think it highlights it when you are on your own. When you're with others you're choping and just get on with what you need to do but I think when you are on your own it just heightens the fear. I think, that's all. That's quite a dark area there as well. STILL 5

ID10 Even when there's people around I don't like it.

ID1 The thing about being on your own is that I feel a bit more vulnerable and I don't know if other people serve as a distraction or if I feel more confident and less of a target cos I'm with somebody.

ID6 There's a problem in the tunnel STILL 6

ID6 There's a few dark spots when you park up on campus. It's quite dark behind HLaSS. It's quite dark behind there and by the Health Centre and under gallery.

ID2 Also behind Estates Dept where minibuses park.

ID10 Going down Forest Grove as well - when you get to the bottom of the hill it's fine but even when there's people in the buildings it's - that route down there - there's not that many people walking up and down there; in the dark anyway. STILL 7

JW Does proximity to the main road have any bearing on your sense of personal safety.

ID10 Yes, once you get to bottom of the hill if there's traffic there's not a problem and I suppose even if it was dark at rush hour I wouldn't mind that. But if it's quiet .......

ID6 It would just be nice to see somebody walking around up there purely because people from anywhere can walk in and they're never apprehended at all so you could be anybody - nobody knows who is actually on campus and who is not. I think that's quite a big issue.

JW Is there anything that you'd do to this route to make it safer?

ID3&5 More lighting

ID6&1 Some visible security person.

ID10 More cameras.

ID5 More security and cameras.

ID3 Maybe a couple of signs telling people 'if you do feel worried phone the Gatehouse'.

JW How would you feel about things like that?

ID1 You'd need to trust that security would respond first.

ID3 Yes, definitely and wouldn't be abused.

ID1 Yes, they've got similar things at train stations.

ID3 You don't want a cry wolf scenario when people just hit them for fun.

ID6 Students would do it just to wind everyone up.

ID8 Cos anyone can come on campus; kids and stuff. They're bound to abuse it.

ID4 I wouldn't want that and find it just raises people's fear levels

ID6 But it's the society we live in these days isn't it.

ID5 Some of the feelings are not just down to this - if I was anywhere in similar situations. I would feel exactly the same.

ROUTE 2

ID2 I'd feel exposed there cos there's only offices there STILL 8

ID6 It's quite dark from the exit gates down

ID2 Yes by Brook Street.

ID6 But there's no-one there (by train station) at all.
ID1 Brook Street stands out particularly because I know there has been some problems there and that's a route I walk every day after dark so yes I'm already aware of that bit.

ID9 I use the exact same route all the time. You know where the exit gate is, back around December time, the street lights were all out and the one on campus was out - it was extremely dark - not so much from someone attacking you point of view. But things like over-stepping the kerbs and pavement were tricky. It wasn't scary, even by lanes there STILL 9

ID9 I mean there's always people hanging about, the majority I assume are students so I don't feel threatened by them but it would be better if lights could be put back lit - even on campus. Looks like you have taken it when some of the lights are out cos it's extremely dark by there.

ID9 If you're going in to Cardiff you're OK cos you've got the push button thing but I catch the train going up the valley and that one, obviously under construction there STILL 10 but it's just totally open now; it's just a shelter.

ID9 The ticket office on the other side is quite imposing really - all boarded in.

ID9 I think the campus is quite well lit in that area as well - behind LRC. I never have cause for concern.

ID1 They are quite wide areas, with wide pavements.

ID9 Even though you are at the back of the LRC and technically no-one could come out and help if you needed assistance; I've never felt unsafe there.

JW Do you think your perceptions would change the minute you left the campus?

ID9 For me it does.

JW Do you feel more protected when you are on the campus because it is University property.

ID9's 9, 6,4,1

ID10 Generally speaking though in the community of Trefforest there is always quite a lot students around but yes, still feel safer on campus.

JW Is there any one thing that you'd do to make this route safer?

ID4 I think better lighting by that Brook Street gate STILL 11 because of that lane, it's a bit scary innit!

ID6 The lane should be lit really so you can see right down there.

JW How would you feel if there were university security guards patrolling Brook Street?

ID6 I wouldn't like that really.

ID4 Well I think the university should be part of the community and if you've got a security guard you're not giving the right message really.

ID5 But then if you've got them patrolling on campus why not have them just off campus as well if it's part of the community.

ID2 Would they have a legal right to be outside the campus?

JW What about the social environment; how do social dynamics affect personal safety - if there's lots of people around or ?

ID6 I think it's highlighted if you're on your own. If you're in a group you just go with the flow. When you are on your own you self preservation kicks in and you start to think about things that aren't there, like shadows - it just heightens your awareness really.

ID7 But I think even when you are on your own even if there is a lot of people around, even if you don't know them you are likely to feel more safe than if you are the only person walking down the road.

ID2 It depends on how many people are around. Like if it's a small group of boys. It depends who they were as well.

ROUTE 3

ID2 I felt you were very exposed on those steps there STILL 12 and then having to walk through that (arch) and that was during the day. There are very steep steps.
ID10 That really big car park is horrible even in the daylight. At night it's very dark.
ID11 I'd never park there.
ID10 I'm fine with Glyntaff but it does seem to empty out quicker than Trefforest does. It does get very, very quiet, very, very quickly.
ID2 Because there's only teaching over there. There's no Students' Union or anything like that so there's no need for people to stay there. They tend to come across here.
ID7 I've been to Glyntaff a couple of times but I would feel at lot less safe doing that whole route cos I don't know it. When you were taking us through it, it looked like there were alleys all over the place and steps and cos I don't know
ID5 You said there was an alleyway by the tram sheds - I wouldn't want to go down there.
ID5 Yes, I wouldn't want to go down there. STILL 13 It's quite well lit but it's still ... phew, no ....
JW So the people who don't use this campus that often, would you say you had a heightened sense of awareness?
ID5 Definitely, judging by those picture.
JW What kind of personal measures, if any, would you take to improve your personal safety.
ID5 With someone else, don't go by yourself.
ID11 Don't park car behind LRC. STILL 14
ID10 The only place I really feel safe is right opposite the entrance.
ID11 Really there should be someone that's based in there all the time.
ID2 Because you are really exposed.
ID11 And it is very quiet over there cos unless there is a lecture on there is no ......
ID11 it is worse over there because you are so isolated.
ID3 What's really odd is when the students go away if you're walking along just during the middle of the day that noise of chatter isn't there. It's a very odd feeling. It's very odd. I can't say I feel nervous or frightened because I don't but you do suddenly become aware of noises and a perception of space and sound.
ID2 anyone can walk into the loo cos the loo is not locked and the main loo area is not locked so because it is not inside your office environment where you do feel safe if it's locked.
ID6 We've got access pads on all ours but then we're in Prospect House down by the railway station anyway - the first building - and we've got pads on four doors, five doors sorry but I think they're only used when Caxton's lock up at night. ... so the pads are there but they aren't used.
ID6 Perhaps the staff should have some sort of security ID.
ID3 We do in Estates.
ID6 Well we haven't. Even staff don't know other staff. Which would be quite good like E-Colleges wear them so you just need a tag.
ID6 Just need a staff card with a picture and an ID number on it that's it.
JW So you think that's a good idea?
ID6 I think so.
ID5 Yes.
ID2 There was a problem - we used to have name tags and one member of staff was being harassed and of course, they know your name so there's that element as well. Perhaps just an ID number would be OK.
ID6 Just to say you're staff and a picture you know and either on a chain or attached somewhere.
ID6 I think it's a good idea cos I wouldn't know unless its people I deal with on a regular basis then I wouldn't know who was staff and who wasn't.
ID3 Unfortunately it all comes down to cost doesn't it really. Swipe card - I think it's £200
to put one swipe card on per door - how many doors in this university? You know, this block alone we looked at it last year just for disabled access - trying to price up door entry for disabled people - it came to half a million pounds so where do you .... do you just put it on main entrances?

But if you limit too much access as well like last year I had to visit a tutor after 5 o'clock in H-Block but the door closes at 5 o'clock so if you haven't got a card to get in you can't have access to the building to get to your lecture. There's no telephone there to be able to ring him to say *well you know I'm downstairs, can you let me in?* So you're just stuck outside thinking well how do I manage? Do you just wait for someone else to come down and open the door or do you go? You know, so it's restricting access in that instance so you have to be very careful how you balance it.

But I think a basic ID card would be a good idea just basically so you could know if it's staff so not necessarily the swipe card.

ID5 And with these then they should be worn so that everybody knows. You've got to wear it.

ID5 It's no good keeping it in your pocket.

ID6 And with these then they should be worn so that everybody knows. You've got to wear it.

ID6 It would help students as well cos they could approach people they know who are staff and it's just easier.

Then it's the argument that it's an infringement on their civil rights. ... Are you big brother checking up or not? Eventually they did accept that it was for the benefit of the greater community rather than as a check on individual people.

And apart from that I go to Ystrad College and I've got an ID card and students have got to wear them irrelevant of whether they're full-time or part-time you've got to put your ID on somewhere so that they can identify you so that they haven't got strangers walking around the place and you do get stopped if you haven't got it on or if they don't know you or they're not familiar with you - they will actually stop you and say *Where's your card?* or whatever. I think it does work sometimes. I know this campus is a lot bigger.

I don't like it at all. I wouldn't fancy walking down there.

Yes. It's either very, very busy over there or completely quiet, even during the day. There's a lot of little tunnels and nooks and crannies. It's a very strange site.

you're not likely to have people over there who shouldn't be there cos of where it is cos Trefforest campus is obviously in the middle of Trefforest you're more than likely to get people from there that shouldn't be there.

It's quite dark up by GBC.

There they are! When nobody's about! (Security Guards).

And they never smile. They are so miserable you wouldn't want to approach them anyway I don't think.

Ooh they were lovely to me when I couldn't start my car. They were fantastic.

Yes they're very helpful actually.

That's dark isn't it? STILL 15

It's a bit dark down to the old railway tunnel as well isn't it?

The steps going up the side of the GBC - I mean that is the main route I would say the students use to walk up to the Halls of Residence. I mean that is quite creepy. I'd do it quite happily in the day, you know I wouldn't think anything of it, but I don't think I'd like to do it at night.

Well because you've got the bushes and it's quite dark.

I always feel because it's quite a dark and narrow area there being close to the refectory I always feel fairly safe cos there's always people around any of the refectories if they are open so I mean when I first saw that it struck me as
being dark and narrow but from my own experience of walking around that area I don't ever feel too bad around there.

ID3 The thing is if you were walking from the gatehouse to H-block I wouldn't use that route.

KM That's one of the problems of amalgamating the routes.

ID2 Yes, I do use all of it. It is a different perception in the day to the night. The only thing you haven't shown is right across from the main entrance is behind Florest Grove - the lane - because I'm doing a course 2 until 9 so people coming on the course at 2 o'clock park in the student carpark because there isn't any room and they have to park up there so - and a couple of them are women so when we come out at 9 pm their car is all the way up there so they've got to walk that route on their own so I usually give them a lift across. It is quite dark so that's I think another area that needs looking at.

ID2 Yes, straight across there. It's not well lit at all.

ID10 waiting at the bus stop in winter in the dark I feel exposed particularly because there's just fencing and bushes behind you. I mean generally, as I've said before, there's always people around but if I work particularly late or

ID6 I think it's worse if people are watching you as you say you know, you're not doing a regular commute that gives you a little bit more vulnerability doesn't it.

JW Do you feel differently on this side of the campus because you're away from the bulk of the academic and support departments STILL 16 (By SU).

ID10 I feel closer to students really.

KM So this would be characterised as the student part of the campus?

ID10 Yes, I mean I use the health centre sometimes a little bit later but there's always - and often my car is parked just below there but I always feel, even though it's dark, I always feel safe because there's there's the union. There's always people around the union and inside the union. It's really only students.

JW What about that there, with those bushes? Do you think you have to have a compromise between what's pleasing in the eye and safety?

ID11 Yes. They are quite low though there as well STILL 17 it's not as if you wouldn't be able to see someone there cos they are quite low. Then it's open there to the main car park area.

ID2 I'd say that's one of the safest spots at night. STILL 18

ID1 Estates car park or visitors car park being unsafe. That first bit is OK but then it goes around the corner, around the back and there's only probably a dozen spaces so I don't go there but I know that it is dark and there's trees on one side and it's just dark.

ID3 The thing at night outside the union - there are security guards there and I suppose if someone did shout then they would possibly come running - I don't know.

ID10 Generally speaking though, in all of them, from what you were saying normally you would take another route and out of all of the routes really there's always an alternative. You know if you feel unsafe you know there's another way of getting there - where you want to be.

JW Is that something that everyone agrees with? You'd try and go another way if you felt unsafe?

IDs 2, 5&6 Yes

ID2 I never put myself at risk if I can help it. There's occasions when you have to but I always look at the alternatives. Not just here but in my daily life.

ID10 If I know I'm working a late night then I always consider where I'm going to park my car and if I have to I'll move it.

ID10 I can't say I've ever felt threatened on the campus even working until that late and I think that's probably cos students are around - there's a lot of night owls out there.

ID2 That it's a bit dark there. STILL 19
KM Is it reasonably well lit do you think?

ID5 No, that needs a bit more lighting there **STILL 20** (by shop).

ID1 But the undergrowth is generally cut back and quite low and the lighting's OK although it could be better I suppose. And all that grass, it's quite open.

ID3 I suppose what you could put there are bollard lights or something **STILL 21** - a small white light on top. Four or five across there. They'll stop you falling off the kerb and breaking your ankle!

ID6 It's not too bad though is it?

ID10 It's always bright, it's well lit isn't it?

ID5 And it's open - it's quite a big space.

ID11 From there down to the arch. **STILL 22**

ID2 I work in B-Block but I park by there the night I'm here until 9 cos I know rather than walk down through the campus.

ID6 And it's better to walk the distance in the day than a short distance at night.

ID2 It's funny how you perceive the danger in the night whereas you don't necessarily perceive it in the day.

JW What about things like the weather - does that have a bearing on your sense of personal safety?

ID4 Yes - I hate getting wet so I go the shortest possible route.

ID3 My perception of the campus changes in October when the hour goes back. You work in Estates, look out and it's 6 o'clock and it's still light and all of a sudden it's 5 o'clock and it's dark. And it happens overnight.

ID3 It's not gradual - it's just like that (clicks fingers). And the campus does look different when it's dark.
FOCUS GROUP 1 - key themes and quotes to illustrate

Staff - Night Time Routes

ROUTE 1
ID3 My first perception was that it was very dark walking around mini roundabout down sweep into car park STILL 1 FG 1 R1

ROUTE 2
ID6 It's quite dark from the exit gates down FG 1 R2
ID1 Brook Street stands out particularly because I know there has been some problems there and that's a route I walk every day after dark so yes I'm already aware of that bit. FG 1 R2
ID9 the street lights were all out and the one on campus was out - it was extremely dark - not so much from someone attacking you point of view. but things like over-stepping the kerbs and pavement were tricky. STILL 9 FG 1 R2
ID2 I'd feel exposed there cos there's only offices there STILL 8 that close at 5-6 pm so if you have a late lecture there's no-one around there even though it looks well lit. FG 1 R2
ID4 better lighting by that Brook Street gate STILL 11 because of that lane, it's a bit scary innit! FG 1 R2
ID6 The lane should be lit really so you can see right down there.FG 1 R2

ROUTE 3
ID7 I've been to Glyntaff a couple of times but I would feel at lot less safe doing that whole route cos I don't know it. When you were taking us through it, it looked like there were alleys all over the place and steps and cos I don't know ... Whereas on this campus I know where the corridors are - that whole route to me looked a lot less safe. FG1
ID3 The main problem and it's not the fault of Kevin or Jo, is that it was under refurbishment so that top plateau was handed over to the contractor. Lots of fence due to redevelopment - contractor's portacabins. Just a temporary measure. Site will actually open up again.FG1
ID2 I feel those steps; I know it's a new building; I felt you were very exposed on those steps there STILL 12 and then having to walk through that (arch) and that was during the day. There are very steep steps.FG 1

ROUTE 4
ID2 The steps going up the side of the GBC - I mean that is the main route I would say the students use to walk up to the Halls of Residence. I mean that is quite creepy. I'd do it quite happily in the day, you know I wouldn't think anything of it, but I don't think I'd like to do it at night. FG 1
JW Is that because it's enclosed or lighting? FG1
ID2 Well because you've got the bushes and it's quite dark. FG 1
ID10 I always feel because it's quite a dark and narrow area there being close to the refectory I always feel fairly safe cos there's always people around any of the refectories if they are open so I mean when I first saw that it struck me as being dark and narrow but from my own experience of walking around that area I don't ever feel too bad around there. FG 1
ID3 The thing is if you were walking from the gatehouse to H-block I wouldn't use that route. FG1
ID2 The only thing you haven't shown is right across from the main entrance is behind Fforest Grove - the lane. It is quite dark so that's I think another area that needs looking at. FG 1 R4
ID2 It's not well lit at all. FG1 R4

501
It's quite dark up by GBC. FG1

That's dark isn't it? STILL 15 FG1 R4

That its a bit dark there. STILL 19 FG1 R4

I'd say that's one of the safest spots at night. STILL 18 FG1 R4

That needs a bit more lighting there STILL 20 (by shop). FG1 R4

I suppose what you could put there are bollard lights or something STILL 21 a small white light on top. Four or five across there. FG1 R4

It's always bright, it's well lit isn't it? FG1 R4

Key determinants of personal safety:

Physical determinants

Night-time

It's all right during the day and everything, it's just in the evening or when you get the dark nights. FG1

It's better to walk the distance in the day than a short distance at night. FG1

Darkness

My perception of the campus changes in October when the hour goes back. And it happens overnight. It's not gradual - it's just like that (clicks fingers). And the campus does look different when it's dark. FG1

Daylight

It's funny how you perceive the danger in the night whereas you don't necessarily perceive it in the day. FG1

It is a different perception in the day to the night. FG1

Lighting

I think the campus is quite well lit in that area as well - behind LRC. I never have cause for concern. FG1

I don't think it's particularly well lit in certain areas at night. Not so much in the day as night. I'm a bit worried, especially if you come out of the building alone you have to go through dark bit to get to your car or whatever. FG1

Campus boundary

Within the campus I don't feel so vulnerable as I do in the immediately adjacent streets. FG1

Generally I don't feel too bad specifically on campus but as soon as I come off it. FG1

Generally speaking though in the community of Trefforest there is always quite a lot students around but yes, still feel safer on campus. FG1

Geographical location

you're not likely to have people over there who shouldn't be there cos of where it is cos Trefforest campus is obviously in the middle of Trefforest you're more than likely to get people from there that shouldn't be there. FG1 R3

It's either very, very busy over there or completely quiet, even during the day. There's a lot of little tunnels and nooks and crannies. It's a very strange site. FG1 R3

Hard security devices

CCTV

I wish there were more cameras around the back in J-Block area. FG1

I think some cameras aren't in use even though they are there. FG1
ID2 when you ask they've never got footage of the area. FG1

Weather
ID4 I hate getting wet so I go the shortest possible route. FG1

Visibility
ID6 The lane should be lit really so you can see right down there. FG1 R2

Environmental design

Enclosed spaces
ID5 on the central avenue as you come out towards the Gatehouse there - you don't actually walk on the road do you, the path is underneath by the big bank and that's pretty scary. STILL 3 FG1 R1
ID5 You've got all the trees on one side and the bank on the other. STILL 4 FG1 R1
ID6 there was an alleyway by the tram sheds - I wouldn't want to go down there. FG1 R3
ID1 But the undergrowth is generally cut back and quite low and the lighting's OK although it could be better I suppose. And all that grass, it's quite open. FG1 R4
ID7 When you were taking us through it, it looked like there were alleys all over the place and steps FG1 R3

Alleyways
ID5 There is a horrible pathway between buildings which has horrible bushes on either side - up towards Sports Centre. FG1

Frightening spaces
ID2 The steps going up the side of the GBC - I mean that is the main route I would say the students use to walk up to the Halls of Residence. I mean that is quite creepy. I'd do it quite happily in the day, you know I wouldn't think anything of it, but I don't think I'd like to do it at night. FG1 R4
ID6 The overspill, that's probably worse STILL 2 FG1 R1
ID5 Yes, I wouldn't want to go down there. STILL 13 It's quite well lit but it's still ... phew, no .... FG1 R3
ID11 From there down to the arch. STILL 22 FG1 R4

Exposure
ID2 I feel those steps; I know it's a new building; I felt you were very exposed on those steps there STILL 12 and then having to walk through that (arch) and that was during the day. There are very steep steps. FG1 R3
ID10 That really big carpark is horrible even in the daylight. At night it's very dark. I've only had to park there once but it was winter and dark at 5 pm. It was a Friday and everyone finished early so we finished later and it's not very nice. FG1 R3
ID10 waiting at the bus stop in winter in the dark I feel exposed particularly because there's just fencing and bushes behind you. I mean generally, as I've said before, there's always people around but if I work particularly late FG1 R4
ID2 Because you are really exposed. FG1 R3
Building design

ID9 The ticket office on the other side is quite imposing really - all boarded in. STILL 10 FG1 R2

Open spaces

ID1 They are quite wide areas, with wide pavements. FG1 R2
ID5 And it's open - it's quite a big space. FG1 R4

Function of space

ID11 Down by the railway arch, the bottom end of the long car park is not very well lit and very creepy in the dark because it's not a through .... unless you're going down there for your car there's no real reason for you to be down there. I try to avoid it as much as possible. FG1
ID1 Estates car park or visitors car park being unsafe. That first bit is OK but then it goes around the corner, around the back and there's only probably a dozen spaces so I don't go there but I know that it is dark and there's trees on one side and it's just dark. FG1 R4
ID6 That's a bit hairy in the day that is. I don't like that in the day, I tend to run through it. FG1 R1
ID6 There's a problem in the tunnel STILL 6 FG1 R1
ID10 I mean I use the health centre sometimes a little bit later but there's always - and often my car is parked just below there but I always feel, even though it's dark, I always feel safe because there's there's the union. There's always people around the union and inside the union. It's really only students. R4 STILL 16 FG1

Isolated places

Example 1: Tunnel end of car park
ID6 When I parked there I tended to run in with key in hand, got in the car and lock the doors and then come out then.FG1 R1

Example 2: Glyntaff
ID10 I'm fine with Glyntaff but it does seem to empty out quicker than Trefforest does. It does get very, very quiet, very, very quickly. FG1 R3
ID2 Because there's only teaching over there. There's no Students' Union or anything like that so there's no need for people to stay there. They tend to come across here. FG1 R3
ID11 And it is very quiet over there FG1 R3

Vegetation

ID5 And with lots of bushes too - lots of places for people to jump out at you.
ID9 I didn't realise that until I looked at that. You think they are nice and green and whatever. You don't realise how many things they shade. FG1
ID11 They are quite low though there as well STILL 17 it's not as if you wouldn't be able to see someone there cos they are quite low. FG1 R4
ID2 Well because you've got the bushes and it's quite dark. FG1 R4

Availability of other routes

ID3 The thing is if you were walking from the gatehouse to H-block I wouldn't use that route. FG1 R4
ID3 I'd go along the main avenue. FG1 R4
ID10 Generally speaking though, in all of them, from what you were saying normally you would take another route and out of all of the routes really there's always an alternative. You know if you feel unsafe you know there's another way of getting there - where you want to be.FG1 R4
Social determinants

Number of other people

ID5 There's usually a lot of people about in the daytime. FG1
ID6 If you're in a group you just go with the flow. When you are on your own your self preservation kicks in and you start to think about things that aren't there, like shadows - it just heightens your awareness really. FG1
ID7 I think even when you are on your own even if there is a lot of people around, even if you don't know them you are likely to feel more safe than if you are the only person walking down the road. FG1
ID2 It depends on how many people are around. Like if it's a small group of boys. It depends who they were as well. FG1
ID10 Going down Forest Grove as well - when you get to the bottom of the hill it's fine but even when there's people in the buildings it's - that route down there - there's not that many people walking up and down there; in the dark anyway. STILL 7 FG1 R1
ID3 What's really odd is when the students go away if you're walking along just during the middle of the day that noise of chatter isn't there. It's a very odd feeling. It's very odd. I can't say I feel nervous or frightened because I don't but you do suddenly become aware of noises and a perception of space and sound. FG1 R3
ID10 The only place I really feel safe is right opposite the entrance. FG1

Nature of other people

ID9 I mean there's always people hanging about, the majority I assume are students so I don't feel threatened by them FG1 R2
ID10 I can't say I've ever felt threatened on the campus even working until that late and I think that's probably cos students are around - there's a lot of night owls out there. FG1

Proximity to other people

ID10 I always feel because it's quite a dark and narrow area there being close to the refectory I always feel fairly safe cos there's always people around any of the refectories if they are open FG1 R4

Security presence

ID7 I think it would be nice to see someone visibly walking round and just keeping a general eye out perhaps would be better. FG1
ID1 I think that would be a much higher impact. Yes, patrolling security guards with high profile clothing so everyone is aware of what their certain responsibility are. FG1
ID10 I just think that what you were saying about having somebody walking around might deter them a little bit. So yes, perhaps more visible security around might be helpful. FG1
ID6 So I think something visible ought to be done otherwise there's no deterrent and the sign is worthless then. FG1
ID5 they never smile. They are so miserable you wouldn't want to approach them anyway I don't think. FG1
ID3 The thing at night outside the union - there are security guards there and I suppose if someone did shout then they would possibly come running - I don't know. FG1 R4

Open access campus

ID6 It would just be nice to see somebody walking around up there purely because people from anywhere can walk in and they're never apprehended at
all so you could be anybody - nobody knows who is actually on campus and who is not. I think that's quite a big issue. That anyone can walk in and out at will. FG1

Security function
ID2 I would regard them as traffic wardens rather than security. It seems to be their main role. FG1

ID cards
ID6 Perhaps the staff should have some sort of security ID. FG1
ID6 Just need a staff card with a picture and an ID number on it that's it. FG1
ID2 we used to have name tags and one member of staff was being harassed and of course, they know your name so there's that element as well. Perhaps just an ID number would be OK. FG1
ID6 I think it's a good idea cos I wouldn't know unless it's people I deal with on a regular basis then I wouldn't know who was staff and who wasn't. FG1
ID3 Unfortunately it all comes down to cost doesn't it really. FG1
ID2 But if you limit too much access as well .... if you haven't got a card to get in you can't have access to the building to get to your lecture. You know, so it's restricting access in that instance so you have to be very careful how you balance it. FG1
ID5 I think a basic ID card would be a good idea just basically so you could know if it's staff so not necessarily the swipe card. FG1
ID6 It would help students as well cos they could approach people they know who are staff and it's just easier. FG1
ID3 Then it's the argument that it's an infringement on their civil rights. FG1
ID6 I go to Ystrad College and I've got an ID card and students have got to wear them irrelevant of whether they're full-time or part-time you've got to put your ID on somewhere so that they can identify you so that they haven't got strangers walking around the place and you do get stopped if you haven't got it on or if they don't know you or they're not familiar with you - they will actually stop you and say "Where's your card?" or whatever. I think it does work sometimes. FG1

Isolation
ID1 The only time on campus I've felt insecure or not safe is when I'm the last person in the office FG1
ID11 it is worse over there because you are so isolated. FG1
ID6 I think it highlights it when you are on your own. When you're with others you're chopping and just get on with what you need to do but I think when you are on your own it just heightens the fear. I think that's all. That's quite a dark area there as well. STILL 5 FG1

Proximity to traffic
ID10 once you get to bottom of the hill if there's traffic there's not a problem and I suppose even if it was dark at rush hour I wouldn't mind that. FG1

Personal determinants

Awareness
ID5 Some of the feelings are not just down to this - if I was anywhere in similar situations I would feel exactly the same FG1
Avoidance – risk reduction
ID10 the hill leading up to the crèche at night....we'll move our cars so that we don't have to... We can avoid those areas. FG1
ID2 when I'm on my course until 9 o'clock I park up under the Refectory so when I come out at 9 o'clock the car is there rather than having to walk all the way through the campus and I'd rather walk down in the morning than walk down in the dark at night. FG1
ID2 I never put myself at risk if I can help it. There's occasions when you have to but I always look at the alternatives. Not just here but in my daily life. FG1
ID10 If I know I'm working a late night then I always consider where I'm going to park my car and if I have to I'll move it. FG1

Examples:
JW So would many of you prefer not to use this car park? FG1
ID's 2, 5, 6, 9 Yes FG1 R1

Familiarity
ID9 I would feel comfortable because of working at the back of J-Block I would be comfortable with my car being parked at the back of J-Block to go out in the night because it's something that I am familiar with FG1
ID7 I've been to Glyntaff a couple of times but I would feel a lot less safe doing that whole route cos I don't know it. When you were taking us through it, it looked like there were alleys all over the place and steps FG1 R3

Personal safety induction courses
ID6 I think it would be good idea to make people aware FG1
ID5 A good idea. It could be linked to H&S like you mentioned about the security guards. A few of us said we weren't even aware that the Gatehouse covered that area. FG1
ID1 The bad side of having some sort of PS thing is that it may make people think there is a particular risk when there might not be. FG1 ID5 Yes, just an awareness rather than a fear. FG1
ID2 As part of their "Duty of Care". FG1

Vulnerability
ID1 The thing about being on your own is that I feel a bit more vulnerable and I don't know if other people serve as a distraction or if I feel more confident and less of a target cos I'm with somebody. FG1
ID6 I think it's worse if people are watching you as you say you know, you're not doing a regular commute that gives you a little bit more vulnerability doesn't it. FG1 R4

Ways to improve the campus
ID3&5 More lighting FG1
ID6&1 Some visible security person. FG1
ID10 More cameras. FG1
ID5 More security and cameras. FG1
ID3 Maybe a couple of signs telling people 'if you do feel worried phone the Gatehouse'. If they are charged with a duty of walking you to your car, just half a dozen signs just equally spaced saying 'phone this number'. FG1

Panic points:
ID1 You'd need to trust that security would respond first. FG1
ID3 Yes, definitely and wouldn't be abused. FG1
ID3 You don't want a cry wolf scenario when people just hit them for fun. FG1
ID6 Students would do it just to wind everyone up. FG1
Cos anyone can come on campus; kids and stuff. They're bound to abuse it.

I wouldn't want that and find it just raises people's fear levels.

But it's the society we live in these days isn't it.

I think a basic ID card would be a good idea just basically so you could know if it's staff so not necessarily the swipe card.

University security guards patrolling Brook Street?

I wouldn't like that really.

Well I think the university should be part of the community and if you've got a security guard you're not giving the right message really.

But then if you've got them patrolling on campus why not have them just off campus as well if it's part of the community.

Would they have a legal right to be outside the campus?

What about having one just inside the gate there cos they would just be within earshot.

Personal measures to improve your personal safety:

With someone else, don't go by yourself.

Don't park car behind LRC.
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Summary of key themes from analysis of sample focus group - staff at Glamorgan
FOCUS GROUP 1 key themes: Staff - Night Time Routes

Physical determinants
- Night-time
- Darkness
- Daylight
- Lighting
- Campus boundary
- Geographical location
- Hard security devices
- Weather
- Environmental design
  - Alleyways
  - Availability of alternative routes
  - Building design
  - Enclosed spaces
  - Exposure
  - Frightening spaces
  - Function of space
  - Isolated places
  - Open spaces
  - Vegetation
  - Visibility

Social determinants
- Number of other people
- Nature of other people
- Proximity to other people
- Security presence
- Open access campus
- Security function
- ID cards
- Isolation
- Proximity to traffic

Personal determinants
- Awareness
- Avoidance – risk reduction/ Personal safety strategies
- Familiarity
- Personal safety induction courses
- Vulnerability

Ways to improve the campus:
- More lighting
- Visible security person
- More cameras
- Signs
- Panic points
- University security guards patrolling Brook Street
- Personal measures to improve your personal safety
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Sample transcript analysis stage 1- staff at Loughborough
FOCUS GROUP 5 - KEY THEMES - REDUCTION OF DATA

Staff at Loughborough University - Glamorgan VRs

ROUTE 1

ID3 It's quite well lit so I'd feel quite safe in that respect umm I'd probably feel safer in a group umm because obviously it just looked really quiet so I think if I was on my own I'd be a bit ... FG5 R1

ID5 There's some dense shrubbery FG5 R1

ID3 I suppose it's somewhere for people to hide FG5 R1

ID6 It seems extremely bright FG5 R1

ID6 Well it struck me that there were certain places that were very bright - wide open spaces where most people would feel reasonably comfortable; I'd certainly feel quite comfortable and at other parts during the route umm you've got dark areas, you've got shrubbery which at times is very close to the path, quite high and I think they often there's this battle between the concept of personal safety and the work of the estates department making everything seem pleasant - it can be quite pleasant during the day but at night time there's a concept of risk maybe in that certain area - is it dangerous in itself? FG5 R1

ID5 there was a bit where the bushes were right on the edge there, where you've got a wall through and it's sort of enclosed spaces where like an alleyway umm where you'd feel vulnerable perhaps FG5 R1

ID5 Yes because that's fairly dim isn't it STILL 1 FG5 R1

ID2 But the car parks are quite open and - apart from there STILL 2 FG5 R1

ID2 I do feel generally safer on university campuses because I have a perception that they are better sort of umm that they are more secure- that there is security there even if there isn't always a 24 hour porter. I feel if that was an ordinary car park in town then I might be a bit more nervous than on campus FG5 R1

ID6 I think it would vary from the environment that the campus was situated in - from one like ours, but I am thinking of a city centre campus where your personal safety issues might be extremely high umm because of the environment they are located in FG5 R1

ID4 But it's about having choice as well - I mean if you want to walk across a car park you can walk across the middle - you don't have to walk along the side here STILL 3 where there is a path but it's next to a hedge. I think there are a couple of places where there wasn't much choice - you had a wall and a hedge and even walking in the middle of that you could still be grabbed at from out of a hedge FG5 R1

JW What would you do in advance, to plan ahead, if you were going to a different campus to make yourself safer? FG5 R1

ID1 I would look at the maps to make sure I know exactly which buildings I needed to go to, how to get from one place to another so I wasn't just wondering around getting lost and things like that FG5 R1

ID2 And where to park so I'd be nearest to where I needed to be FG5 R1

ID6 Yes I think I tend to take into account where it is - before I go somewhere like Manchester, you know, what steps I might take would be quite different than if I was going to Leicester university or Nottingham Trent - the difference - you know my perception of personal safety might vary tremendously FG5 R1

ID6 I probably wouldn't do a great deal other than make sure I know where I'm going to and where I can park my car FG5 R1

ID2 if I was going during the day I wouldn't be that worried but I'd take, I'd be more precautionous about finding where I was going if I was going in the night definitely FG5 R1

ID6 I didn't like the umm - there was a container right at the first umm - images that we saw FG5 R1

ID2 That looks quite dark STILL 4 FG5 R1

ID6 Yes you don't know what's behind that in any direction STILL 5 FG5 R1
ID6 I think signs helps FG5 R1
ID6 That's right – yeah windows, signage, umm for anything like this. I didn't notice any CCTV around FG5 R1
ID2 That makes me feel a bit safer but not massively because they FG5 R1
ID3 Get switched off FG5 R1
ID2 Yeah, is it switched on, is there any camera in it, is anyone looking? FG5 R1
ID1 Going back to the vegetation thing – and CCTV – before I actually had my bag snatched at Nottingham university campus and there was CCTV but they'd let the trees grow too tall so they couldn't see anything FG5 R1
ID2 Yeah I did kind of look in car parks and things – I think I'm aware and it makes me feel a little bit better but I do look out for them (CCTV) FG5 R1
ID6 As an outsider the uniforms don't scream security STILL 6 FG5 R1
ID6 I mean obviously if you were related to the university you'd know what your security looks like what - but umm a visible patrolling presence be it on foot or in a vehicle, marked quite clearly as security is – there's a feel good factor about that FG5 R1
ID5 On the back of the uniform they could have 'security' or something FG5 R1
ID6 I think I'd be reassured FG5 R1
ID5 I think especially at night-time you'd feel more secure FG5 R1
ID6 it's alright having a security presence but it needs to be seen and it needs to be balanced as well because you don't want it o be like a prison FG5 R1

ROUTE 2

ID1 I think that car park felt quite safe – it had the barriers and also the vegetation around the car park was quite sort of low and while it still looked nice so that's better FG5 R2
ID2 The fact that it's day time is a big factor for me – I just feel safer in the day anyway so FG5 R2
JW Is that the over-riding influence? FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah probably well err not always. I mean I guess there's some places where I'd feel more nervous than others but if I was maybe if I was in a town and I kind of got waylaid down a street that I felt was very deserted than I'd feel nervous then but I think sort of round the campus generally in the daytime when there's people around then I'd immediately feel safer in the daytime FG5 R2
ID1 I think I'd feel less safe as you sort of come off the campus FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah that wall that – the wall seems a bit strange to me STILL 7 I don't know why because there's like an alleyway that goes down FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah I might not feel very safe going down there STILL 8 I might think twice about whether I needed to go down there or not FG5 R2
ID3 It's almost like a bit of a contrast because the campus buildings look quite pleasant but then you come to the other side of the road and it kind of looks very different and possibly if I was walking along the road I'd probably stick to the campus side a bit more to feel a bit safer I think. FG5 R2
ID1 I think I'd just maybe feel safer rightly or wrongly on campus because you feel more like – who – maybe who is on campus is controlled slightly more but in reality that might not be the case in the reality but that's what you'd think and then going off campus to where there could be absolutely anyone FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah because my first university wasn't a campus university, it was a town university so the buildings did look like university buildings but I think those are the cues I guess that if the building has got lots of labels on then or maybe just the landscape is kept quite neat and it's a university property or if it's not so, you know if it's residential everyone has their own tastes and what they do – so little cues like that – obviously that's very landscaped STILL 9 and the campus is all very controlled. FG5 R2
Yeah because sometimes I've got buses to other university and if it's not clear where to get off that's quite worrying because you don't want to get off at the wrong place and end up where you can't get onto campus easily and your going to be kind of wondering around.

Yeah so that - I wouldn't really know to get off there - if I realised it's the right stop.

Need a big sign as well.

And also is that a map? That makes me feel better - there was a map in the previous shot and if there's a map when you arrive on the bus it's great to have a map there straight away, so you can go right I know where I'm going - you don't have to kind of wonder around every place looking kind of for a cue where to go.

Usually you'd go to the university's website you'd usually find you can print it off and I use the travel websites as well, like there's travel transport direct or something and I use that to plan my route to get to the university and which place I need to get, to get the train or whatever so I would use that.

I think one of my choices for coming to Loughborough umm rather than picking an inner city campus was on that sort of basis in terms of levels of crime and things like that so I think it would influence my decision.

Yeah there was a perception that that would be safer. If I was driving somewhere I think I'd feel better with one of these out-of-town ones because you don't have that worry about getting lost in a one way system and ending up where you don't want to be and you know you'd probably be able to find it ok linking it in with the reputation of the city, sometimes the reputation of certain areas of a city - **** in Bristol, Toxteth in Liverpool - quite simply areas like that do and certainly the city campuses area different beasts to non-city environments.

And it is where I'm familiar with - if I know the city; if I know the city generally, somewhere like Newcastle, I'd feel happier there even if I don't know the university campus - it's just that familiarity. Maybe it's you just the area that I'm from - cities in that area I'm a bit more familiar with so I'm less worried about that.

But the social environment was an issue on the night-time route but is it as much of an issue on this one because it's in the day so it's not so much of an issue?

I'd feel it was slightly less of an issue personally umm because it was day-time but it does strike me as being quiet still so.

But there's traffic there as well - I know you umm said about traffic in terms of someone could stop and pinch your handbag or something but I think having traffic about makes me feel safer.

It's more if there's no traffic and suddenly one car comes then you start to panic, if you've got your back towards it - I always try and walk towards the traffic. Things like that - just cars milling around makes you feel a bit better.

And the people issue - it doesn't really bother me as much - what I feel about having people around me is if someone was too close to me - in my personal space, like if I'm in a busy high street and there's loads of people then that is a normal environment but if I was in an empty space like that and someone was really close to me then I would feel scared and uncomfortable.

You wouldn't get me down those steps. Ha ha!

No there's no-one around either.

And some of it was really dimly lit.
Yeah it looked like a building site FG5 R3

That's a bit prison-like STILL 10 FG5 R3

It's almost as if that fencing area indicates there's a problem there - you know -
either going to keep people in or keep people out FG5 R3

It’s funny that because it’s not the sort of fence that I’d imagine somebody
leaping over to get in yet it makes me feel unsafe just from the look of it FG5 R3

And the kind of fence, you know – it’s hard, a very hard fence FG5 R3

It just looks quite aggressive FG5 R3

Yeah, I think it just gives the impression of somewhere that is, yeah that is
industrial and I think that kind of building site feel that it’s got – even just the
comes look threatening! STILL 11 FG5 R3

The cone bit, the coned bit in the last section just looked untidy and that nobody
really cared about that area FG5 R3

Yeah like you say it’s almost as if that kind of feel that it’s not much cared about
or it makes you feel unsafe FG5 R3

We did mention it but I think it’s important because I noticed there didn’t seem
to be any graffiti in place you know on the previous photos that you showed us
so you’ve either not got a problem with it or it’s cleaned up pretty quickly and
and it – if you do get it and it’s cleaned up quickly then you get that perception
that people care therefore it’s a safe environment or there isn’t any. Again you
go to environments where you’ve got lots and lots of it and whilst there’s
nothing threatening about graffiti itself, the very fact it’s there – it feels bad. FG5
R3

Even things like the portocabins make me feel nervous, just a temporary thing
maybe FG5 R3

Maybe if you knew the environment and knew that thing were doing work and
knew it was only temporary but because you don’t know the environment those
portocabins could have been there years and years FG5 R3

I know where’s a lot of work going on at York campus and you often find that
you’ll go so far down a route and then it’ll be blocked off and you have to double
back – things like that make you quite nervous like you know you might not be
able get round a certain way or – that makes me nervous so I do think it doesn’t
seem to be as stringent when building work is going on FG5 R3

I can’t really explain why – it’s just something about it makes you less
comfortable FG5 R3

I think it’s because it’s not permanent – yet. It’s like there’s no guarantee that
there’ll be someone around if you need somebody in a hurry FG5 R3

Also there’s no windows FG5 R3

So lack of windows then you feel you can’t be observed? FG5 R3

Well yeah, it’s more threatening without them but that’s quite badly lit as well
wasn’t it. The lighting is not brilliant there FG5 R3

The bits where there that looked like the entrance and things like that where
there were a couple of people still there and they looked like a permanent
building – I’d be heading towards there definitely. that looked like a safe bit
yeah STILL 12 places like that looks quite safe. FG5 R3

But the lighting doesn’t seem as well thought out as the other campus FG5 R3

Certainly I think two of the car parks looked well dodgy; not just because they
had comes over it, it was very, very dark FG5 R3

Because even though there were cars there that made you think there were
people around it just felt really isolated like if you were walking through there on
your own you’d be the only person possibly on the whole of that campus. It just
seemed very isolated. FG5 R3

KM  do you have any preference about the different kinds of lighting, you know
sodium lighting, light spilling out of buildings – do you think that makes a
difference? FG5 R3

I guess I don’t really know the difference. I only sort of well you’ve got the
overhead lights FG5 R3
ID5 Well I think that's quite reassuring where you've got the glass front door and you can see people in there ~
STILL 13 FG5 R3
ID2 Only because light spilling out of a building suggests it's kind of habitable — there's people in there and that's nice FG5 R3
ID1 I know as in car parks types of lighting that those in car parks might in some ways do as much damage as good because it creates shadows FG5 R3
ID4 I think the thing is with outdoors you can always see that it's dark — you're going to go into the dark at some point but with a building you're going in — there's light beyond whereas where you are going there it's dark beyond so permanently not knowing what's round the next corner FG5 R3
JW Based on what you've been saying about this route at night; would you feel happy doing it in the day? FG5 R3
ID2 Happier than at night FG5 R3
ID1 There's still be all the building work. I think you'd probably feel safer but not totally comfortable FG5 R3
ID4 it wasn't as open as the other two we've seen. FG5 R3
JW So openness is better for your personal safety? FG5 R3
ID4 For me, yes FG5 R3
ID2 I think generally apart from things like commons and parks and things FG5 R3

ROUTE 4

ID5 I wouldn't like to walk down there even in the day light on my own!! FG5 R4
ID5 Yeah this bit ~ here with the overhanging and the bridge down there — potentially threatening FG5 R4
JW Is that because specifically it's off campus FG5 R4
ID1 It feels very enclosed FG5 R4
ID5 Yeah and isolated as well — there's no-one, there's narrow pavements. It just looks if someone's coming the other way and you know FG5 R4
ID5 I think you were saying about things look well maintained **** overgrown tree, bit you know, that indicates it's a bit wild, not very well kept FG5 R4
ID2 It's the use of — you know how we were saying how you distinguish between what's the university and what's not? I was thinking of colour, like the use of colour; you know that entrance bit they had the blue G and then the blue carried on and you showed us the entrance and it was all kind of blue and nicely painted and yes this is there and then it kind of stops and you go oh great — do you know what I mean? It's almost like colour co-ordinating FG5 R4
ID2 It does kind of make it look nice FG5 R4
JW What about the bit that went through the building? Did you feel safer? FG5 R4
ID2 I feel safer in the building FG5 R4
JW Do you automatically feel safer? FG5 R4
ID1 I thought that was quite interesting — doing it in the daytime but back here if I'm — in the daytime I feel safe but at night and even in the winter if it gets to like 4 o'clock it's dark and I'm in the office on my own .... and I do sometimes feel oh I think I should go home now FG5 R4
ID1 Partly for me it's not knowing if you're the only person — there could be someone in like the office three doors down but I don't know FG5 R4
ID2 But that kind of building that we walked through then just feels a lot more open and a bit more — it was very well lit — it felt a bit more open plan even though FG5 R4
ID1 a bit more of a public space wasn't it? Whereas where out office area you wouldn't go there unless you had a reason to FG5 R4
ID2 But there's a route on York campus just like that when the alternative is to go on a night is to go round the outside where it's really, really dark and by the lake or there's through the building which was well lit and you kind of had that moment
of contact with humanity and then you go out again into the scary world — it’s
kind of reassuring. FG5 R4
ID2 I can’t remember actually. I don’t think we did when I was a student; you got
your attack alarm and that kind of stuff. FG5 R4
ID3 No I didn’t. I think it might have been useful — not to the extent that it would
make you really anxious but just so that you would know if there was a
procedure FG5 R4
ID4 we are meant too let somebody else know even if they are not on campus if
you are working on campus FG5 R4
KM When you mentioned about entrance do you have ID badges? FG5 R4
ID6 No I mean there’s two different policies umm — presently staff are supposed to
wear them at all times on university property with certain exceptions FG5 R4
ID6 I mean it varies — some people do wear them all the time and as we’ve heard
other people leave them in cars. Students have them and are required to
produce them on demand .... but they don’t have to wear them .... it doesn’t
really seem to create any great difficulty to be honest. But like I say with the
staff, most staff seem to have them on and as you say, some don’t FG5 R4
ID6 It’s interesting talking about new staff because we have a very structured
personal safety input for students but they are quite easy because they come in
in one great dollop but staff come throughout the year. FG5 R4
ID1 We went on a staff induction and I don’t think there was anything about
personal safety. FG5 R4
ID1 There was stuff about Health and Safety .... but I don’t recall being told
anything about personal safety. FG5 R4

ROUTE 5

ID2 If you say that’s like a student areas and if I knew that and knew the area I’d
probably feel ok round there but as a first time visitor I’d feel quite
ID5 Yeah the lighting is very poor there isn’t it? STILL 15 FG5 R5
ID2 Yeah — if this was my first time walking to the station I’d probably be quite wary,
yeh sort of round there STILL 16 FG5 R5
KM This gate is the only way on on this die of the campus FG5 R5
ID2 So if you were on campus late you’d have to go out the other — go around? FG5
R5
ID6 No it’s to stop students walking down Ashby Drive at 3 o’clock in the morning
and lifting up windscreen wipers on the resident’s cars and pinching garden
gnomes FG5 R5
ID5 There’s graffiti there FG5 R5
KM This is actually the university perimeter FG5 R5
ID4 My God that’s even worse and you’ve got to go by both of those to get out or
in? STILL 17 FG5 R5
ID5 They could so with some lighting on the walls or something FG5 R5
ID3 I’d be a bit wary about that especially if it was round about 11 o’clock because
you’d know - you know after 11 it’s probably less likely that people will be
around as well so if it got to around that time I’d be quite anxious I think FG5 R5
ID2 Yeah — I think once I’d done it a few times I probably would be ok if I knew that
was quite a busy area. I don’t think I’d worry too much but it would be the first
few times FG5 R5
ID3 It seems really close so that’s reassuring as well FG5 R5
ID1 And the actual station seemed quite well lit FG5 R5
ID1 I would be wary about a train station at night if it was unmanned FG5 R5
JW A panic button FG5 R5
ID2 I quite like things like that except that I never trust that they are going to be
working all the time! It’s always a worry FG5 R5
KM Because all the stations on the network have information points which are also
panic buttons FG5 R5
I think that's a really good idea FG5 R5
I think maybe there was some earlier bits that were similar to before – I think – yeah like there STILL 18 with the foliage and things FG5 R5
Yeah very high conifers, weren't there? FG5 R5
And pushing it onto the footpath as well FG5 R5
I think maybe they are obscuring the lights in places, sort of dark shadows FG5 R5
Yeah that feels a bit sort of a bit overbearing somehow STILL 19 FG5 R5
It seems very empty at night-time FG5 R5
It's funny with Halls of Residence because I think I do feel kind of safer especially with students around but I also feel that maybe they are a bit of a target as well for people to loiter around and so it's kind of a mixed thing in some ways FG5 R5
It's looking quite dark towards the edges STILL 20 FG5 R5
But that looks so bright night-time FG5 R5
Like lighting is a signal of how – where you are on campus and even if there weren't fences to tell you that you weren't on campus anymore you could maybe guess because all the lights have suddenly like disappeared FG5 R5
Would it make a difference for example that they are very tall bushes but they are also the grey industrial fence about 9 foot tall so there is no way on other than to climb it - ie knowing that it's a very secure perimeter rather than just a case of bushes. What do you think? FG5 R5
It could work both ways because if someone was running after you, you wouldn't be able to get out FG5 R5
I just think if you want to get on there is always a way, you know, probably there's a way for them to get on FG5 R5
I don't think universities can go down the level where you've got perimeters totally secure. At the end of the day you are trying to sell the place to people and you want it to be welcoming and it's supposed to be like a university not a prison FG5 R5
Yeah I really didn't like the on other campus that very big fence – you know no-one's going to jump over it but it doesn't make you feel safer FG5 R5
It just feels harsh and quite aggressive
Without making you feel especially safer FG5 R5
it just heightens your anxiety like you say - you know if someone's got security dogs you don't want to go in – it's not a very welcoming environment – as long as you know it's secure - well for me it's more of a security presence; like you see the cars going round, things like that – that makes me feel safer than a big fence FG5 R5
That bit looks nice and safe for some reason STILL 22 – I don't know whether it sounds silly but I don't know whether it's to do with the grass and stuff – it just looks nice so it makes you feel a bit safer I think than the bit before when you just saw this fence then this massive dark behind it FG5 R5
You know there's no-one lurking about as well FG5 R5
But I don't like to feel too exposed – and I think somewhere like that where it's kind of got open-ness but it's also got a feeling of people being there and err in the buildings – you don't feel exposed – you feel like – you don't feel closed in FG5 R5
I'm just wondering overall – how safe would you say our campus is or for each one in turn? First impressions? FG5
The main one I'd say looked pretty safe FG5
The main one I would say is pretty safe. Fairly safe – bits that could be improved, like they could on any campus – like with some of the walkways were a bit enclosed and at the front with trees but generally very well lit generally FG5
Cut the shrubs down FG5
Yeah – the lighting I was impressed with – it feels very well lit and it feels like there’s always be somewhere that you could feel safe – you don’t have to go down dark paths FG5

There was a first impression which is why I asked the question right at the beginning – lighting levels I thought were very good FG5

But like I say it appeared to generally be a very bright campus at night which I think was very positive. Obviously there were certain areas where it was very dark but the fact that so much of it was so light....Umm, my gut reaction – it seemed on the face of it to be a reasonably safe campus – but I don’t like the skips and you know the temporary buildings on either site; I think they seemed to be a bit of a problem but generally speaking it didn’t feel particularly unsafe. It didn’t feel like an area that would raise a lot of concerns. FG5

Yeah I’d agree with that. I think I’d possibly feel safer on that campus than this one (Loughborough) if I obviously came on as a stranger or a visitor umm because of things like the lighting, the openness of some of the areas FG5

The most important bit for me is that the walkways are lit up umm so that if there’s set routes around campus that you know where you’re going and you know that they’ll be lit that’s what’s kind of important to me so if there’s clear routes around and they’re lit that’s the most important. FG5

There didn’t seem to be many signs on the routes that you photographed FG5

But on the subject of kind of naming buildings, how important do you – I know you mentioned the fact that the function of the building is often not very clear on signs – do you think that’s – is that a personal safety issue? Knowing that you’re near a particular kind of building? FG5

I think it’s probably more important at night you know, knowing whether buildings are academic or social buildings. Because an academic building wouldn’t necessarily help me feel safer because you think it would be empty at night FG5
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Sample transcript analysis stage 2 - staff at Loughborough
FOCUS GROUP 5 – ANALYSIS 2 – key themes and quotes to illustrate

Staff at Loughborough University - Glamorgan VRs

ROUTE 1

ID3 It's quite well lit so I'd feel quite safe in that respect umm I'd probably feel safer in a group umm because obviously it just looked really quiet so I think if I was on my own I'd be a bit FG5 R1
ID5 There's some dense shrubbery FG5 R1
ID3 I suppose it's somewhere for people to hide FG5 R1
ID6 It seems extremely bright FG5 R1
ID6 Well it struck me that there were certain places that were very bright – wide open spaces where most people would feel reasonably comfortable; I'd certainly feel quite comfortable and at other parts during the route umm you've got dark areas, you've got shrubbery which at times is very close to the path, quite high and I think they often there's this battle between the concept of personal safety and the work of the estates department making everything seem pleasant – it can be quite pleasant during the day but at night time there's a concept of risk maybe in that certain area – is it dangerous in itself? FG5 R1
ID5 there was a bit where the bushes were right on the edge there, where you've got a wall through and it's sort of enclosed spaces where like an alleyway umm where you'd feel vulnerable perhaps FG5 R1

ROUTE 2

ID1 I think that car park felt quite safe – it had the barriers and also the vegetation around the car park was quite sort of low and while it still looked nice so that's better FG5 R2
ID2 The fact that it's day time is a big factor for me – I just feel safer in the day anyway so FG5 R2

ROUTE 3

ID2 You wouldn't get me down those steps. Ha ha! FG5 R3
ID2 No there's no-one around either FG5 R3
ID5 And some of it was really dimly lit FG5 R3
ID3 Yeah it looked like a building site FG5 R3
ID1 That's a bit prison-like STILL 10 FG5 R3

ROUTE 4

ID5 I wouldn't like to walk down there even in the day light on my own! FG5 R4
ID5 Yeah this bit STILL 14 here with the overhanging and the bridge down there – potentially threatening FG5 R4
ID1 It feels very enclosed FG5 R4
ID5 Yeah and isolated as well – there's no-one, there's narrow pavements. It just looks if someone's coming the other way and you know FG5 R4

ROUTE 5

ID2 If you say that's like a student areas and if I knew that and knew the area I'd probably feel ok round there but as a first time visitor I'd feel quite
ID5 Yeah the lighting is very poor there isn't it? STILL 15 FG5 R5
ID2 Yeah – if this was my first time walking to the station I'd probably be quite wary, yeah sort of round there STILL 16 FG5 R5
Physical determinants

Night-time
ID1 it seems very empty at night-time FG5 R5

Darkness
ID2 That looks quite dark STILL 4 FG5 R1
ID6 Yes you don’t know what’s behind that in any direction STILL 5 FG5 R1
ID1 It’s looking quite dark towards the edges STILL 20 FG5 R5

Daylight
JW Is that (daylight) the over-riding influence? FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah probably well err not always. I mean I guess there’s some places where I’d feel more nervous than others but if I was maybe if I was in a town and I kind of got waylaid down a street that I felt was very deserted than I’d feel nervous then but I think sort of round the campus generally in the daytime when there’s people around then I’d immediately feel safer in the daytime FG5 R2
JW Based on what you’ve been saying about this route at night; would you feel happy doing it in the day? FG5 R3
ID2 Happier than at night FG5 R3
ID1 There’s still be all the building work. I think you’d probably feel safer but not totally comfortable FG5 R3

Lighting
ID5 Yes because that’s fairly dim isn’t it STILL 1 FG5 R1
ID5 But the lighting doesn’t seem as well thought out as the other campus FG5 R3
ID6 Certainly I think two of the car parks looked well dodgy; not just because they had cones over it, it was very, very dark FG5 R3
KM do you have any preference about the different kinds of lighting, you know sodium lighting, light spilling out of buildings – do you think that makes a difference? FG5 R3
ID2 I guess I don’t really know the difference. I only sort of well you’ve got the overhead lights FG5 R3
ID2 Only because light spilling out of a building suggests it’s kind of habitable – there’s people in there and that’s nice FG5 R3
ID1 I know as in car parks types of lighting that those in car parks might in some ways do as much damage as good because it creates shadows FG5 R3
ID4 I think the thing is with outdoors you can always see that it’s dark – your going to go into the dark at some point but with a building you’re going in – there’s light beyond whereas where you are going there it’s dark beyond so permanently not knowing what’s round the next corner FG5 R3
ID2 But that looks so bright STILL 21 FG5 R5
ID1 Like lighting is a signal of how – where you are on campus and even if there weren’t fences to tell you that you weren’t on campus anymore you could maybe guess because all the lights have suddenly like disappeared FG5 R5

Campus boundary
ID2 I do feel generally safer on university campuses because I have a perception that they are better sort of umm that they are more secure- that there is security there even if there isn’t always a 24 hour porter. I feel if that was an ordinary car park in town then I might be a bit more nervous than on campus FG5 R1
ID1 I think I’d feel less safe as you sort of come off the campus FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah I might not feel very safe going down there STILL 8 I might think twice about whether I needed to go down there or not FG5 R2
ID3 It’s almost like a bit of a contrast because the campus buildings look quite pleasant but then you come to the other side of the road and it kind of looks
very different and possibly if I was walking along the road I'd probably stick to
the campus side a bit more to feel a bit safer I think. FG5 R2

ID1 I think I'd just maybe feel safer rightly or wrongly on campus because you feel
more like - who - maybe who is on campus is controlled slightly more but in
reality that might not be the case in the reality but that's what you'd think and
then going off campus to where there could be absolutely anyone FG5 R2

ID2 Yeah because my first university wasn't a campus university, it was a town
university so the buildings did look like university buildings but I think those are
the cues I guess that if the building has got lots of labels on then or maybe just
the landscape is kept quite neat and it's a university property or if it's not so,
you know if it's residential everyone has their own tastes and what they do - so
little cues like that - obviously that's very landscaped STILL 9 and the campus
is all very controlled. FG5 R2

Geographical location

ID6 I think it would vary from the environment that the campus was situated in -
from one like ours, but I am thinking of a city centre campus where your
personal safety issues might be extremely high umm because of the
environment they are located in FG5 R1

ID6 linking it in with the reputation of the city, sometimes the reputation of certain
areas of a city - ***** in Bristol, Toxteth in Liverpool - quite simply areas like
that they do and certainly the city campuses area different beasts to non-city
environments. FG5 R2

Signage and campus maps

ID6 I think signs helps FG5 R1
ID1 Need a big sign as well FG5 R2
ID2 And also is that a map? That makes me feel better - there was a map in the
previous shot and if there's a map when you arrive on the bus it's great to have
a map there straight away, so you can go right I know where I'm going - you
don't have to kind of wonder around every place looking kind of for a cue where
to go. FG5 R2

Hard security devices e.g. CCTV

ID6 I didn't notice any CCTV around FG5 R1
ID2 That makes me feel a bit safer but not massively because they FG5 R1
ID3 Get switched off FG5 R1
ID2 Yeah, is it switched on, is there any camera in it, is anyone looking? FG5 R1
ID1 Going back to the vegetation thing - and CCTV - before I actually had my bag
snatched at Nottingham university campus and there was CCTV but they'd let
the trees grow too tall so they couldn't see anything FG5 R1
ID2 Yeah I did kind of look in car parks and things - I think I'm aware and it makes
me feel a little bit better but I do look out for them (CCTV) FG5 R1

Transport modes

ID2 Yeah because sometimes I've got buses to other university and if it's not clear
where to get off that's quite worrying because you don't want to get off at the
wrong place and end up where you can't get onto campus easily and your going
to be kind of wondering around FG5 R2
ID2 Yeah so that - I wouldn't really know to get off there - if I realised it's the right
stop FG5 R2
ID3 It seems really close so that's reassuring as well FG5 R5
ID1 And the actual station seemed quite well lit FG5 R5
ID1 I would be wary about a train station at night if it was unmanned FG5 R5
JW A panic button FG5 R5
ID2 I quite like things like that except that I never trust that they are going to be
working all the time! It's always a worry FG5 R5
Because all the stations on the network have information points which are also panic buttons.

I think that's a really good idea.

Inside buildings

I feel safer in the building.

I thought that was quite interesting — doing it in the daytime but back here if I'm in the daytime I feel safe but at night and even in the winter if it gets to 4 o'clock it's dark and I'm in the office on my own .... and I do sometimes feel oh I think I should go home now.

But that kind of building that we walked through then just feels a lot more open and a bit more — it was very well lit — it felt a bit more open plan even though.

a bit more of a public space wasn't it? Whereas where out office area you wouldn't go there unless you had a reason to.

But there's a route on York campus just like that when the alternative is to go on a night is to go round the outside where it's really, really dark and by the lake or there's through the building which was well lit and you kind of had that moment of contact with humanity and then you go out again into the scary world — it's kind of reassuring.

Environmental design

Enclosed spaces

But the car parks are quite open and — apart from there.

Alleyways

Yeah that wall that — the wall seems a bit strange to me.

This gate is the only way on this side of the campus.

So if you were on campus late you'd have to go out the other — go around?

There's graffiti there.

This is actually the university perimeter.

My God that's even worse and you've got to go by both of those to get out or in?

There is some lighting on the walls or something.

I'd be a bit wary about that especially if it was round about 11 o'clock because you'd know - you know after 11 it's probably less likely that people will be around as well so if it got to around that time I'd be quite anxious I think.

Yeah — I think once I'd done it a few times I probably would be ok if I knew that was quite a busy area. I don't think I'd worry too much but it would be the first few times.

Fencing

It's almost as if that fencing area indicates there's a problem there — you know — either going to keep people in or keep people out.

It's funny that because it's not the sort of fence that I'd imagine somebody leaping over to get in yet it makes me feel unsafe just from the look of it.

And the kind of fence, you know — it's hard, a very hard fence.

It just looks quite aggressive.

Building design e.g. windows

Also there's no windows.

So lack of windows then you feel you can't be observed?
ID5: Well yeah, it's more threatening without them but that's quite badly lit as well wasn't it. The lighting is not brilliant there FG5 R3
ID2: The bits where there that looked like the entrance and things like that where there were a couple of people still there and they looked like a permanent building – I'd be heading towards there definitely. that looked like a safe bit yeah STILL 12 places like that looks quite safe. FG5 R3
ID5: Well I think that's quite reassuring where you've got the glass front door and you can see people in there STILL 13 FG5 R3

Obstructions
ID6: I didn't like the umm - there was a container right at the first umm - images that we saw FG5 R1

Temporary structures
ID2: Even things like the portocabins make me feel nervous, just a temporary thing maybe FG5 R3
ID1: Maybe if you knew the environment and knew that thing were doing work and knew it was only temporary but because you don't know the environment those portocabins could have been there years and years FG5 R3
ID2: I know where's a lot of work going on at York campus and you often find that you'll go so far down a route and then it'll be blocked off and you have to double back – things like that make you quite nervous like you know you might not be able get round a certain way or – that makes me nervous so I do think it doesn't seem to be as stringent when building work is going on FG5 R3
ID: I can't really explain why – it's just something about it makes you less comfortable FG5 R3
ID4: I think it's because it's not permanent – yet. It's like there's no guarantee that there'll be someone around if you need somebody in a hurry FG5 R3

Open spaces
ID4: it wasn't as open as the other two we've seen. FG5 R3
JW: So openness is better for your personal safety? FG5 R3
ID4: For me, yes FG5 R3
ID2: I think generally apart from things like commons and parks and things FG5 R3
ID3: That bit looks nice and safe for some reason STILL 22 – I don't know whether it sounds silly but I don't know whether it's to do with the grass and stuff – it just looks nice so it makes you feel a bit safer I think than the bit before when you just saw this fence then this massive dark behind it FG5 R5
ID1: You know there's no-one lurking about as well FG5 R5
ID2: But I don't like to feel too exposed – and I think somewhere like that where it's kind of got open-ness but it's also got a feeling of people being there and err in the buildings – you don't feel exposed – you feel like – you don't feel closed in FG5 R5

Function of space
ID2: It's the use of – you know how we were saying how you distinguish between what's the university and what's not? I was thinking of colour, like the use of colour; you know that entrance bit they had the blue G and then the blue carried on and you showed us the entrance and it was all kind of blue and nicely painted and yes this is there and then it kind of stops and you go oh great – do you know what I mean? It's almost like colour co-ordinating FG5 R4
ID2: It does kind of make it look nice FG5 R4
ID2: It's funny with Halls of Residence because I think I do feel kind of safer especially with students around but I also feel that maybe they are a bit of a target as well for people to loiter around and so it's kind of a mixed thing in some ways FG5 R5
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Isolated places
ID3 Because even though there were cars there that made you think there were people around it just felt really isolated like if you were walking through there on your own you'd be the only person possibly on the whole of that campus. It just seemed very isolated. FG5 R3

Maintenance
ID2 Yeah, I think it just gives the impression of somewhere that is, yeah that is industrial and I think that kind of building site feel that it's got — even just the comes look threatening! STILL 11 FG5 R3
ID1 The cone bit, the coned bit in the last section just looked untidy and that nobody really cared about that area FG5 R3
ID2 Yeah like you say it's almost as if that kind of feel that it's not much cared about or it makes you feel unsafe FG5 R3
ID6 We did mention it but I think it's important because I noticed there didn't seem to be any graffiti in place you know on the previous photos that you showed us so you've either not got a problem with it or its cleaned up pretty quickly erm and it — if you do get it and it's cleaned up quickly then you get that perception that people care therefore it's a safe environment or there Isn't any. Again you go to environments where you've got lots and lots of it and whilst there's nothing threatening about graffiti itself, the very fact it's there — it feels bad. FG5 R3
ID5 I think you were saying about things look well maintained ***** overgrown tree, bit you know, that indicates it's a bit wild, not very well kept FG5 R4

Availability of alternative routes
ID4 But it's about having choice as well — I mean if you want to walk across a car park you can walk across the middle — you don't have to walk along the side here STILL 3 where there is a path but it's next to a hedge. I think there are a couple of places where there wasn't much choice — you had a wall and a hedge and even walking in the middle of that you could still be grabbed at from out of a hedge FG5 R1

Vegetation
ID2 I think maybe there was some earlier bits that were similar to before — I think — yeah like there STILL 18 with the foliage and things FG5 R5
ID5 Yeah very high conifers, weren't there? FG5 R5
ID6 And pushing it onto the footpath as well FG5 R5
ID2 I think maybe they are obscuring the lights in places, sort of dark shadows FG5 R5
ID2 Yeah that feels a bit sort of a bit overbearing somehow STILL 19 FG5 R5

Social determinants

Number of other people
JW But the social environment was an issue on the night-time route but is it as much of an issue on this one because it's in the day so it's not so much of an issue? FG5 R2
ID3 I'd feel it was slightly less of an issue personally umm because it was day-time but it does strike me as being quiet still so FG5 R2

Proximity to other people
ID1 And the people issue — it doesn't really bother me as much — what I feel about having people around me is if someone was too close to me — in my personal space, like if I'm in a busy high street and there's loads of people then that is a
normal environment but if I was in an empty space like that and someone was really close to me then I would feel scared and uncomfortable FG5 R2

Security presence
ID6 As an outsider the uniforms don't scream security STILL 6 FG5 R1
ID6 I mean obviously if you were related to the university you'd know what your security looks like what - but umm a visible patrolling presence be it on foot or in a vehicle, marked quite clearly as security is - there's a feel good factor about that FG5 R1
ID5 On the back of the uniform they could have 'security' or something FG5 R1
ID6 I think I'd be reassured FG5 R1
ID5 I think especially at night-time you'd feel more secure FG5 R1
ID6 it's alright having a security presence but it needs to be seen and it needs to be balanced as well because you don't want it to be like a prison FG5 R1

Open access campus
KM would it make a difference for example that they are very tall bushes but they are also the grey industrial fence about 9 foot tall so there is no way on other than to climb it - ie knowing that it's a very secure perimeter rather than just a case of bushes. What do you think? FG5 R5
ID5 It could work both ways because if someone was running after you, you wouldn't be able to get out FG5 R5
ID2 I just think if you want to get on there is always a way, you know, probably there's a way for them to get on FG5 R5
ID6 I don't think universities can go down the level where you've got perimeters totally secure. At the end of the day you are trying to sell the place to people and you want it to be welcoming and it's supposed to be like a university not a prison FG5 R5
ID2 Yeah I really didn't like the on other campus that very big fence - you know no-one's going to jump over it but it doesn't make you feel safer FG5 R5
ID1 It just feels harsh and quite aggressive
ID2 Without making you feel especially safer FG5 R5
ID2 it just heightens your anxiety like you say - you know if someone's got security dogs you don't want to go in - it's not a very welcoming environment - as long as you know it's secure well for me it's more of a security presence; like you see the cars going round, things like that - that makes me feel safer than a big fence FG5 R5

ID cards
KM When you mentioned about entrance do you have ID badges? FG5 R4
ID6 No I mean there's two different policies umm - presently staff are supposed to wear them at all times on university property with certain exceptions FG5 R4
ID6 I mean it varies - some people do wear them all the time and as we've heard other people leave them in cars. Students have them and are required to produce them on demand .... but they don't have to wear them .... it doesn't really seem to create any great difficulty to be honest. But like I say with the staff, most staff seem to have them on and as you say, some don't FG5 R4

Isolation
ID1 Partly for me it's not knowing if you're the only person - there could be someone in like the office three doors down but I don't know FG5 R4

Proximity to traffic
ID1 But there's traffic there as well - I know you umm said about traffic in terms of someone could stop and pinch your handbag or something but I think having traffic about makes me feel safer FG5 R2
It's more if there's no traffic and suddenly one car comes then you start to panic, if you've got your back towards it - I always try and walk towards the traffic. Things like that - just cars milling around makes you feel a bit better.

**Crime and perceptions of crime**

ID3: I think one of my choices for coming to Loughborough umm rather than picking an inner city campus was on that sort of basis in terms of levels of crime and things like that so I think it would influence my decision.

ID2: Yeah there was a perception that that would be safer. If I was driving somewhere I think I'd feel better with one of these out-of-town ones because you don't have that worry about getting lost in a one way system and ending up where you don't want to be and you know you'd probably be able to find it ok.

**Personal determinants**

**Planning ahead/preparation**

JW: What would you do in advance, to plan ahead, if you were going to a different campus to make yourself safer?

ID1: I would look at the maps to make sure I know exactly which buildings I needed to go to, how to get from one place to another so I wasn't just wondering around getting lost and things like that.

ID2: And where to park so I'd be nearest to where I needed to be.

ID6: Yes I think I tend to take into account where it is - before I go somewhere like Manchester, you know, what steps I might take would be quite different than if I was going to Leicester university or Nottingham Trent - the difference - you know my perception of personal safety might vary tremendously.

ID6: I probably wouldn't do a great deal other than make sure I know where I'm going to and where I can park my car.

ID2: if I was going during the day I wouldn't be that worried but I'd take, I'd be more precautious about finding where I was going if I was going in the night definitely.

ID2: Usually you'd go to the university's website you'd usually find you can print it off.

ID2: And I use the travel websites as well, like there's travel transport direct or something and I use that to plan my route to get to the university and which place I need to get, to get the train or whatever so I would use that.

**Avoidance – risk reduction**

ID4: We are meant too let somebody else know even if they are not on campus if you are working on campus.

**Familiarity**

ID2: And it is where I'm familiar with - if I know the city; if I know the city generally, somewhere like Newcastle, I'd feel happier there even if I don't know the university campus - it's just that familiarity. Maybe it's you just the area that I'm from - cities in that area I'm a bit more familiar with so I'm less worried about that.

**Personal safety induction courses**

ID2: I can't remember actually. I don't think we did when I was a student; you got your attack alarm and that kind of stuff.

ID3: No I didn't. I think it might have been useful – not to the extent that it would make you really anxious but just so that you would know if there was a procedure.
We went on a staff induction and I don't think there was anything about personal safety. FG5 R4

There was stuff about Health and Safety .... but I don't recall being told anything about personal safety. FG5 R4

It's interesting talking about new staff because we have a very structured personal safety input for students but they are quite easy because they come in one great dollop but staff come throughout the year. FG5 R4

Summary of overall visitors' perceptions of Glamorgan's campus

The main one I would say is pretty safe. Fairly safe - bits that could be improved, like they could on any campus - like with some of the walkways were a bit enclosed and at the front with trees but generally very well lit generally FG5

Yeah - the lighting I was impressed with - it feels very well lit and it feels like there's always be somewhere that you could feel safe - you don't have to go down dark paths FG5

There was a first impression which is why I asked the question right at the beginning - lighting levels I thought were very good FG5

But like I say it appeared to generally be a very bright campus at night which I think was very positive. Obviously there were certain areas where it was very dark but the fact that so much of it was so light....Umm, my gut reaction - it seemed on the face of it to be a reasonably safe campus ... but generally speaking it didn't feel particularly unsafe. It didn't feel like an area that would raise a lot of concerns. FG5

Yeah I'd agree with that. I think I'd possibly feel safer on that campus than this one (Loughborough) if I obviously came on as a stranger or a visitor umm because of things like the lighting, the openness of some of the areas FG5

The most important bit for me is that the walkways are lit up umm so that if - there's set routes around campus that you know where you're going and you know that they'll be lit that's what's kind of important to me so if there's clear routes around and they're lit that's the most important. FG5

There didn't seem to be many signs on the routes that you photographed FG5

But on the subject of kind of naming buildings, how important do you - I know you mentioned the fact that the function of the building is often not very clear on signs - do you think that's - is that a personal safety issue? Knowing that you're near a particular kind of building? FG5

I think it's probably more important at night you know, knowing whether buildings are academic or social buildings. Because an academic building wouldn't necessarily help me feel safer because you think it would be empty at night FG5

Ways to improve personal safety on campus

Cut the shrubs down FG5

I don't like the skips and you know the temporary buildings on either site; I think they seemed to be a bit of a problem FG5
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Summary of key themes from analysis of sample focus group - staff at Loughborough
FOCUS GROUP 5 – ANALYSIS 1 – KEY THEMES

Staff at Loughborough university - Glamorgan VRs

Physical determinants
- Night-time
- Darkness
- Daylight
- Lighting
- Campus boundary
- Geographical location
- Signage and campus maps
- Hard security devices
- Transport modes
- Inside buildings
- Environmental design
  - Alleyways
  - Availability of alternative routes
  - Building design
  - Enclosed spaces
  - Fencing
  - Function of space
  - Isolated places
  - Maintenance
  - Obstructions
  - Open spaces
  - Temporary structures
  - Vegetation

Social determinants
- Number of other people
- Proximity to other people
- Security presence
- Open access campus
- ID cards
- Isolation
- Proximity to traffic
- Crime and perceptions of crime

Personal determinants
- Planning ahead
- Avoidance – risk reduction/ Personal safety strategies
- Familiarity
- Personal safety induction courses

Ways to improve personal safety on campus
- Cut the shrubs down
- Remove the skips and the temporary buildings
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Route analysis from questionnaires: Glamorgan campus routes in plan form
STAFF ROUTE 02
STAFF ROUTE 03
STAFF ROUTE 5
STAFF ROUTE 07
STUDENT ROUTES 6 AND 7 COMBINED
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