Perceptions of School Administrators and Students on Security and Safety at Selected Tertiary Institutions in Ghana

Desmond Oppong

Sunyani Technical University, P. O. Box 206 Sunyani Ghana
Corresponding author: Desmond Oppong. E-mail: desopp@yahoo.com

Managing Editors

Prof. Daniel Obeng-Ofori
Rev. Fr. Prof. PeterNkrumah A.
Prof. Kaku Sagary Nokoe

Abstract: The goal of the study is to review the perceptions of school administrators and students on security and safety at selected tertiary institutions in Bono Region, Ghana. The study was conducted at two public tertiary in Ghana's Bono Region. The study used a concurrent mixed-methods approach to collect both quantitative data through Likert scales and qualitative data through open questions within a single questionnaire and some interviews with school administrators. A sample size of seven hundred and fifty-eight (758), including students and administrators was used for this study. The survey revealed that students believe there is good security and safety on the two campuses. Additionally, students say they feel comfortable on campus during the day and night. They also say they feel safe overall. In addition, students do not carry something on them for protection when walking on campus and students are ready to report crime/s against them to the university security. It, however, came out from the study that students avoid certain places on campus because of fear of their security and safety. The study revealed proactive security and safety management practices in the two universities. It came out that the universities provide annual security and safety reports detailing any security and safety-related events with crime prevention details. The study further recommends that University management should prioritize efforts to enhance campus security and safety by employing more strong security personnel and deploying modern security gadgets/items, particularly in locations that students perceive as unsafe.

Keywords: security, university students, school administrators, UENR, STU, Ghana

1. INTRODUCTION

The perceptions of school administrators and students regarding security and safety in selected tertiary institutions in the Bono Region of Ghana vary based on their individual experiences and

roles within the educational system. School administrators, who are responsible for overseeing the overall operations of the institutions, place a strong emphasis on maintaining a secure and safe environment for the students. They prioritize the implementation of robust security measures, such as employing security personnel, installing surveillance cameras, and implementing access control systems. Administrators often collaborate with local law enforcement agencies to ensure prompt response to any security concerns. Rolfe (2006). From the perspective of school administrators, the safety and security of students are crucial for fostering an optimal learning environment (Chen, Shek, & Bu, 2011).

They understand that students can only excel academically when they feel safe and protected. Therefore, administrators work diligently to address any potential risks or threats that may arise within the educational setting. On the other hand, students' perceptions of security and safety in these tertiary institutions may vary (Yang et al., 2019). While some students may feel secure and confident in their institution's safety measures, others may express concerns about certain aspects. Factors that influence student perceptions include the visibility and effectiveness of security personnel, the presence of adequate lighting in common areas, and the implementation of preventive measures against theft, harassment, or other criminal activities (Currie, 1994). Focused on preparing US college campuses for acts of on-campus violence, Habib and Noman (2019) observed that even while there are emergency procedures accessible on various campuses, only 25% of participants in a logistic regression study with a sample size of 161 participants from different US educational institutions felt that students understand those emergency procedures. Regarding the timing of communication, 25% of respondents appear to be aware that pupils would be informed within the following five minutes if there were any major violent behaviors. Most participants according to the researcher do not realize the importance of emergency drills and do not engage in their campus-wide practice of them regularly (Habib & Noman, 2019)

The perceptions of school administrators and students regarding security and safety in selected tertiary institutions in the Bono Region of Ghana vary based on their individual experiences and roles within the educational system. School administrators, who are responsible for overseeing the overall operations of the institutions, place a strong emphasis on maintaining a secure and safe environment for the students. They prioritize the implementation of robust security measures, such as employing security personnel, installing surveillance cameras, and implementing access control systems. Administrators often collaborate with local law enforcement agencies to ensure prompt response to any security concerns. Rolfe, G. (2006). Therefore, administrators work diligently to address any potential risks or threats that may arise within the educational setting. While some students may feel secure and confident in their institution's safety measures, others may express concerns about certain aspects. Factors that influence student perceptions include the visibility and effectiveness of security personnel, the presence of adequate lighting in common areas, and the implementation of preventive measures against theft, harassment, or other criminal activities. Currie, D. H. (1994).

Additionally, students' perceptions of security and safety may be influenced by their personal experiences or incidents they have witnessed or heard about from others. Any instances of violence, theft, or other security breaches within or near the campus can significantly influence students' sense of safety and trust in the institution (Hugman, 2017). To address these varying perceptions and concerns, school administrators need to maintain open lines of communication with students (Scotland, 2012). Regular feedback sessions, surveys, or town hall meetings can provide valuable insights into students' experiences and concerns related to security and safety. By actively involving students in the decision-making processes and responding promptly to their

feedback, administrators can work towards creating a safer and more secure environment for everyone in the tertiary institutions within the Bono Region of Ghana.

The point of view maintains that the relationship between the institution and the student is admirable, and it recognizes that as adults, students have the exclusive right to independence about their concerns (Patel, 2019). The second viewpoint also demonstrates that the university has a duty of care to safeguard its students from damage because of the special relationship that exists between students and universities (Patel, 2019). Due to the independence of our universities and colleges, both parents and students are giving their choice of college or universities more consideration than ever before. College and university campuses are no longer safe havens, much like the majority of communities in today's world, even those situated in the most pastoral settings. Nearly a million college students in the Western world may carry guns as a safety precaution, which has caused campus safety to be a top concern for both parents and students when choosing a higher school (Institute of Legislative Action, 2016). Campus security may be important to parents and students since there is a chance that they will become involved in crime while attending college or university. According to a survey, college students are more likely to experience crime on campus than they are at home (The Conversation, 2016).

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS
Study Area

Study Type and Design
This study used the concurrent mixed-methods approach. The concurrent mixed method was employed to collect both quantitative data and qualitative data. Concurrent designs are effective when seeking to triangulate data to determine and demonstrate congruence between both quantitative and qualitative findings. Triangulation can be achieved by identifying whether the two types of data support the same results and conclusions. Triangulation can be used to reduce the risk of chance associations and bias, as studies using only one method are more vulnerable to errors (Wilson, 2014, cited in Bell, et al., 2022). Research that utilizes different types of data can provide cross-data validity checks and thus can help to demonstrate validity, and potentially extend generalisability. Concurrent mixed methods designs can be particularly efficacious for research focused on evaluation, where multiple data points and streams can be reviewed to come to an overall result and conclusion (Bell, et al., 2022).

According to Kuranchie (2021), a researcher who desires to come out with a credible research outcome would want to combine the two methods so that a comparison of the results could be done after the exercise for better interrogations and understanding of the issues. The findings of the qualitative approach are compared with that of the quantitative approach to check for equivalences. Ary *et al.,* (2002), cited in Kuranchie (2021), summarise the reasons for combining qualitative and quantitative methods in a single study as using one method to verify the findings of the other, using one method as the groundwork for the other and using the two methods in a complementary fashion to explain different aspects of the same research question.

A greater and fuller grasp of the issues under study would be provided by the mixed method (Babbie, 2010, cited in Kuranchie, 2021). Babbie (2010) avers that a researcher may be interested in finding out the "why" and "what" of a phenomenon so, using both approaches would help the researcher to find appropriate answers to the questions on the issues. In this case, the qualitative aspect would provide data to answer the "why" question while the quantitative data would satisfy the "what" curiosity. Babbie (2010) concludes that with the mixed method approach, one complements the other as each maximizes the strengths and minimizes the limitations of the other.

Population
The study's target group is university students and administrators from universities in Ghana's Bono region. The two (2) regionally recognized public universities, which are, Sunyani Technical University (STU) and University for Energy and Natural Resources (UENR), were used. This is comprised of STU, Six Thousand, Three Hundred and Twenty-Five (6325) undergraduate students and Ninety-five (95) administrators and EUNR, Eight Thousand, Six Hundred and Fifty-Eight (8658) undergraduate Students and Eighty-Two (82) Administrators. This study focused on the students and school administrators to learn about their perspectives and experiences with security and safety measures in their schools, as well as their deficiencies.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

This study focused on students and administrators to learn about their perspectives and experiences with security and safety measures in their schools, as well as their deficiencies. Concerning students, the focus was on students who had spent more than one academic year in the selected universities. This is to ensure that data gathered by this study are from students who have had some experiences in their institutions of learning. Administrators with Senior Member ranks were selected for this study since they are mostly involved in decision and policy-making. In this regard, the respondents were put into clusters of universities with their students and school administrators. Quota sampling was used to assign a quota from each cluster of universities. This guarantees that the sample adequately reflects the population's various characteristics (Kusi, 2012 cited in, Kuranchie, 2021).

Purposive and simple random sampling methods were used to select the school administrators and the students respectively. In this case, not all school administrators are knowledgeable in security and safety issues on university campuses hence senior member-ranked administrators who deal with security and safety issues and are involved in decision and policy-making were selected to participate in this study.

A simple random method was used to select the undergraduate students to represent students who are a homogenous group that shares similar characteristics. Various methods have been suggested to be used in calculating sample size for a study. For instance, Nwana (1992), referenced in Kuranchie (2021), claims that for populations of a few hundred, a sample size of 40% or more, several hundred, a sample size of 20%, a few thousand, a sample size of 10%, and a more thousand, a sample size of 5% or less, would be appropriate. Concerning that and the homogeneous nature of the target population, this study assigned a 5% quota from each cluster of universities, to select the participants for the study since their target populations, undergraduate students and school administrators, fall within several thousand.

With the 5% quota assigned to each cluster of university, three hundred sixteen (316) students and five (5) school administrators were selected for one university, and four hundred and thirty-three (433) students and four (4) school administrators were selected from another university, giving a sample size of seven hundred and fifty-eight (758) for this study. Although response rates are usually low, a 30 percent response rate is acceptable. This indicates that for analysis, 228 replies will suffice. The study, however, received 751 replies from the entire population.

Instrumentation
Questionnaires and key informant interviews were the main methods that were utilized by the researcher to collect data. The fact that all respondents under consideration could read and write

and more and better detail were needed especially from school administrators necessitated the use of these instruments. More importantly, some respondents' restricted schedules necessitated the utilization of key informant interviews to gather essential data for the study. A questionnaire and an interview guide were created for the two separate respondents or sampled groups, thus, students and school administrators. Each instrument was developed with specific reference to the research questions.

The instruments for both students and school administrators consisted of 4 parts: demographic data, indicators of security and safety on campus, perception of school administrators and students on security and safety, and the nature of management of campus security and safety. Before implementation, the questionnaire underwent a pilot test to determine the validity of each item. Following the pilot testing, a Cronbach alpha reliability test was conducted using the Predictive Analytic Software (PASW), which produced a reliability coefficient of 0.78. As a result, the research team was able to guarantee that each question on the security and safety questionnaire was answered consistently. In response to comments, some item components were also reworded to enhance the readability and cohesiveness of the individual things. Because the interview questions were taken from the questionnaire, the interview instrument did not need to be pilot tested. The internal consistency and usability of the interview items were shown by the reliability coefficient of 0.78.

Data Collection Procedure
With the support of a research assistant and the use of Google Forms to transmit questions electronically, questionnaires were administered. The questionnaires were left with respondents and collected after two weeks. Those who responded via google forms sent their responses a day after the questionnaires were sent electronically and after two weeks, the link was closed. The researcher was the one who performed the interviews. The conversations that took place during the interviews were recorded and afterward transcribed. Six of the respondents, all of whom were school administrators, were interviewed in total. In the end, 751 were filled out and returned.

Data Analysis
The completed questionnaires were first edited for consistency. For the open-ended items, a short list was prepared from a master list of responses to obtain the key responses given by respondents. All the responses ticked on the questionnaire were recorded on a broadsheet before being fed into the computer for statistical analysis, using the SPSS. To enhance scoring and analysis of the data, the various categories on the data, and the various categories on the questionnaire were coded according to the following scoring key: (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Undecided/uncertain, 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly disagree). The nature of the study demanded both inferential and descriptive statistical tools to be used in the analysis of the data. Hence, frequency counts, mean and standard deviation, and independent samples t-tests were employed to answer the data to answer the research questions. The data was put into tables, which were analyzed and discussed. Analysis and discussions were based on seven hundred and fifty-one (751) responses. For the qualitative data gathered from the administrators, a thematic analysis was done.

3. RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
To obtain a fair understanding of the types of respondents that were part of the study, certain demographic information was collected from the respondents. Sex, educational attainment, age, and residence status are only a few of the demographic details collected about the respondents.

Sex of Respondents
This section discusses the sex of the respondents for the study. This is shown in Table 4.1 below.

Table 2: Sex of Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percent (%)
Male	425	56.7
Female	324	43.3
Total	749	100

The survey showed that 56.7% (425) of respondents were males against 43.3% (324) females.

Level of Study of Respondents
Table 3. Level of study

Level	Frequency	Percent (%)
200	279	37.2
300	196	26.2
400	274	36.6
Total	749	100

Out of the 749 students surveyed 37.2% (279) were in level 200, 26.2% (196) were in level 300 and 36.6% (274) were level 400 students females as revealed in Table 3. Above. The greater part of respondents 37.2% (279) are in level 200.

Age of Respondents
Table 4: Age of Respondents

Age (Years)	Frequency	Percent (%)
15-19	38	5.1
20-24	585	78.1
25-29	119	15.9
30 and above	7	0.9
Total	749	100

It came out from the survey that 5.1% (38) of respondents were between the ages of 15-19, 78.1% (585) were between 20-24 years, 15.9% (119) between 25-29 years, and 0.9% were above 30 years. The summary of the data showed that the majority of the students 78.1% (585) fall between the ages of 20-24 years. This shows the homogeneity of respondents.

Residential Status
Table 5: Residential Status of Respondents

Residence	Frequency	Percent (%)
Halls of Residence	339	45.3
Private Hostels and Rented Apartments	410	54.7
Total	749	100

Upon being asked for details on their living status, it was discovered that 45.3% (339) of the students resided in residence halls, while 54.7% (410) did not. According to Table 5, 54.7% (410) of students live in privately rented apartments where their safety cannot be easily guaranteed. These students may be more concerned about their safety and security given the lack of security personnel in these private settings.

Student Status
Table 6: Student Status of Respondents

Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
Regular	709	94.7
Weekend	40	5.3
Total	**749**	**100**

The study showed that 94.7% (709) of respondents are regular students whilst 5.3% (40) are weekend students. This indicates that the majority of respondents 94.7% (709) are regular students who spend most of their school time on the campuses of the two universities.

Perception of Security and Safety on Campus
Respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement using a Likert scale of 1–5, where 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided/uncertain, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly disagree, to determine how much students and administrators of the various institutions feel safe and secure on the various campuses. The mean and standard deviation of the replies provided by the student respondents were calculated and used in the study for analysis purposes. They underwent mean score analysis. A mean score of 3 or more was understood as an agreement and a score of 3 or less as disagreement.

Table 7: Perception of Security and Safety on Campus

	Mean	Std. dev.
There is safety on the university campus during the day	3.98	1.06
There is safety on the university campus during the night	3.36	1.24
The lighting situation on campus is good	3.04	1.27
I feel safe and secured on my university campus	4.24	1.17
Students avoid certain places on campus because of fear for their security and safety.	4.95	1.69
Students carry something on them for protection when walking on campus	1.28	0.45
Students are ready to report crime/s against them to university security	3.85	0.36
Mean of Means	**3.39**	**1.05**

From Table 7, student-respondents indicated their agreement with the statement 'I feel safe and secured on my university campuses. A mean score of 4.24 was recorded indicating respondents' strong agreement with the statement. On the other hand, student respondents revealed they strongly agree that 'students avoid certain places on campus because of fear of their security and safety'. This recorded a mean score of 4.95 indicating respondent's strong agreement with the statement that they avoid certain places on the two campuses for fear of their safety. In the qualitative study, when respondents were asked to mention places, certain places within the two campuses were mentioned. Non-resident students indicated that they do not feel safe on their way to their rented hostels and apartment. Administrators SO1 at the University of Energy and

Natural Resources and SO1 at Sunyani Technical University confirmed this response during interview sessions with them. They explained that efforts are being made to improve patrols at the places mentioned since they receive reports from these places. They further indicated they are talking to private hostels who have registered with them to improve the security situation at their hostels. On whether 'students are ready to report crime/s against them to university security', student respondents indicated with a mean score of 3.85 that they agree with this statement. Student-respondents revealed they agree with the statement 'there is safety on the university campus during the day'. This had a mean score of 3.98 indicating students feel safe on campus.

On 'there is safety on the university campus during the night', student-respondents indicated their agreement with the statement, with a mean score of 3.36. This means students feel safe during the night on the two campuses. When asked about whether students carry something on them for protection when walking on campus, respondents strongly disagreed with a mean score of 1.28. This means students do not carry items on them for protection on their campuses. From Table 7, the mean means of respondents on all statements on the perception of security and safety on campus indicates there is a positive or high perception of students on security and safety on their various campuses. This had a mean means score of 3.39. This indicates that students agree that they feel safe on campus.

Suggestions to Improve Security and Safety on Campus
Respondents were asked to make suggestions to improve security and safety on their campuses. A short list was prepared from a master list of responses to get the key responses given by respondents.

Table 8: Suggestions to Improve Security and Safety on Campus

Suggestions	Frequency	Percent (%)
More and strong security personnel should be employed	303	40.5
Modern security gadgets like CCTV should be used	134	17.9
The lighting situation should be improved	162	21.6
Emergency helplines should be deployed	36	4.8
Total	**749**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2022
About 40.5% (303) suggested that more strong security personnel should be employed. 17.9% (134), suggested modern security gadgets like CCTV should be used. 21.6% (162) also suggested that the lighting situation should be improved and 4.8% (36) suggested emergency helplines should be deployed.

Management of Campus Security
This section sought to solicit responses from respondents on the management of security and safety to access its effectiveness and proactiveness on the two university campuses. Students were asked to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with statements on the management of security and safety. The mean of determination is 3 where responses below it indicate a level of disagreement and those above the mean indicate a level of agreement.

Table 9: Management of Campus Security

Statements	Mean	Std. dev.
My university provides annual security and safety report detailing any security and safety-related events with crime prevention details	3.08	0.87

My university provides enough resources to manage security and safety on my campus	3.37	1.05
My university has a sufficiently close and direct relationship with students to impose a duty to protect the student from foreseeable dangerous activities occurring on the university premises	4.86	1.13
My university involves the security department in key management (comprising ordering, cutting, and delivering keys), of the whole university	3.22	1.19
Disclosing all criminal conduct/information in my university may give the university a less marketable image, and hence convey a misleading image of my institution	4.73	1.27
My university has a crime logbook	4.21	0.82
My university undertakes trend analysis of crimes registered in the crime log book and advises appropriately	4.62	0.69
Mean of Means	**3.19**	**0.96**

According to Table 9, respondents agreed with the statement, "My university offers annual security and safety report showing any security and safety related occurrences with crime prevention details," with a mean score of 3.08. This indicates that respondents are informed about the level of crime and the type(s) of crime that occur on the two university campuses. On whether their university undertakes trend analysis of crimes registered in the crime logbook and advises appropriately, respondents indicated a strong agreement scoring 4.62 on the mean. This confirms the finding of this study that the universities involved in the study provide annual security and safety reports detailing any security and safety-related events with crime prevention details.

On the statement 'My university provides enough resources to manage security and safety on my campus', respondents indicated their agreement with a mean score of 3.37. All respondents from the administrators supported this during the interview. However, administrators SO1 at the University of Energy and Natural Resources and SO1 at Sunyani Technical University who are directly involved in security and safety management, indicated during the interview sessions that they expect to see more resources dedicated to security and safety on campus. SO1 at Sunyani Technical University for example retorted *you will never see the value of security and safety until a crime is committed and lives are involved.*

On 'My university has a sufficiently close and direct relationship with students to impose a duty to protect the student from foreseeable dangerous activities occurring on the university premises', respondents strongly agreed with a mean score of 4.86. This paints the picture that respondents have trust in their security system and confirms the finding of this study that 'Students are ready to report crime/s against them to university security'.

Respondents indicated that their university involves the security department in key management (comprising ordering, cutting, and delivering keys), of the whole university. This had a mean score of 3.22. In a further explanation in an interview with administrator SO1 at Sunyani Technical University, it came out that the security department is not involved in ordering, cutting, and delivering. However, it is the department that manages key handling, thus, staff and students are required to leave their keys with the security department whenever they leave campus. Drivers are also required to submit all keys to the university vehicles at the security department.
Respondents strongly agreed scoring 4.73 on the mean that disclosing all criminal conduct/information in their university may give the university a less marketable image, and hence

convey a misleading image of their institution. This prompted a further inquiry from Administrators in an interview and all of them 100% (9), confirmed this agreement. This means the two universities may be economical with details on criminal conduct/ information.

The grand mean or mean of means on the management of security, and safety indicates respondents' agreement with statements on the management of security and safety with a mean of means score of 3.19. This indicates a high level of effective and proactive management of security and safety on the campuses of universities involved in the study.

Types of Security Being Practiced in University Campuses
On the types of security being practiced by the universities involved in this study, responses were solicited from respondents to determine the type/s of security being practiced at their universities.

Table 10: Types of Security Being Practiced on University Campuses

Type	Frequency	Percent (%)
Employment of hardware like a truncheon, whistles, recorders, digital cameras, etc.	344	45.9
Security personnel's attitude, observational skills, and effective relationship between security personnel and students.	243	32.4
A combination of any two of the above	93	12.4
A combination of all (A, B, and C above)	69	9.2
Total	**749**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2022

The majority 45.9% (344) respondents, indicated their university employs hardware like a truncheon, whistles, recorders, digital cameras, etc. 32.4% (243), responded their university security personnel's attitude, observational skills and effective relationships between security personnel and students are good, 12.4% (93) selected a combination of employment of hardware like a truncheon, whistles, recorders, digital cameras, etc. and security personnel's attitude, observational skills and effective relationships between security personnel and students, no respondent (0) selected timely and correct recording of relevant preventive security information to avoid future dangers and occurrences within the institution. However, 9.2% (69) said they see all types. These responses indicate that the universities practice static security and dynamic security. None of the universities is practicing intelligence security.

Table 11: Independent Sample T-test Results on Differences between Male and Female Students' Perception of Security and Safety on Campus

Sex	N	M	SD	df	t	sig
Male	425	2.38	0.91	2	0.431	0.630
Female	342	2.36	1.30			

Source: Field Survey, 2022.

Perspectives on security and safety on campuses scores for the two sexes were compared using an independent samples t-test. Male (M=2.38, SD=0.91) and Female (M=2.36, SD=1.30); t(2)=0.431, p>0.63. The result shows no statistically significance difference in the perception of male and female students of the two universities, on security and safety. They all have the perception that security and safety on the campuses are good. Because of the results, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4. DISCUSSION

Perception of Security and Safety on Campus

The study revealed that student-respondents agree with the statement 'I feel safe and secured on my university campuses. This contradicts Owusu, *et al.*, (2016), that the safety of university campuses has been a hot topic in recent years. The problem might be ascribed to students' increased fear of risk as a result of many high-profile incidents publicized by the national media in recent years. It might also be because the number of students enrolled in our institutions is outpacing the number of security officers provided by university officials on our campuses. Furthermore, the topic has been examined from the standpoint that rising female enrolment levels might be a factor, as women are often viewed as susceptible when it comes to safety and security concerns.

On the other hand, student respondents revealed they strongly agree that 'students avoid certain places on campus because of fear of their security and safety'. This somewhat concurs with Loukaitou-Sideris and Fink (2009) who investigated the physical environment on campus and concluded that specific environmental characteristics in public settings and their immediate surroundings are often connected with higher terror perceptions. The authors went on to discuss the precise design elements of public areas that can affect people's perceptions of apprehension, including settings with blockages in one's line of sight, with lots of places to hide, and with no obvious way out.

On whether 'students are ready to report crime/s against them to university security', student respondents indicated that they agree with this statement. This contrasts Beard (2010) that students here and there feel hesitant to report crimes on campus since they are questionable about how the campus security personnel will deal with the data. To forestall any pessimism concerning the treatment of a crime, some will decide not to report the information or crime. The lack of reporting of crimes or dangerous situations on campus is an indicator that a robust security mindset is needed. Building a security environment in which individuals have a favorable sense of security calls for a transparent and proactive strategy for dealing with crime. However, this agrees with Makhaye (2017) that the "under-reporting of crimes" is a significant aspect of the empowerment of offenders. The crime picture on campus is distorted because of underreporting. The information provided by reported crimes can be used to identify crime hot spots, peak crime times, and whether more security is required. This can be achieved by making sure the incident reporting procedure is straightforward and impartial. The school must also make sure that all employees and students are aware of where to report issues and how their reports will be handled.

When asked about whether students carry something on them for protection when walking on campus, respondents strongly disagreed. This means students do not carry items on them for protection on their campuses. This contradicts numerous studies showing that most students take some kind of safety measure on campus (Brown & Andy; Currie 1994; 2007; Pain, 2000). Carrying a weapon or a weapon-like item is one strategy for avoiding conflict. Men and women take different actions, according to Currie (1994). Women are much more prone to use avoidance strategies than men, who are much more likely to carry a gun. Males tended to use no protection at all far more frequently than women did. According to Starkweather (2007), students may employ audacious methods to deal with their concerns about campus safety. Individuals frequently act violently as a coping mechanism in response to safety to restrict the acts of criminals and feel safe.

The mean means of respondents on all statements on the perception of security and safety on campus indicates there is a positive or high perception of students on security and safety on their various campuses. This means students feel safe and secure on campus. This agrees with Carrico (2016), that several factors influence a student's overall perception of safety on a college campus. A study conducted inside the Virginia Community College system looked into students' perceptions of safety by determining the kind of crimes they were most afraid of and the places they felt most unsafe. Investigated criteria were the type and number of security personnel, undergraduate characteristics, and the rural setting of the campus. Community colleges should make every effort to create well-lit, secure campuses that are planned with preventing crime in view.

Suggestions to Improve Security and Safety on Campus
Student respondents suggested that more and strong security personnel should be employed. In addition, modern security gadgets like CCTV should be used and the lighting situation should be improved. Lastly, emergency helplines should be deployed. The picture painted here concurs with the finding of a study by Abbas (2020), where respondents called for security personnel with a high level of professionalism to be engaged, and contemporary equipment should be supplied to them.

Management of Campus Security
According to the study, respondents agreed that their university produces an annual security and safety report that includes information on any security- or safety-related incidents as well as crime prevention measures. This means respondents are aware of the crime rate and type/s of crime that goes on, on the two university campuses. On whether their university undertakes trend analysis of crimes registered in the crime logbook and advises appropriately, respondents indicated a strong agreement. This confirms the finding of this study that the universities involved in the study provide annual security and safety reports detailing any security and safety-related events with crime prevention details.

In the statement 'My university provides enough resources to manage security and safety on my campus', respondents indicated their agreement. All respondents from the administrators supported this during the interview. However, administrators SO1 at the University of Energy and Natural Resources and SO1 at Sunyani Technical University who are directly involved in security and safety management, indicated during the interview sessions that they expect to see more resources dedicated to security and safety on campus. SO1 at Sunyani Technical University for example retorted *you will never see the value of security and safety until a crime is committed and lives are involved.*

On 'My university has a sufficiently close and direct relationship with students to impose a duty to protect the student from foreseeable dangerous activities occurring on the university premises', respondents strongly agreed with a mean score of 4.86. This paints the picture that respondents have trust in their security system and confirms the finding of this study that 'Students are ready to report crime/s against them to university security'.

Respondents indicated that their university involves the security department in key management (comprising ordering, cutting, and delivering keys), of the whole university. This had a mean score of 3.22. In a further explanation in an interview with administrator SO1 at Sunyani Technical University, it came out that the security department is not involved in ordering, cutting, and delivering. However, it is the department that manages key handling, thus, staff and students are

required to leave their keys with the security department whenever they leave campus. Drivers are also required to submit all keys to the university vehicles at the security department.

Respondents strongly agreed scoring 4.73 on the mean that disclosing all criminal conduct/information in their university may give the university a less marketable image, and hence convey a misleading image of their institution. This prompted a further inquiry from Administrators in an interview and all of them 100% (9), confirmed this agreement. This means the two universities may be economical with details on criminal conduct/ information. This supports Thorough Good and Padilla (2013) that many higher education administrators may be concerned that disclosing all criminal conduct as defined by the Clery Law may give their universities a less marketable image, and hence convey a misleading image of their institutions. When inquired further as to whether this agreement influences the kind of crime statistics they report in their annual security report, they indicated, they rather put in efforts to avoid serious crimes like murder, rape, assault, etc., on their campus since the media is out there to report on whatever happens on campus. This disagrees with Hollis (2010), that there is a delicate line between providing too much information to the university community and regulating information distribution. Nonetheless, respondents concur with Hollis that carefully regulated information dissemination to portray a secure school environment may lead to a decreased degree of awareness regarding campus violence.

The grand mean or mean of means on the management of security, and safety indicates respondents' agreement with statements on the management of security and safety with a mean of means score of 3.19. This indicates a high level of effective and proactive management of security and safety on the campuses of universities involved in the study. This agrees with Franzosa (2009) that "the key to combating campus insecurity is to make resources available, increase awareness of concerns, and maintain open lines of communication, not to instill fear or limit freedom". The results support Agyenim-(2013) Boateng's assertion that the goal of security is to provide best practices advice on crime prevention and detection, including the provision of a crime/incident reporting process, responding to calls for service, providing routine patrols, checking, locking, and unlocking buildings, out-of-hours responsibility for emergencies, investigation of complaints regarding staff, visitor, and student behavior, and disciplinary action. Key management, comprising ordering, cutting, and delivering keys for the whole University and sound level monitoring of events and activities, as well as recording, safekeeping, and disposal of any found items.

Types of Security Being Practiced in University Campuses
The revealed that the majority 45.9% (344) respondents, indicated their university employs hardware like a truncheon, whistles, recorders, digital cameras, etc. 32.4% (243), responded their university security personnel's attitude, observational skills and effective relationships between security personnel and students are good, 12.4% (93) selected a combination of employment of hardware like a truncheon, whistles, recorders, digital cameras, etc. and security personnel's attitude, observational skills and effective relationships between security personnel and students, no respondent (0) selected timely and correct recording of relevant preventive security information to avoid future dangers and occurrences within the institution. However, 9.2% (69) said they see all types.

These responses indicate that the universities practice static security and dynamic security. None of the universities is practicing intelligence security. This deviates from Agyenim-Boateng's (2013) conclusion that the direct and combined impact of all three dimensions of security is the overall protection of an institution. In this regard, the institution's dynamic, static, and intelligence security

are critical components. This is because they work together to ensure the institution's overall security. Emphasizing one to the exclusion of others might jeopardize security and order, resulting in security breakdowns.

Difference between Male and Female Students on Perception of Security and Safety on Campus
The finding of the study indicated that there is no statistical significance in the perception of male and female students of the two universities, on security and safety. They all have the perception that security and safety on the campuses are good. This disagrees with the finding of a study by Currie (1994) that women reported much more threatening situations on campus than males, even though the study did not focus on gender.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The survey revealed that students believe there is good security and safety on the two campuses. Additionally, students say they feel comfortable on campus during the day and night. They also say they feel safe overall. In addition, students do not carry something on them for protection when walking on campus and students are ready to report crime/s against them to the university security. It, however, came out from the study that students avoid certain places on campus because of fear of their security and safety. The study showed that the majority of the respondents suggested the employment of more strong security personnel. In addition, modern security gadgets/items like CCTV should be deployed and the lighting situation should be improved.

The study revealed proactive security and safety management practices in the two universities. It came out that the universities provide annual security and safety reports detailing any security and safety-related events with crime prevention details. In addition, the universities provide enough resources to manage security and safety on my campus and have a sufficiently close and direct relationship with students to impose a duty to protect the student from foreseeable dangerous activities occurring on the university premises. It also came out that the universities have crime logbooks and that they undertake trend analysis of crimes registered in the crime logbook and advise appropriately. The study revealed that the two universities use static and dynamic security and have ignored intelligence security.

All three aspects of security affect the entire protection of an institution directly and collectively. Consequently, the institution's dynamic, static, and intelligence security are essential elements in this regard. This is because they cooperate to protect the overall security of the institution. Emphasizing one above the others could compromise security and order and lead to security failures. The study revealed the practice of static and some form of dynamic security, which is not enough to give overall security and safety on campus. Several factors have the potential to affect how parents and potential students decide which institution or university to send their children to. Higher education institutions advertise the well-liked characteristics of college location, academic disciplines, campus size, athletic programmes, and campus environment to attract prospective students and earn the trust of their parents. However, if effectively managed, campus security and safety can be a key selling point that dramatically boosts student enrolment**.** Although students' perception of security and safety is high, students expect to see the deployment of modern security gadgets and more strong security men on their campuses. With these, students' perception of security and safety would be better thereby having the needed impact on the university's enrolment.

Data Availability

Data used for this research is available upon request from the corresponding author.

Notes

1. I appreciate the anonymous reviewer's comments, which I have noted and worked on to improve the manuscript's scholarly caliber and visibility.

Reference

Abbas, J., & Sagsan, M. (2019). "Identification of key employability attributes and evaluation of university graduates' performance: instrument development and validation". *Higher Education Skills and Work-Based Learning, Vol. 10 No. 3*, 449-466.

Brown, S. L., & Andy, M. M. (2007). Risk perception, fuzzy representations, and comparative optimism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 575-578.

Bubnovskaia, O. V., Leonidova, V. V., & Lysova, A. V. (2019). Security or Safety: Quantitative and Comparative Analysis of Usage in Research Works Published in 2004–2019. *Behavioral Sciences, 9*(12).

Chandra, T., Zebrowski, J. P., McClain, R., & Lanertz, L. Y. (2021). Generating Standard Operating Procedures for the Manipulation of Hazardous Chemicals in Academic Laboratories. *American Chemical Society*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chas.0c00092

Chen, Y. Y., Shek, D., & Bu, F. F. (2011). Applications of interpretive and constructionist research methods in adolescent research: Philosophy, principles, and examples. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ijamh.2011.022

Cheng, J., Xuan, S., Hu, Y., Liu, X., Bian, M., Chen, L., . . . Don, Z. (2022). The framework of safety management in a university laboratory. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries, Vol., 80*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2022.104871

Crotty, M. .. ((1998).). The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspectives in the Research Process. *Sage.*, 67.

Currie, D. H. (1994). Women's safety on campus: Challenging the University as gendered space. *Humanity & Society*, 24-47.

Fischman, J., & Foster, A. L. (2007). Campus safety gains sharper vision with a new breed of surveillance cameras. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53(34)*, 13 – 25.

Flannery, D. J.-L. (2000). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice.*

Fletcher, P. C., & Bryden, P. J. (2007). Preliminary examination of safety issues on a university campus: Personal safety practices, beliefs, and attitudes of female faculty and staff. *College Student Journal*, 1149-1162.

Greenleaf, C. D. (2022). The War on Drugs Symposium: 50 Years Later. *The University of New Hampshire Law Review.* The University of New Hampshire.

Griffin, O. R. (2015). Confronting the Evolving Safety and Security Challenge at Colleges and Universities. *Pierce L. Rev. 413 (2007), available at http://scholars.unh.edu/unh_lr/vol5/iss3/4.*

Habib, M. A., & Noman, R. (2019). "Are human capital, intellectual property rights, and research and development expenditures important for total factor productivity? An empirical analysis". *International Journal of Social Economics, Vol. 46 No. 6*, 756-774.

Hugman, L. (2017). Campus Life Security. [Online]. Retrieved January 19, 2022, from https://campuslifesecurity.com/articles/2017/07/12/the-secret-to-more-efficient-campus-security-system-planning-ans-maintenance.aspx

Huth, M., & Nielson, F. (2019). Static Analysis for Proactive Security. In: Computing and Software Science. *Switzerland: Cham Springer,,* 374-392.

Kincaid, J., Donovan, J., & Pettitt, B. (2005). "Simulation techniques for training emergency response". *International Journal of Emergency Management, Vol. 1 No. 3,* 238.

Kuranchie, A. (2016). *Research Made Easy.* Kumasi: BOOKWORM PUBLICATIONS.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., & Fink, C. (2009). Addressing women's fear of victimization in transportation settings. *Urban Affairs Review,* 554-587.

Lum, C. (2021). Human Factors Issues and the Impact of Technology on Society. From https://www.igi-global.com

Oprean, C., Titu, M., & Tanasecu, C. (2017). Security Management of Campus Security. *International Conference,* (pp. 418-422).

Owusu, G. A., Akoto, J. S., & Abnory, M. M. (2016). Is Our Safety and Security Guaranteed on the University of Cape Coast Campus? Undergraduates Students' Perceptions. *International Journal of Higher Education Vol. 5, No. 4.*

Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness, and rigor: Quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing.* doi http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.03727.x.

Scotland, J. .. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching,* doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Shahzad, M., Ying, Q., Rehman, S., Zafar, A., Ding, X., & Abbas, J. (2019). "Impact of knowledge absorptive capacity on corporate sustainability with mediating role of CSR: analysis from the Asian context". *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, Vol. 63 No. 2,* 148-174.

Simpeh, F., & Shakantu, W. (2018). On-Campus housing facilities: the perceptions of Ghanaian. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences Vol. 9 No. 6,* pp. 318-324.

Starkweather, S. (2007). Gender, perceptions of safety and strategic responses among Ohio University students. *A Journal of Feminist Geography,* 355-370.

Thoroughgood., C. N., & Padilla, A. (2013). Destructive leadership and the Penn State scandal: A toxic triangle perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 6,* 144-149.

Trust, R. (2013, July 2). *Shaping campus safety perceptions.* From www.livesafemobile.com/shaping-campus-safety-perceptions

Van Schalkwyk, R., & Steenkamp, R. (2016). "The exploration of service quality leadership for private higher education institutions in South Africa". *JHEA/RESA, Vol. 14 No. 2,* 85-105.

Wachie, E. O. (2022). *Human Factor and X-Ray Baggage Screening on Provision of Security and Safety of Universities Within Nairobi City County, Kenya.*

Wang, B., Chao, W., Reniers, G., Huang, L., Liangguo, K., & Laobing, Z. (2018). The future of hazardous chemical safety in China: Opportunities, problems, challenges, and tasks. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitutenv.2018.06.174

Yang, Y., Reniers, G., Chen, G., & Goerlandt, F. (2019). A bibliometric review of laboratory safety in universities. *Safety Science, 120.* From https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.06.022