

4-1-2005

Safety and Education at Trinity College

Grace Kim
Trinity College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Kim, Grace, "Safety and Education at Trinity College". Senior Theses, Trinity College, Hartford, CT 2005.
Trinity College Digital Repository, <http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/theses/74>

Safety and Education at Trinity College

Research Question and Significance

At approximately 1:30 this morning [October 31, 2004] a Trinity student was the victim of a sexual assault. The victim does not know the perpetrators. She describes them as college age, but does not believe they are Trinity students. The Hartford Police Department has been notified and an investigation is underway (Jorge Lugo, Campus Safety Report)

On the date of December 4th 2004, at approximately 9:50 p.m., a student was walking on Allen Pl. near the intersection of Affleck St., when he was accosted by two men. The student reported that one of the men brandished a pistol. Both individuals went through the pockets of the student, stole a small amount of money and then walked north on Affleck St. away from the student (Jorge Lugo, Campus Safety Report).

A student reported to the College that at approximately 3:00 a.m. today [November 19, 2004], a group of four students was the target of harassing, homophobic language (Jorge Lugo, Campus Safety Report).

These are three different types of violent incidents that have occurred on Trinity campus this fall semester, 2004. This semester has seen a number of violent incidents, which Campus Safety reports and sends out in e-mails to each student. The serious nature of these events has brought to attention many concerns and questions over the level of personal safety of students at Trinity College.

Located in Hartford, Connecticut, Trinity College is a small, residential, liberal arts college with 2,188 students. Due to its urban location, one of Trinity's top priorities is creating an atmosphere that is safe and conducive for learning. Safety is absolutely essential for every college because students must feel safe in order to learn effectively. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, one must first ensure safety before learning can be truly achieved (Huitt W, 1). Additionally, Trinity must be able to reassure parents with confidence that they are sending their children to a safe learning environment since students come from 44 different states and 28 different countries. Essentially, if a school

can not properly ensure the safety of their students, the college loses status, merit, and prestige. It is especially important for Trinity to ensure the safety of its students because the majority of the student population lives on campus. This makes safety on campus one of Trinity's top priorities because they assume a degree of responsibility for students' on-campus safety. With the recent events involving physical and emotional violence on Trinity campus, exemplified in the earlier quotes above, one wonders how the lack of safety has affected students' learning. Trinity must constantly evaluate the extent to which these incidents of violence affect students' ability to learn. How have the recent incidents of physical and emotional violence affected students' learning? Learning will be defined both as academic and non-academic learning.

Primary Sources and Methodology

The primary sources used for this research will be 90 surveys taken from a random sample of sophomores, juniors, and seniors (thirty per class). The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Trinity approved the survey, and participants were labeled anonymous. The freshman class and students living off-campus will be excluded from the evaluation of the surveys for the following reasons. The freshman class can not give an accurate assessment of safety on campus due to their limited exposure to the campus. Also, the general freshman fear of being new to the college experience and being away from home may confound the surveys evaluation of safety. Students that live off-campus are also excluded due to the small population that lives off-campus and also to eliminate the number of fears pertaining to safety specific to living off-campus. The surveys will assess the level of safety on campus as well as how students perceive their safety relative

to their safety in September. Nine in-depth interviews will also be implemented (three per class). This will supplement the surveys and provide a more thorough understanding of the level of fear and safety on campus. Additional sources will be from campus safety, utilizing their logged data on the number of violent incidents last year.

Literature Review

The article, “Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs” by William G. Huitt describes how humans are motivated by their drive to fulfill their unsatisfied needs. Illustrated by a pyramid, Abraham Maslow created a hierarchy of needs, in which the needs found on the lower level of the pyramid must first be achieved before moving up to the next level of unsatisfied needs. According to Maslow, the hierarchy of needs that are most essential are the deficiency levels which are in this order: physiological, safety and security, belonging and love, and esteem. In these levels, one cannot obtain esteem—defined as the ability to achieve—gain approval and recognition, and be competent without first satisfying the first three levels of need. The term physiological need refers to such categories as hunger and thirst. After one has secured a food and water supply, the next level of concern, energy, and focus, is on ensuring safety and security in which one can be confident that they are out of danger. The next level includes the need to belong and be accepted by people. Therefore, according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, safety must be ensured for learning to be effective (Huitt, William, “Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs”).

“Safety and Excellence”, by John Merrow describes safe and excellent schools as ensuring three types of safety: physical safety, emotional safety, and intellectual safety. Physical safety is the most obvious, and it pertains to school violence and the likelihood of being physically injured or killed in school. Emotional safety concerns the level of teasing and bullying that causes emotional distress for students. Emotional safety also deals with the connection between students and faculty. Without the confidence that professors and administration will be able to stop these types of problems, students will not be able to feel assured of their safety, demonstrated by this quote:

“That means that when children are teased, or frightened, or bothered, they feel confident taking their problems to the teachers, and the teachers won’t dismiss them....’The truly safe school really starts with this alliance, where if there’s going to be some kind of physical violence or violence to ideas, like cheating, a significant number of kids will feel their reputation will be tarnished if something happens, and they will speak out” (Merrow, 4).

Intellectual safety regards how comfortable students feel in expressing themselves in the classroom. If students feel that they will be laughed at for answering a question incorrectly, then learning is stunted by this fear, exemplified by this quote, ““There can’t be a climate where the kids laugh at the wrong answer. When that happens, a kid will immediately shut down and refuse to participate. And that’s when learning stops” (Merrow, 5). Therefore, the surveys will assess not only physical safety, but also emotional and intellectual safety.

In, “LAUSD School Facilities and Academic Achievement”, Jack Buckley, Mark Schneider, and Yi Shang measure the affect of compliance on academic achievement in the Los Angeles unified school district (LAUSD). Each school is evaluated on 14 measures of compliance: “accident preventions, asbestos management, fire/life safety, campus security, chemical safety, pest management, lead management, restroom facilities...indoor environment..., maintenance and repair, safe school plan, emergency

preparedness, traffic and pedestrian safety, and science lab safety. According to Buckley, Schneider, and Shang, “The compliance rating is linked to academic achievement. This means that just as various socioeconomic indicators predict academic performance, health and safety compliance (and what it indicates about the condition and management of the school facility) is also related to performance” (Buckley, J., Schneider, M, and Yi Shang, 3). Unfortunately there hasn’t been much research done on campus safety and its affects on learning.

Thesis

Before the data was collected, I proposed a hypothesis stating that according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, the recent incidents on campus will have elevated the level of fear, reducing students’ level of safety, and therefore negatively affect student learning. However, after the data was analyzed, it became clear that my hypothesis would need to be reformulated. My thesis then suggested that the recent incidents of violence have no real effect on students’ level of personal safety or on their ability to learn at Trinity College.

Evidence

There are two main sources of data that will supply evidence that support my thesis: the surveys and the in-depth interviews. The survey analysis includes frequencies through valid percents, averages, graphs, and cross-tabs that will allow a complete evaluation of the current level of safety on campus and will also note any changes to students’ level of safety since September.

The overall level of safety on Trinity campus was evaluated by two measures. Safety on campus was analyzed by the frequency and average of a single question on the

survey: Rate the overall level of safety at Trinity. The second measure of safety at Trinity was a comprehensive rating that cumulated six questions together to give a more thorough assessment of safety on Trinity campus. The questions include: Rate how safe it is to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus? How concerned are you of theft in your dorm room? How concerned are you of being attacked during the day on campus? How concerned are you of being attacked at night on campus? Rate the level of safety you feel at parties on campus. Rate the overall level of safety at Trinity. The first indicator was used as a means to test the accuracy of the comprehensive measure of safety at Trinity. Results of the comprehensive measure illustrated that on average, students feel somewhat safe (the number that indicated somewhat safe was labeled 12 and very safe was labeled 6). The overall mean was 12.1818 (see chart 1 and graph 1).

Results of the first indicator support the comprehensive measure. Participants were directed to choose very safe, somewhat safe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe to best describe the overall level of safety on campus. 60.2% of participants indicated that they felt somewhat safe on campus and 28.4% felt somewhat unsafe. Only 9.1% indicated that Trinity was very safe, and 2.3% indicated that Trinity campus was very unsafe. The mean outcome was 2.2386, which means that on average, most students feel somewhat safe (somewhat safe was labeled 2) (see chart 2 and graph 2).

The effects of the recent incidents were also measured through a comprehensive measure that cumulated 6 questions on the survey: How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies? During this semester, have you avoided going to the library due to concern for your safety? How often do you take extra precautions due to the recent incidents on campus? How often have you had

trouble sleeping at night due to the recent events? How frequently do you talk with friends about the recent events? Are you concerned about your safety now more than you were in September? A rating of 6 then would suggest that students were not affected at all by the recent events, while 12 would show that students were affected a few times, 18 would demonstrate that students sometimes felt affected, 24 would signify that students were affected frequently, and a rating of 30 would denote that students felt very affected by the recent incidents. The average of the results show a score of 12.4045, which illustrates that on average, participants felt that they were affected by the recent events a few times (see chart 3 and graph 3).

A second measure was used to support the comprehensive measure of the effects of the recent incidents. I looked at an individual question: Are you concerned about your safety now more than you were in September? This question addresses any change in the level of safety at Trinity since September. Students were asked to rate either very less concerned, somewhat less concerned, about the same, somewhat more concerned, or very more concerned. 58.9% of students indicated that they felt the same about safety on-campus since September, while 31.1% indicated that they were somewhat more concerned. Those that indicated very less concerned constituted 3.3% of the results, those that felt somewhat less concerned made up only 1.1% of the results, and those that felt very more concerned about their level of safety since September made up 5.6% of the results (see chart 4 and graph 4).

After measuring the physical level of safety on campus and the changes in the level of safety since September, I also decided to determine the level of emotional and intellectual safety. Emotional safety pertains to the level of teasing, bullying, or

ridiculing on campus. It also involves the confidence that students have towards Trinity's ability to handle such acts. The emotional safety measure consisted of three questions: During this semester, have you been teased, ridiculed, or hazed on campus? How capable do you think Trinity can tackle issues such as teasing and hazing? How confident are you that if you were the subject of ridicule, Trinity will be able to stop it? A rating of 3 indicates that the campus is very emotionally safe, 6.5 specifies a rating of somewhat emotional safe, 9.5 designating somewhat emotional unsafe, and a rating of 13 signifying a very emotional unsafe environment. The mean of the results show a rating of 6.7333, indicating that on average students feel somewhat emotionally safe on campus (see chart 5 and graph 5).

Intellectual safety measures how safe students feel to express themselves intellectually inside the classroom. This measure was comprised by two questions: How comfortable do you feel expressing yourself intellectually in class? and How often do students laugh or ridicule wrong answers in class? The scale given started with 2 denoting a very intellectually safe campus, while 9 indicated the other extreme. Therefore, 4.33 would comprise a somewhat safe rating, while a 6.66 rating would represent a somewhat intellectually unsafe evaluation, and 9 indicating a very unsafe intellectual environment. The mean rating was 3.5556, meaning that most students feel in between very safe and somewhat safe, intellectually, but closer to very safe. However, it is also significant to note that none of the ninety participants indicated a score higher than 6, although the scale reaches a maximum ranking of 9 (see chart 6 and graph 6).

Also, important to calculate was the level of social cohesion on campus. Maslow's hierarchy of needs refers not only to need for safety, but also the need for a

sense of belonging and acceptance. I choose to measure this variable so that I would be able to eliminate the possibility that students' attention to safety is due to the recent events and not due to insecurity and a lack of a sense of belonging—if the surveys indicate that most students feel unaccepted, than it would confound the data collected because this lack of belonging would influence their answers on the surveys in a statistically significant way.

Social cohesion was measured by comprising three questions together: How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity? How accepted do you feel by the Trinity community? Are you affiliated with any groups or organizations at Trinity? It is important to emphasize that acceptance by the Trinity culture does not dictate a complete sense of belonging and acceptance. As long as a student's primary group supplied them a sense of acceptance, than it would be enough not to confound the data. In this case, the rating started with 11 representing a very strong sense of acceptance, and 3 meaning that students felt very unaccepted. Therefore, a rating of 8 would refer to a student feeling somewhat accepted, and a rating of 5 would indicate a student who felt somewhat unaccepted. The average rating was 9.3913, which shows that most students feel in between very accepted and somewhat accepted, but closer to somewhat accepted (see chart 7 and graph 7).

I also measured the first question (How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity?) independently to support the findings. This measured complemented the comprehensive measure on social cohesion at Trinity. Results show that 63.2% have very strong social networks, the highest ranking available, and 27.6% felt that their friendships were somewhat strong. The mean came out to 3.5517, also

signifying that on average, students feel that their friendships are in between very strong and somewhat strong (see chart 8 and graph 8).

I also measured the individual question: How safe it was to walk alone after dark off-campus (Hartford)? This measure was used to illustrate how the current level of safety may affect student's non-academic learning. Ratings ranged from 1 to 4, where 1 signified a rating of very safe and 4 demonstrated a very unsafe measure. Most students indicated that it was very unsafe to walk alone after dark in Hartford. 51.1% felt that Hartford, or going off-campus was very unsafe, while 34.4% showed that it was somewhat unsafe. Only 13.3% stated that it was somewhat safe, and 1.1% decided that it was very safe. The average came out to 3.3556, meaning that the majority of students felt that walking alone after dark off-campus would be either very unsafe or somewhat unsafe (see chart 9 and graph 9).

I also measured the individual question: How safe is it to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus? This too would supplement the question above and provide a more thorough understanding of how the present level of safety affects students' non-academic learning. 44.4% of participates indicated that they felt somewhat unsafe, while 38.9% of students felt somewhat safe walking alone after dark on Trinity campus. Although only 5.6% of participates felt that it was very safe, 11.1% actually indicated that they felt very unsafe walking alone after dark on campus. The mean came out to 2.611, indicating that on average most students felt in between somewhat safe and somewhat unsafe to walk alone after dark on campus (see chart 10 and graph 10).

In order to better assess how the recent events affected students' academic ability, I also measured the individual survey question: How often have you avoided going to the

library due to the recent incidents? 77.8% of participants overwhelming indicated that they have not at all avoided the library due to the recent incidents of violence. The mean showed 1.4222, which demonstrated that on average, students either never avoided the library due to the recent events or have so only a few times during the semester. The ratings ranged from 1 to 5, 1 representing never, and 5 meaning all the time. Sometimes was represented by the rating 3, while 4 denoted frequently and 2 signified a few times (see chart 11 and graph 11).

The individual question, “How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies” was also measured to better support the thesis. It was demonstrated by this measure that on average, students’ studies have not at all or have been a few times affected by the recent events. The ratings ranged from 1 to 5, where 1 would represent that students have never been affected by the recent incidences, while 5 would suggest that students’ studies were affected by the recent incidents all the time. The mean resulted to 1.4607. A score of 2 implies that students’ studies have been affected a few times by the recent events (see chart 12 and graph 12).

Cross-tabs were also incorporated in order to take into account any confounding variables, such as academic class, gender, and income. The cross-tabs between academic class and safety combined 2 questions together: What year are you? and Rate the overall level of safety at Trinity? It was exemplified that a student’s academic year did not affect their sense of overall safety at Trinity. Most students answered in the same categories, despite their class standing. For example, for those that indicated that the campus was very safe, 3 were sophomores, 2 were juniors, and 3 were seniors. This illustrates that on

the most part, class standing did not affect one's sense of overall safety at Trinity (see chart 13 and graph 13).

Gender and safety were also cross-tabulated. More females completed the survey than males, and this needed to be accounted for. About 55% females and 45% males participated in the surveys. According to the data, females were more likely to select a somewhat unsafe rating than males. Females were also less inclined to select the rating very safe to describe the overall level of safety at Trinity—6 males felt very safe at Trinity, where only 2 females felt very safe. This also illustrates that males are more in favor of selecting the very safe rating to describe safety at Trinity (see chart 14 and graph 14).

Income and safety were also evaluated to exemplify how a student's family income could affect their perception of safety. The data revealed that those households that make less than 30,000 were more inclined to state that Trinity was very safe, while those households that make more than 150,000 are more prone to rate that Trinity is somewhat unsafe. Out of the 27 participants that have households that make over 150,000, 13 of those participants felt somewhat unsafe on campus, while only 8 out of the 47 participants of households that make between 30,000 and 150,000, revealed that they felt somewhat unsafe on campus (see chart 15 and graph 15).

Therefore, females and participants of households that make over 150,000 confound the data by negatively influencing their perception of safety towards the somewhat unsafe rating. Therefore, 28.4% of students who felt somewhat unsafe according to data has been influenced by gender and income, and have been inflated by these variables. Hence, this data confirms that most students feel that Trinity campus is

somewhat safe, and the confounding variables did little to affect the outcome of the surveys.

Analysis

Most students feel somewhat safe at Trinity College. Additionally, there has been no statistically significant evidence that students' level of safety has been affected by the recent effects, since most students revealed that they felt the same level of safety since September this semester. It was also demonstrated in my survey analysis that most students feel a strong sense of belonging and acceptance at Trinity. However, the present level of safety on campus hinders non-academic learning. Many students are afraid of going off-campus into Hartford alone. Additionally, although students feel more secure walking alone on campus at night, students are still negatively affected by the present level of safety, because the majority of participants felt somewhat unsafe. Also, discovered was that Trinity is very intellectually safe, and somewhat emotionally safe. Overall, Trinity rates somewhat safe, physically, intellectually, and emotionally.

In-depth interviews have also supported and supplemented the evidence provided by the surveys, while filling in questions about student fears and why their level of safety had not been affected by the recent incidents of violence. For example, subject A, a White senior male and subject G, a White junior female, stated that their fear on-campus was not any fear pertaining to Hartford, but of student on student violence on-campus, especially of drunk and belligerent college-aged males getting together on the weekend. Subject B, a White sophomore male, furthered this statement by stating that, "...the problem with safety is not external but internal". Subject C, a White senior female added that her fear on campus was the fear of random acts of violence. Subject F, and E, both

White female juniors also included that the cause of their fears was due to the fact that Trinity students are blatantly different from Hartford residents, in terms of class and race. The race and class divide between Hartford and Trinity residents has become so obvious that many of the interviewees have suggested that Trinity is a bubble like atmosphere with almost a literal fence around its borders. This blatant division is what many of the interviewees felt caused fear on campus. Also, female interviewees were more inclined to state that their fears on campus concerned sexual assault. Subject C reiterated that due to her gender, she had to be more concerned. She also stated that her fears on campus would be much more amplified if she had actually been a victim of any acts of violence. She had no prior experience that she felt put her safety in jeopardy. Also, important to note was the fact that Subject A is gay. In order to take into account variables that would affect the interviewee's perception of safety, I questioned how his sexual orientation could affect his outlook. He emphasized that due to his strong friendships he had not reason to be afraid on campus. Ultimately, subject A still felt that the campus was still very safe. Subject D, a White senior male added that his level of safety had not changed since September because he was expecting a certain number of violent incidents coming into school. The recent incidents did not raise his level of fear, but more reinforced his expectations for the semester. Subject F, a White junior female also added that most students do not realize how safe Trinity really is. After evaluating these answers, I researched on the number of incidents on-campus last year in comparison with the number of incidents this semester. The data I found supported the responses of these interviews, because it showed that many of the incidents on campus in the past three years were not physical, emotional, or intellectual assaults, but motor vehicle theft. Also,

I noticed that on average, two sexual assaults occur each year (Campus Safety 2003 Annual Report, <http://www.trincoll.edu/StudentLife/HealthSafety/CampusSafety/AnnualReport.htm>). This corresponds to Subject D's expectation of the level of safety on campus (see chart 16).

In conclusion, the recent events on campus have had a short-lived reaction and in turn have not disrupted students' level of safety since September. The level of safety on campus has been maintained since September and most students feel that Trinity is somewhat safe, physically and emotionally, and very safe intellectually. Academic learning has not been negatively affected by the recent incidents of violence on campus. However, the current level of safety shows that it hinders non-academic or social learning, since most students feel that walking alone after dark on campus is somewhat unsafe and walking alone after dark in Hartford is very unsafe. Subject I, an Asian sophomore female ended her interview stating that perhaps Trinity's policies in keeping students safe is actually a cause and consequence of the level of fear on campus. Subject H, a White junior female also further supported this idea stating that, "it isn't so much the actual acts of violence that make me afraid, but the lack of information and the way that information of those acts are communicated to us". Perhaps, in making the campus too secure, Trinity has unconsciously discouraged students from leaving campus and from exploring the world outside.

Bibliography

1. Buckley, J., Schneiger, M., and Yi Shang, "LAUSD School Facilities and Academic Performance".
2. Huitt, W. (2004). "Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs". *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved November 20, 2004 from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/regsys/maslow.html>.
3. Merrow, John. "Safety and Excellence". *Educational Horizons*. Retrieved November 4, 2004 from <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>: 19-32.

Chart 1: Comprehensive measure describing the overall level of safety at Trinity College

Rating: 7 (very safe), 14 (somewhat safe), 21 (somewhat unsafe), 28 (very unsafe)

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall level of safety at Trinity (comprehensive)	88	7.00	19.00	12.1818	2.82251
Valid N (listwise)	88				

Graph 1: Comprehensive measure describing the overall level of safety at Trinity College

Rating: (very safe), 14 (somewhat safe), 21 (somewhat unsafe), 28 (very unsafe)




Chart 2: Rate the overall level of safety on campus

Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)

Frequency


		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very safe	8	8.9	9.1	9.1
	somewhat safe	53	58.9	60.2	69.3
	somewhat unsafe	25	27.8	28.4	97.7
	very unsafe	2	2.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	88	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.2		
Total		90	100.0		

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Rate the overall safety at Trinity	88	1.00	4.00	2.2386	.64317
Valid N (listwise)	88				

Graph 2: Rate the overall level of safety on campus

Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)




Rate the overall safety at Trinity

Chart 3: Comprehensive measure describing the overall effects of recent events
Rating: 6 (not at all affected), 12 (a few times), 18 (sometimes), 24 (frequently), 30 (all the time)

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How affected do you feel by the recent events?	89	8.00	25.00	12.4045	3.63293
Valid N (listwise)	89				

Graph 3: Comprehensive measure describing the overall effects of recent events
Rating: 6 (not at all affected), 12 (a few times), 18 (sometimes), 24 (frequently), 30 (all the time)



How affected do you feel by the recent events?

6 (not affected) - 30 (very affected)

Chart 4: Are you concerned about your safety more than you were in September?
Rating: 1 (very less concerned), 2 (somewhat less concerned), 3 (about the same), 4 (somewhat more concerned), 5 (very more concerned)


Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very less concerned	3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	somewhat less concerned	1	1.1	1.1	4.4
	about the same	53	58.9	58.9	63.3
	somewhat more concerned	28	31.1	31.1	94.4
	very more concerned	5	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total		90	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Are you more concerned about your safety than you were in Sept?	90	1.00	5.00	3.3444	.75194
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 4: Are you concerned about your safety more than you were in September?
Rating: 1 (very less concerned), 2 (somewhat less concerned), 3 (about the same), 4 (somewhat more concerned), 5 (very more concerned)



Are you more concerned than in Sept?

Chart 5: Emotional safety measure


Rating: 3 (very safe), 6.333 (somewhat safe), 9.666 (somewhat unsafe), 13 (very unsafe)

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
emotional safety	90	3.00	13.00	6.7333	1.86511
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 5: Emotional safety measure

Rating: 3 (very safe), 6.333 (somewhat safe), 9.666 (somewhat unsafe), 13 (very unsafe)



emotional safety

3 (very emotionally safe) - 13 (very emotionally unsafe)

Chart 6: Intellectual safety measure


Rating: 2 (very safe), 4.333 (somewhat safe), 6.666 (somewhat unsafe), 9 (very unsafe)

Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
intellectual safety	90	2.00	6.00	3.5556	1.11286
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 6: Intellectual safety measure

Rating: 2 (very safe), 4.333 (somewhat safe), 6.666 (somewhat unsafe), 9 (very unsafe)



intellectual safety

2 (very intellectually safe) - 9 (very intellectually unsafe)

Chart 7: Comprehensive measure describing social cohesion


Rating: 11 (very accepted), 8.333 (somewhat accepted), 5.666 (somewhat unaccepted), 3 (very unaccepted)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
cohesion	69	6.00	11.00	9.3913	1.43709
Valid N (listwise)	69				

Graph 7: Comprehensive measure describing social cohesion

Rating: 11 (very accepted), 8.333 (somewhat accepted), 5.666 (somewhat unaccepted), 3 (very unaccepted)



cohesion

11 (very accepted) - 3 (very unaccepted)

Chart 8: How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity?
Rating: 1 (no social networks), 2 (not strong), 3 (somewhat strong), 4 (very strong)


Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no social networks	2	2.2	2.3	2.3
	not strong	5	5.6	5.7	8.0
	somewhat strong	24	26.7	27.6	35.6
	very strong	55	61.1	63.2	98.9
	5.00	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total		87	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	3	3.3		
Total		90	100.0		

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity?	87	1.00	5.00	3.5517	.72751
Valid N (listwise)	87				

Graph 8: How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity?
Rating: 1 (no social networks), 2 (not strong), 3 (somewhat strong), 4 (very strong)



How strong are your social networks (friendships) at Trinity?

Chart 9: How safe it was to walk alone after dark off-campus (Hartford)?
Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)


Frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very safe	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	somewhat safe	12	13.3	13.3	14.4
	somewhat unsafe	31	34.4	34.4	48.9
	very unsafe	46	51.1	51.1	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How safe is it to walk alone after dark off-campus (Hartford)?	90	1.00	4.00	3.3556	.75418
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 9: How safe it was to walk alone after dark off-campus (Hartford)?
Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)



How safe is it to walk alone after dark off-campus (Hartford)?

Chart 10: How safe is it to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus?

Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)

Frequency


		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very safe	5	5.6	5.6	5.6
	somewhat safe	35	38.9	38.9	44.4
	somewhat unsafe	40	44.4	44.4	88.9
	very unsafe	10	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How safe is it to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus?	90	1.00	4.00	2.6111	.75987
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 10: How safe is it to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus?

Rating: 1 (very safe), 2 (somewhat safe), 3 (somewhat unsafe), 4 (very unsafe)



How safe is it to walk alone after dark on Trinity campus?

Chart 11: How often have you avoided going to the library due to the recent incidents?

Rating: 1 (not at all), 2 (a few times), 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), 5 (all the time)

Frequency


	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not at all	70	77.8	77.8	77.8
a few times	10	11.1	11.1	88.9
sometimes	5	5.6	5.6	94.4
frequently	2	2.2	2.2	96.7
all the time	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How often have you avoided going to the library due to the recent incidents?	90	1.00	5.00	1.4222	.94783
Valid N (listwise)	90				

Graph 11: How often have you avoided going to the library due to the recent incidents?

Rating: 1 (not at all), 2 (a few times), 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), 5 (all the time)



How often have you avoided going to the library due to the r

Chart 12: How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies

Rating: 1 (not at all), 2 (a few times), 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), 5 (all the time)


Frequency					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not at all	60	66.7	67.4	67.4
	a few times	20	22.2	22.5	89.9
	sometimes	7	7.8	7.9	97.8
	frequently	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
	all the time	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total		89	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		90	100.0		

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies?	89	1.00	5.00	1.4607	.78416
Valid N (listwise)	89				

Graph 12: How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies

Rating: 1 (not at all), 2 (a few times), 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), 5 (all the time)




How often has the concern over the recent incidents of violence on campus affected your studies?

Chart 13: Academic Class Standing and Safety Crosstabulation

What year are you? * Rate the overall safety at Trinity Crosstabulation

		Rate the overall safety at Trinity				Total
		very safe	somewhat safe	somewhat unsafe	very unsafe	
What year are you?	Sophomore	3	18	6	1	28
	Junior	2	16	11	1	30
	Senior	3	19	8	0	30
Total		8	53	25	2	88

Graph 13: Academic Class Standing




What year are you?

Chart 14: Gender and Safety Crosstabulation

What is your sex? * Rate the overall safety at Trinity Crosstabulation

		Rate the overall safety at Trinity				Total
		very safe	somewhat safe	somewhat unsafe	very unsafe	
What is your sex?	Male	6	24	8	1	39
	Female	2	29	17	1	49
Total		8	53	25	2	88

Graph 14: Gender




What is your sex?

Chart 15: Income and Safety Crosstabulation

Rate the overall safety at Trinity * What is your family's annual income? Crosstabulation

		What is your family's annual income?				Total
		less than 30,000	30,000-70,000	70,000-150,000	More than 150,000	
Rate the overall safety at Trinity	Very safe	2	2	2	1	7
	somewhat safe	1	11	23	12	47
	somewhat unsafe	1	4	4	13	22
	Very unsafe	0	1	0	1	2
Total		4	18	29	27	78

Graph 15: Income



What is your family's annual income?

**Chart 16: Campus Safety 2003 Annual Report
Trinity College Three-Year Disclosure of Crimes
Reported to Campus Safety and Other Administrative
Entities on Campus**

Type of Incidents Occurring on Campus and Reported to Campus Safety	2003 Locations			Totals		
	Campus	Non-Campus	Residence Halls	2003	2002	2001
Aggravated Assault	0	0	0	0	5	1
Arson	0	1	0	1 (a)	0	4
Burglary	4	3	2	9 (b)	18	9
Criminal Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hate Crime	0	0	0	0	0	1
Manslaughter (Non-Negligent)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter (Negligent)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicle Theft	20	1	0	21	15	11 (c)
Robbery	2	1	0	3	5	8
Sex Offenses: (Forcible)	1	0	1	2	2	2