

ETD Archive

---

2016

## The Impact of School Policing Practices on Student Behaviors in Ohio Public Schools

Jennifer Marie Dohy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Dohy, Jennifer Marie, "The Impact of School Policing Practices on Student Behaviors in Ohio Public Schools" (2016). *ETD Archive*. 887.

<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/887>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact [library.es@csuohio.edu](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).

**THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL POLICING PRACTICES ON STUDENT  
BEHAVIORS IN OHIO PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**JENNIFER DOHY**

**Bachelors of Science**

**Cleveland State University**

**December 2010**

**Master of Education**

**Cleveland State University**

**August 2012**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN URBAN EDUCATION**

**at the**

**Cleveland State University**

**May 2016**

© Copyright by Jennifer Dohy, 2016

We hereby approve the dissertation  
of  
**Jennifer Dohy**

Candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Education Degree

This Dissertation has been approved for the  
**Office of Doctoral Studies,**  
College of Education and Human Services  
and

**CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY**  
College of Graduate Studies by

---

Chairperson: Tachelle I. Banks, Ph.D.  
Teacher Education

---

Methodologist: Joshua G. Bagaka's, Ph.D.  
Curriculum and Foundations

---

Anne M. Galletta, Ph.D.  
Curriculum and Foundations

---

Brian Harper, Ph.D.  
Curriculum and Foundations

---

Ronnie A. Dunn, Ph.D.  
Urban Studies

**April 25, 2016**  
Student's Date of Defense

**THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL POLICING PRACTICES ON STUDENT  
BEHAVIORS IN OHIO PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**JENNIFER DOHY**

**ABSTRACT**

Many American public schools began to employ School Resource Officers (SROs) in the 1990s as a result of mass school shootings in the early 1990s (Weiler & Cray, 2011). An SRO is a law enforcement officer serving primarily within a school community whose mission is to ensure safety, order, and discipline through conflict mediation and critical incident response (Clark, 2011). According to national data, there are currently SROs in 35% of schools, regardless of level (e.g., elementary, middle, and high school), location (e.g., rural, town, suburban, or city), or student population (Weiler & Cray, 2011). Despite a heavy reliance on policing in American public schools, limited research exists regarding the long term implications of these measures on student behaviors.

The present study examined variations in incidents of student insubordination and violence between 2010 and 2014. An individual change model allowed for repeated observations of student behaviors in 148 schools at the individual school level at the initial status (2010) and over time. Findings were significant at the initial status only. As school size and the total number of school policing measures increased, so did student incidents of insubordination in 2010. School policing and the percentage of economic disadvantage did not predict violence. Findings contribute to the knowledge base regarding school policing by considering the actual number of behavior incidents with respect to policing in all school locales, revealing that the impact of school policing on

student behaviors may transcend race and geographic location. The study recommends alternative approaches to problematic behavior and intensive training for school police officers.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER:	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	4
Purpose of the Study .....	6
Hypotheses .....	6
Research design .....	7
Significance .....	7
Theoretical Framework .....	10
Definitions of Key Terms .....	22
Organization of the Study .....	25
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	26
Social Construction and Labeling Theory .....	27
School discipline policies and the media .....	30
Social construction of “urban.” .....	33
Social construction of inner city, urban schools .....	33
Historical Analysis Regarding the Urban and Minority Relationship ...	37
1950s -1960s .....	37
1980-1995 .....	41
Broken windows .....	45
Mental disabilities and public drunkenness .....	50

Support of broken windows .....	52
Arguments against broken windows .....	54
Police brutality and racial profiling.....	64
Summary .....	66
Incrementalism.....	68
School discipline .....	70
Safety policies .....	71
School safety and broken windows .....	72
School policing and foot patrol .....	73
The Gun Free School Act and Zero Tolerance Policies .....	74
Effectiveness and consequence of zero tolerance policies .....	75
Zero Tolerance and inner city, urban, minority students .....	80
School Policing.....	83
Security guards and violence in schools.....	89
Student perceptions .....	91
Cultural Forces.....	92
Cultural forces in urban communities .....	95
Cultural forces and inner city, urban schools .....	98
Summary .....	103
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	106
Introduction.....	106
Purpose of the Study .....	106
Pilot Study .....	107



Research Design.....	111
Variables.....	111
Participants .....	111
Instrumentation.....	112
Procedures .....	113
Institutional review board .....	113
Data processing and analysis.....	114
Model specification .....	117
Level 1 model .....	117
Level 2 model .....	117
Summary .....	118
IV. FINDINGS .....	119
Introduction.....	119
Descriptive Characteristics .....	122
Findings of the Study .....	122
Research questions #1 .....	123
Research questions #2 .....	124
Research question #3.....	125
Research question #4.....	126
Overview.....	127
Summary .....	128
V. DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	130
Introduction.....	130

Discussion of Findings.....	131
Labeling theory, social construction, and minority students.....	132
School security measures and broken windows .....	134
Incrementalism .....	138
School size and student behaviors.....	138
Cultural forces and student behaviors .....	140
Poverty and student behaviors.....	144
Strengths and Limitations .....	145
Implications for Practice .....	148
Conclusions.....	152
Recommendations for Future Research .....	152
REFERENCES .....	154

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of an Individual Change Model regarding the extent to which students' incidents of insubordination in 2010 (Level 1)..... 124
2. Summary of Individual Change Modeling involving how the rate of change in students' incidents of insubordination between 2010 and 2014 (Level 2) relates to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools ..... 125
3. Summary of Individual Change Model regarding the extent to which students' incidents of violence in 2010 (Level 1) relate to the total number of school security measures..... 126
4. Summary of Individual Change Modeling regarding how the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between 2010 and 2014 (Level 2) relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools ..... 127

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The dominant narrative involving urban schools is one of a police state inundated with armed guards and intense behavioral problems (Alexander, 2010). This viewpoint holds in stark opposition to the more positive cultural lens involving non-urban schools, which are often regarded as safer, and thus require less security (Alexander, 2010). The mass shooting at Sandy Hook elementary school on December 14, 2012, which took the lives of 20 children and six adult staff members, has ignited an intense national debate regarding school security and the safety of children in the classroom. This national discussion may signal the beginning of a paradigmatic shift in school safety and security practices. With such charged emotions and politicized rhetoric tied into the safety of school-aged children, it is important to examine the factors involved in the policing and safety of American schools.

In response to the tragic mass shooting at Sandy Hook, National Rifle Association (NRA) chief executive Wayne LaPierre stated, “the only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun, is a good guy with a gun” (Connor & Isikoff, 2012, para 2). LaPierre’s statement and subsequent plan to introduce armed guards and security volunteers into schools’ classroom (Connor & Isikoff, 2012). Within this emotionally charged conversation

many have promoted subjective “truths” rather than facts and may have lost sight of the existing body of research and statistics regarding violence in American schools.

In the year 2010, 4,828 young people aged 10-24 were murdered in the United States, an average of 13 per day. The overwhelming majority, 86% were male (4,171) and were killed with a firearm (82.8%). Homicide is the second leading cause of death for people aged 15-24, although less than 1% of all youth homicides during the 2008-2009 school year occurred at school. The overall percentage of school related youth homicides have steadily held below 2% since the 1992-1993 school year (Center for Disease Control, 2012).

A 2011 nationally representative youth survey of students in grades 9-12, which was conducted by the Center for Disease Control (CDC), revealed 32.8% of students report having been in a physical fight in the preceding 12 months. The prevalence of fighting was slightly higher for males (40.7%) than females (24.4%). Of the students surveyed, 16.6% self-identified as having carried a weapon (gun, knife or club) on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey. Males were more likely to carry a weapon (25.9%) than females (6.8%). Of the students who carried a weapon, 5.1% reported carrying a gun on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey. Males reported carrying a firearm more (8.6%) than females (1.4%). In the 12 months preceding the survey, 7.4% of students’ report being threatened or injured one or more times with a weapon on school property (Center for Disease Control, 2012).

Nationally, mass school shootings or “rampage shootings” are in the extreme minority of adolescent homicides (Newman & Fox, 2009) though they occupy a significant portion of the national dialogue on adolescent violence (Newman & Fox, 2009). Popular discourse often links school shootings with urban environments despite

their unrelated sociological underpinnings (DeLeon, 2012). The motives and suspects are often reified within the greater context of urban violence as such situations do not fit with how the non-urban identity has been constructed (Alexander, 2010; DeLeon, 2012).

The intense emotions related to the mass school shooting at Sandy Hook and the existing school security measures are not new. Many schools, particularly in inner city, urban spaces, have had school security measures, such as guards and metal detectors, as far back as the 1960s. Their use intensified in the 1990s after a mass shooting at Columbine high school, which left 14 students and one teacher dead (Weiler & Cray, 2011). Despite the fact that school security measures were originally put in place to protect students from outsiders, more and more, these measures are being used to police students within schools and little is known regarding the influence these measures have on student behaviors in American public schools (Nolan, 2011). In Nolan's (2011) ethnography, she observed in a large urban high school that was patrolled by twelve police officers from the local precinct, four officers from a special task force, and twenty "safety agents" who were all hired for purposes of order maintenance.

The present study is interested in determining the impact of school policing practices on student behaviors over time. It is important to note that the literature regarding school policing does not make a clear distinction between police officers and "safety agents." Nolan refers to their use as "order-maintenance policing" (p. 4). The literature also discusses School Resource Officers (SROs), or officers that work primarily in the school (Weiler & Cray, 2011). To determine if there is there is a difference in terms of the relationship between those considered SROs and police officers, the present study examined each of these measures in relationship to the total number of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence.

## **Statement of the Problem**

In 1994, with the passage of the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA), a zero tolerance mindset moved into American public schools. Educational funding requirements contained within the GFSA required a mandatory one-year expulsion for any student carrying a firearm on a school campus (Rice, 2009; Teske, 2011). Many school districts embraced the zero tolerance mindset as a pathway to remove subjective influences on student discipline (American Psychologist, 2008), relieve educators of exercising deliberation and critical judgments (Giroux, 2003), and remove dangerous students while simultaneously sending a strong message of deterrence to others (American Psychologist, 2008; Gregory & Cornell, 2009). By the 1996–1997 school year, 94% of schools held zero tolerance policies surrounding firearms, 91% for other weaponry, 88% for drugs, and 87% for alcohol (Dupper, 2010). Zero tolerance policies have recently been applied to non-violent offenses, such as insubordination and have increasingly been used as an authoritarian tool (Gregory & Cornell, 2009) to punish and remove challenging students (Dupper, 2010). Behaviors that are considered insubordinate or disorderly, which will be used interchangeably throughout this paper, are considered to be subjective by some scholars and include, but are not limited to, refusing to follow instructions and swearing (Nolan, 2011). Punishing students for these “offenses,” under a zero tolerance mindset could exacerbate existing issues, particularly for minority and special education populations (Dupper, 2010; Nolan, 2011).

Zero tolerance policies in schools appear to be related to of the precedent set by prisons in that the policy disproportionately affects Black and Hispanic students at a rate approximately three times the rate of their White peers (Dupper, 2010). It also appears that students with emotional behavioral disorders (EBD) are suspended and expelled at a

rate not representative of their overall population (American Psychologist, 2008). The literature surrounding the suspension and expulsion of many minority and disabled students mirrors the drastic increase in overall incarcerations, asserting an increase of 1.7 million students suspended annually in 1974 to 3.1 million students suspended in 2001 (Teske, 2011). More recently, a study conducted by UCLA (2015) found that in North Carolina 21% of Native American students were suspended. English Language Learners (ELL) and those residing in low-income areas are also more likely to be suspended or expelled from school than their counterparts (Losen, Hudson, Keith, Morison, & Beway, 2015).

Acting in conjunction with Zero Tolerance policies in schools, many schools have hired School Resource Officers (SROs), also in response to a number of mass school shootings in the 1990s (e.g. Columbine) (Weiler & Cray, 2011). The SRO is considered a police officer first and a member of the school community second (Clark, 2011; Weiler & Cray, 2011), and is a law enforcement officer serving primarily within a school community. The SROs mission is to ensure safety, order, and discipline through conflict mediation and critical incident response (Clark, 2011). According to national data as examined by Weiler & Cray (2011), there are currently SROs in 35% of schools, regardless of level (e.g., elementary, middle, and high school), location (e.g., rural, town, suburban, or city), or student population. Despite the increased reliance on SRO's in American public schools, it is unclear how their presence impacts student behaviors over time (Hyman & Snook, 2000). Qualitative research conducted by Nolan (2011) suggests that a potentially adverse relationship exists between authority figures, such as SROs, and inner city, urban, minority students that criminalizes, rather than reduces, problematic student behaviors.



## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to determine whether the presence of school policing measures in schools is related to problematic student behaviors in all Ohio school locales, including urban, suburban, and rural schools as well as elementary, middle, and high school settings. Trends in student behaviors over a four-year time frame as related to the presence of school policing in suburban and rural schools will be included. Student behaviors are comprised of insubordination and violence. The following research questions will be addressed.

1. To what extent are student incidents of insubordination in 2010 related to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
2. To what extent does the rate of change in student incidents of insubordination between 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years relate to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
3. To what extent are student incidents of violence in 2010 related to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
4. To what extent does the rate of change in student incidents of violence between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years relate to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?

The reason for limiting the study to these select years is due to the fact that federal grants and funding for SROs may only last for three years (Weiler & Cray, 2011).

**Hypotheses.** Based on the findings from a pilot study, to be discussed later, and the examined literature, it is hypothesized that student behaviors involving insubordination and violence will either remain unaffected or increase over time with the presence of security guards in inner city, urban school settings. Additionally, poverty

levels and the percentage of minority students are thought to correlate with the number of disciplinary incidents in schools, where schools characterized as high poverty and/or have a larger minority population will likely experience higher rates of disciplinary incidents, the result, perhaps, of systemic issues, such as racial profiling. However, due to the paucity of research involving the impact of school security guards on student behaviors in suburban and rural schools, a hypothesis regarding this relationship is not possible at this time.

**Research design.** In order to study the relationship over time between the presence of school security guards and student behaviors over time, a survey, which will be disseminated via SurveyMonkey, will ask public school principals in urban, suburban, and rural schools, at all levels (e.g. elementary), in Ohio to identify the total number of security guards in their schools. As mentioned, Weiler and Cray (2011) found that SROs are in 35% of schools, regardless of level, location, or student population. The total number of disciplinary measures for insubordination and violence in participating schools will be obtained from the Ohio Department of Education's website for the 2010-2014 school years (Ohio Department of Education (ODE), 2014). Each school will then receive a code and be copied into a SPSS spreadsheet with their respective number of security guards and number of student behaviors for each year. These data will be transferred to an HLM program and will be examined using an individual change model to determine the impact of school security guards on student behaviors over time.

### **Significance**

The use of security measures in the form of security guards have been present in many "troubled" inner city, urban schools, with large minority populations as far back as the 1960s (Addington, 2009; Fuentes, 2012; Vera Institute of Justice, 1999). Urban

schools were and still are considered by the dominant narrative to be hotspots for violence. As a result, they are thought to require more interventions in the form of policing than their suburban and rural counterparts (Nolan, 2011) to ensure elements from their “dangerous” neighborhoods do not bleed into schools (Smith, 2011). However, after the 1999 shooting at Columbine High School, which left 14 students and 1 teacher dead, the increased use of what Addington (2009) terms as “visible security measures,” or the presence of metal detectors, security cameras, and law enforcement officers and private security guards began to be implemented in suburban and rural schools as well. Addington (2009) explains that these measures are the most common response to school shootings and suggests that there is a limited understanding regarding the effectiveness and potential consequences of their use. As such, Addington (2009) implores researchers to develop ways to evaluate and assess their effectiveness in America’s public schools. To date, the majority of research regarding this topic is qualitative in nature.

As mentioned, literature examining the effectiveness of school security is limited (Addington, 2009) and generally involves student perceptions in urban school environments of such measures that are, namely, negative and qualitative in nature. Students in these studies often perceive the guards as being adversaries rather than respected school staff members who can mediate against problematic behaviors in their schools (Nolan, 2011). Other quantitative research suggests the use of police officers can make the school environment feel more similar to a correctional facility than a school (Theirot, 2009) and may be associated with victimization, fear (Schreck & Miller, 2003), social disorder (Mayer & Leone, 1999), insubordination, and violence (Theirot, 2009).

While these data are valuable, there is limited research regarding current student behavioral outcomes after the implementation of school security guards in all school

locales (Addington, 2009; Nolan, 2011). Having a zero tolerance mindset and a heavy police state that criminalizes student behaviors and results in the removal of students may create a self-fulfilling prophecy in the minds of students that could cause or further contribute to their problematic behaviors (Addington, 2009; Nolan 2011; & Toldson, 2012). In other words, when students are viewed as having violent tendencies, they are treated as potential offenders by security officers, which can trigger negative behaviors from students. This is a noted problem for inner city, urban schools, with high minority populations (Nolan, 2011) and will be discussed in more detail in proceeding selections of this paper.

In evaluating the impact of school practices on student behaviors in American public schools, the present study seeks to move beyond conjecture and negative connotations associated with the term “urban” and minority populations that seem to lead to uninformed school security decisions. Instead, an investigation into the use of school security guards with respect to the actual number of incidents of student behaviors that occur within all school locales must take place in order to have an accurate data picture regarding the effectiveness and necessity of these measures. Suburban, rural, and urban schools at all levels (e.g. elementary) will be included in the present study as focusing only on inner-city, predominately Black or Latino schools would further contribute to the notion that school discipline is designated an “urban problem” and Wilson’s attention to the interaction of structural and cultural forces will inform the discussion of study findings. Results from this study may allow policymakers to begin to make knowledgeable judgments to advocate for or contravene the use of school security guards as a means to mediate against problematic student behaviors within all school settings. Reducing student disciplinary incidents will not be accomplished by ignoring issues of

racism, stereotypes, and disproportionality as doing so will not allow one to understand the root causes of problematic student behaviors and/ or the nuances associated with this issue. As a result, the literature review highlights past and present contributions to the notion that urban schools are more violent than their counterparts.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Racism as an ideology of racial domination is embedded in America's cultural framework and is a hindrance to the economic progression of minority groups (Wilson, 2009). There are currently two accepted definitions of racism that include:

1. A belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race
2. Racial prejudice or discrimination (Merriam-Webster, 2015).

To expound on this briefly, in *The Mismeasure of Man*, Gould (1996) discusses and reports errors in historical studies that have suggested that Blacks are predisposed to being less intelligent and more violent than Whites. He also quotes many influential leaders who share this sentiment, including President Lincoln, who argued the following during the 1858 Douglas debates:

There is a physical difference between the white and black races, which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race (Angle, 1958, p. 235).

President Lincoln's quote fits in with the first definition of racism, viewing one race as being inferior to another, a belief that seems to exist insidiously in society's structures.

The dominant narrative's understanding of racism in America is that of severe isolated events committed by individuals, while not much attention is paid to how racism exists within the structures of our society (Alexander, 2010). An individual person who commits a blatant act of racism, such as murdering someone because of race, is not thought to reflect dominant society. However, dominant society is less aware of the notion that racism can manifest itself in the structures of society, including but not limited to discrimination in hiring practices and housing, as suggested by the second definition of racism (Wilson, 2009), and schools are not immune to such social patterns (Majors & Billson, 1992; Nolan, 2011).

Structural forces often exist as an extension of racism and can reinforce poverty and inequitable opportunities for minorities (Wilson, 2009). Structural forces involve the arrangement of social positions, social roles, and networks of social relationships (Wilson, 2009). *Social acts* are considered by Wilson (2009) to include the behaviors of individuals that contribute to inequities in a society, such as stereotyping and discrimination in hiring and housing. *Social processes* are the vehicle by which the status quo is maintained that exclude individuals based on race or ethnicity, including laws, policies and institutional practices (Wilson, 2009). Given the aforementioned data revealing the disproportionate impact discipline measures have on poor students of color, it is not unreasonable to assume that structural forces exist in schools in the form of zero tolerance policies and school policing practices.

The GFSA and school policing practices can result in the *exclusion* of students through a high rate of suspensions, expulsions, and court summonses, which affect minority and special education students more often than their White counterparts (Nolan, 2011). These disciplinary practices can be considered structural forces, wherein popular

discourse stereotypes minority students as having more aggressive tendencies than their counterparts (*social acts*), and the process by which problematic behaviors are managed within school settings are applied differently by school locale and race/minority status (*social processes*). As mentioned, highly segregated inner-city schools often mirror the atmosphere of correctional facilities with a larger police presence and punitive reactions to problematic student behaviors (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). In order to understand this relationship, it is important to consider how American public schools have become dependent on punitive measures to mediate against problematic student behaviors. Zero tolerance policies and school security guards in schools, then, may be structural forces that have inadvertently contributed further to the discipline gap and subsequent school-to-prison-pipeline.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union (2013), the school-to-prison pipeline is a metaphorical term to describe material consequences of certain policies in which children are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice system. Students involved in the pipeline often are a racial minority, may have learning disabilities, and often come from situations of generational poverty. From this view, it seems those most affected by the policies and procedures surrounding zero tolerance disciplinary action in schools are placed on a high-risk path to incarceration (Dupper, 2010). For certain segments of student populations, such as minorities, schools are increasingly following policies and procedures as seen in prisons, including armed security guards, surveillance, and random searches (Alexander, 2010, Fuentes, 2012; Giroux, 2003; Nolan, 2011). Instead of investing time and personnel to shape positive behaviors in students, many school districts are implementing measures that criminalize student behavior, enabling the removal of “problematic” students (Alexander, 2010;

Fuentes, 2012; Giroux, 2003; Nolan, 2011). As such, the school may inadvertently hold responsibility for shaping future inmates, particularly minority populations, through the removal of educational opportunity and the implementation of punitive measures, such as the use of suspensions and expulsions for minor infractions and disproportionately impact minority and special education populations (Alexander, 2010; Giroux, 2003; Swain & Noblit, 2011).

A recent report indicates that the rate of suspensions occurs at unprecedented rates across the United States. This study combined all out-of-school suspension rates for every school district and found that students are reportedly losing almost eighteen million days a year due to suspensions, the highest of which occurred in Florida at the elementary/secondary levels (Losen, et al., 2015). Additionally, the United States is not closing the school discipline gap, which involves the use of disciplinary measures, such as suspensions, that affect minority students at a higher rate than their White counterparts. St. Louis, Missouri, for example, is cited as the worst in the United States regarding this gap, wherein Black students are suspended more often than White students. This gap is experienced at varying degrees by different states. The UCLA subsequently poses questions regarding the reasons 21 percent of American Indian students are suspended in North Carolina, why 14 percent of black elementary students are suspended in Missouri, and 19 percent of English Language Learners (ELLs) are suspended at the secondary level in Montana (Losen, et al., 2015).

The answers to the aforementioned questions may not involve a simple linear relationship where A causes B. Nonetheless, research into the potential systemic causes of such disparities could help inform school discipline policies. Perhaps the adoption of a zero tolerance mindset in public schools and the use of school security guards to mediate



against problematic student behaviors may have, inadvertently, contributed further to the discipline gap and the school-to-prison pipeline. However, since there is a lack of empirical research to prove or disprove the effects zero tolerance policies and school policing practices have on student behavioral outcomes (Dupper, 2010; Hyman & Snook, 2000; Martinez, 2009), all conversations surrounding these topics, both good and bad, can only be described as conjecture.

The adoption of school discipline measures in the form of the GFSA and school security measures seem to mirror the War on Drugs efforts of the 1980s, which posited strict punitive measures would prevent crime and protect law-abiding citizens by removing criminal drug offenders from the general populous (Teske, 2012). These policies operate under a zero tolerance mindset where the removal of criminals from the general populous through one-strike measures supersedes efforts to determine the root causes of their behaviors. It will be argued that the War on Drugs and school discipline policies seem to have been informed by the Broken Windows theory of Crime (Teske, 2012) through the incrementalist approach to policy development and justified by the social construction of urban, minority populations. More specifically, the use of school discipline policies in the form of zero tolerance and school policing practices, to mediate against problematic student behaviors in many American public schools, may be the result of the complex relationships between the following structural forces: The Broken Windows Theory of Crime, incrementalism, and the social construction of inner city, urban, and minority populations.

The Broken Windows Theory of Crime suggests that communities must attend to physical and social disorder, such as broken windows and public drunkenness, respectively, to mediate against more severe crimes (e.g. murder) (Kelling & Coles,

1996; Wilson & Kelling 1982). In other words, by allowing minor disorderly behaviors to persist without consequence, these authors believe that this neglect will encourage more problematic behaviors. To minimize this effect, Kelling and Coles (1996) suggest the use of foot patrol to walk around and interact with citizens, creating undefined, but understood and enforced rules, such as not sitting or lying in a stoop. Critics of the Broken Windows theory suggest that the implementation of order maintenance has resulted in a war on the poor, leading to increasing numbers of unemployed residents and has done little to reduce crime rates while increasing the population of minority populations in our nation's prisons (Nolan, 2011).

As mentioned, the War on Drugs efforts of the 1980s fall under the umbrella of zero tolerance policies and were potentially informed by the Broken Windows Theory. The War on Drugs targeted poor, inner city, urban spaces, specifically, which tend to have higher populations of minorities, despite the fact that some suburban, rural residents, and White residents have also been known to buy and/or sell drugs (Alexander, 2010). In fact, White youth are, statistically speaking, more likely to abuse drugs and struggle with addiction than their counterparts while Black youth are ten times more likely to be arrested for drug use and possession (Szalavitz, 2011). Following the implementation of the War on Drugs, the prison population of inner city, urban minorities grew exponentially (Alexander, 2010).

The ACLU (2013) reports that while 1 in every 106 White adult males are incarcerated, 1 in every 36 and 1 in every 15 Hispanic and Black adult males are incarcerated, respectively. Being convicted of a crime makes it even more difficult for individuals living in inner city, urban neighborhoods to find employment after they are released, as they are required to indicate that they have been convicted of a crime on an

application. This potentially dissuades employers from hiring them and may increase the likelihood that they will commit a crime again, such as selling drugs, to make money, to combat economic hardship (Alexander, 2010). Despite poor and disparate outcomes of the War on Drugs of the 1980s, policies related to crime reduction policies, seem to have been and continue to be informed by the Broken Windows theory and sustained through incrementalism, and may be responsible for the implementation of the Gun Free School Act (GFSA) and school policing in our nation's schools to deter problematic student behaviors.

Incrementalism involves ongoing efforts to correct current, explicitly defined issues of social concern (Lindblom, 1959). The use of illicit drugs, for instant, could be described as an issue of social concern that can be mediated through the use of the War on Drugs efforts, or more generally, the use of a zero tolerance approach. Future policies, in this case, put a lot of emphasis on the past to inform future policies that do not vary much from one another and are measured *solely* by the agreement of decision makers to determine its quality (Lindblom, 1959). In other words, empirical evidence is not necessary when making decisions regarding policies that are developed through incrementalism. With respect to the aforementioned example involving illegal drug use, policy makers have chosen to apply strict, one-strike measures that remove criminals from the general populous to mediate against "broken windows" or minor infractions without providing evidence to support the assertion that such practices will minimize crime. This paper will argue that the development of zero tolerance policies and the use of school policing practices seemed to have been designed *incrementally* from past policies including the War on Drugs, which have been informed by the Broken Window's theory. Since there is no empirical evidence, to date, to support the use of zero tolerance

policies and school policing practices (Fuentes, 2012), their use may be the result of *agreements* made by policy makers that suggest these measures will mediate against problematic behaviors through a focus on “fixing” social and physical disorder within American schools; however, attempting to solve a problem that may exist as a systemic issue, without addressing such problems may do more harm than good.

The perpetuation of the use of structural forces in the form of zero tolerance policies and policing in the community and in schools can cause a self-fulfilling prophecy for those who feel marginalized by such practices; wherein stereotyped and marginalized individuals begin to act in accordance with societal expectations, developing cultural norms (Wilson, 2009). With respect to inner city, urban residents being viewed as more violent than their counterparts, individuals within these setting may act out that which is suggested by the dominant narrative. These stereotypes inform how others, particularly, but not exclusively, middle class Whites interact with young Black men in particular. When students, particularly Black males, are viewed as violent, this creates the context in which they are more likely to act out these stereotypes. These resulting behaviors can be termed “cultural forces,” a term coined by Wilson (2009). It is important to note, that although much of the research considers the impact of structural forces on the cultural norms of Black males in inner city, urban space, Black females are not immune.

Cultural forces, or attitudes and shared outlooks among a group, may be associated with racial inequality and result from the marginalization of minority populations through structural forces (Wilson, 2009). The “Code of the Street” (Anderson, 1999; Wilson, 2009) and the cool pose culture (Majors & Bilson, 1992; Hall, 2009; Wilson, 2009) are examples of cultural forces. Anderson (1999) conceived the “code of the street” as unofficial rules that govern behaviors. When an individual

feels disrespected by another, the code often suggests physical violence to avoid appearing weak and losing respect. Cool pose behaviors are examples of cultural forces thought to stem from a desire to fulfill masculine roles and improve one's self-presentation in a White dominated society where social and economic mobility seems difficult if not impossible to obtain (Hall, 2009). The "cool pose" culture is defined as "a ritualized form of masculinity that entails behaviors, scripts, physical posturing, impression management, and carefully crafted performances" (Majors & Billson, 1992, p. 4). Behaviors associated with the cool pose culture include remaining poised under pressure and in disruptive environments as a way to ease anxiety (Majors & Billson, 1992).

"The Code of the Street" and the "Cool Pose" culture appear in the examined literature separately, with the exception of Wilson's (2009) work where they are both mentioned but not discussed together. This paper will look at them simultaneously as "cool" behaviors seem to be indicative of those focused on garnering and maintain respect, as emphasized by the "code of the street." In other words, cool behaviors can be viewed as informal rules set by the "code of the street." As mentioned, the "cool pose" culture suggests that remaining poised in difficult situations in attempt to maintain self-presentation in a White dominated society, which can be understood as "respect" in this paper.

The "cool pose" culture may have motivational underpinnings within underserved urban neighborhoods; wherein the more controlled Black males feel, the more likely they are to engage in behaviors that negatively influence their projected outcomes (Deci, 1995). Majors and Billson (1992) describe the "cool pose" culture as a paradox that allows some Black males to cope with this reality while, at the same time,

contributes to issues with authority figures, such as police officers. In this case, to attempt to protect their self-image, when faced with a conflict with someone in authority, such as a police officer, some Black males will refuse to back down, even if doing so may result in violence or arrest (Majors & Billson, 1992).

There is less emphasis placed on Cultural Forces as an explanation for disparate outcomes between minorities and dominant white society, which may be the result of researchers fearing that such investigations would be viewed as blaming the victim (Wilson, 2010). Wilson (2009) contends, however, that excluding cultural forces from a discussion regarding racial group outcomes would result in an incomplete picture regarding how structural and cultural forces interact and contribute, over time, to racial inequalities. It is important to note here that while cultural influences contribute to racial disparities, the role of structural forces as a contributor cannot be downplayed. In short, to truly understand racial inequities, an investigation into how structural forces may impact and interact with the development of cultural traits and behaviors may prove vital. When individuals are exposed to controlling environmental factors and treated as though they are deviant and in need of reform, their actions increasingly meet these behavioral expectations and may contribute to the implementation of increasingly punitive measures (Deci, 1995). With respect to the current research involving the impact of school policing practices on student behaviors, this relationship may result in a feedback loop wherein controlling, punitive measures (*structural forces*) are employed to mediate against problematic behaviors but instead generate increased levels of problematic behaviors (*cultural forces*), which exacerbate the existing social and economic disparities and the overrepresentation of Black males in the criminal justice system (*structural forces*) (Nolan, 2011).

School discipline policies in the form of the GFSA and school security measures were implemented to ensure the safety of students after a string of mass school shootings, which occurred in predominately White towns (Hyman & Snook, 2000). Despite this fact, schools in inner cities with large minority populations began to mirror correctional facilities with an increase in school security measures involving metal detectors and school security officers, perhaps the result of stereotypes associated with minority, inner city populations that suggest that students within these spaces are more violent than their counterparts (Fuentes, 2012). In this case, safety is not as focused on the potential threat of an intruder, but on policing students within inner city, urban school environments (Nolan, 2011). The dependence on school policing practices to mediate against problematic student behavior may explain the exponential growth of suspensions and expulsions of minority and special education students in American public schools (Nolan, 2011). As mentioned, zero tolerance policies are thought to exacerbate existing problematic student behaviors in inner city, urban schools with high minority populations through confrontations with security guards, which, in turn, could increase disparities between minority students and their counterparts (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012).

By ignoring the systemic causes of disciplinary disparities between groups, it is likely that any well-intended effort to mediate against problematic student behaviors will be ineffective. Wilson (1987) contends that if policy programs to mediate against social dislocations were developed with the view that these issues were the result of racism, they would differ, substantially, from those that insist that such issues have nothing to do with race. As mentioned, the dominant narrative suggests urban schools with large minority populations are more violent than their counterparts (Alexander, 2010). Therefore, current beliefs regarding school violence may be understood through an

examination of historic, structural contributions to the standpoint that urban schools and, subsequently, minority students, are more violent than their rural, suburban, and White counterparts, which seem to have led to the divergent application of school policing between and within these settings. Despite this, it is important to point out that zero tolerance policies and the use of school policing may not have been implemented with the intention of marginalizing minority populations. As Wilson (1987) point out, even if racism ceased to exist, structural hierarchies would persist.

Although zero tolerance policies and school policing practices may not have developed with the intention of increasing the discipline gap between minorities and their White peers, they could exist as extensions of policies derived from stereotypes that suggest inner-city, minority populations are more violent counterparts. This idea can be illustrated through the War on Drugs efforts of the 1980s, which targeted inner city, urban areas specifically and can be linked to the use of zero tolerance policies and policing in schools, increasing the minority population in America's prisons (Alexander, 2010).

The following literature review begins with the social construction of inner city, urban minorities as "deviants" as viewing students through such stereotypical lenses may justify the use of zero tolerance policies and policing practices to mediate against perceived disorder both in communities and in American public schools. The Broken Windows Theory is also examined to establish a basis for proceeding segments, which will consider the impact of this theory on school discipline policies, namely zero tolerance measures, and to propose a link between the notion of community policing to "fix broken windows," (Kelling & Coles, 1996) and the increased police state in American public schools. This link may be attributed to the incrementalist approach to



policy development as using this method of decision making to inform crime reduction policies may have allowed for the proliferation of punitive measures, such as the War on Drugs, to curb instances of crime, first in communities and then, later, in public schools, in the form of Zero Tolerance and school policing practices. The potential impact of these structures on the development of cultural forces is also discussed in effort to understand the relationship between school policing and student behaviors.

### **Definitions of Key Terms**

*Broken Windows:* The Broken Windows Theory of Crime suggests that communities must attend to physical and social disorder, such as broken windows and public drunkenness, respectively, to mediate against more severe crimes (e.g. murder) (Kelling & Coles; 1996; Wilson & Kelling 1982).

*Blockbusting:* The action of real estate agents that encourage Whites to move out of neighborhoods by playing on their racist views, selling homes to Black Americans. This hope behind this effort is to cause Whites to panic and sell their home below its value, while the real estate agent makes a profit by selling to Blacks for a higher price.

*Cool Pose:* The “cool pose” is defined as “a ritualized form of masculinity that entails behaviors, scripts, physical posturing, impression management, and carefully crafted performances” (Majors & Billson, 1992, p. 4). Behaviors associated with the cool pose culture include remaining poised under pressure and in disruptive environments as a way to ease anxiety from the observation that despite hard work, society’s structural forces may impede social mobility, particularly for Black males (Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2010).

*Cultural Forces:* Cultural forces include attitudes and shared outlooks among a group. Cultural forces may be associated with racial inequality and result from the marginalization of minority populations through structural forces (Wilson, 2010).

*Gun Free School Act:* In 1994, with the passage of the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA), a zero tolerance mindset moved into American public schools. Educational funding requirements contained within the GFSA required a mandatory one-year expulsion for any student carrying a firearm on a school campus (Rice, 2009; Teske, 2011).

*Foot Patrol:* Foot patrol walk around an assigned section or “beat” of a neighborhood and interact with citizens, creating undefined, but understood and enforced, rules such as not sitting or laying in a stoop (Wilson & Kelling, 1996).

*Incrementalism:* Incrementalism in public policy involves ongoing efforts to correct current, explicitly defined issues of social concern based solely on the agreement of decision makers to determine its quality (Lindblom, 1959).

*Labeling Theory:* A theory that suggests deviant behaviors may be associated with dominant narratives that negatively label minorities, or those defined as deviant, by the majority (Becker, 1963).

*Punctuated Equilibrium:* a drastic change in policy following a significant event (Baugartner, Jones, & Materson, 2014).

*School-to-prison pipeline:* According to the American Civil Liberties Union (2013), the school-to-prison pipeline is a metaphorical term to describe material consequences of certain policies in which children are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice system.

*School Resource Officers (SROs)*: The SRO is considered a police officer first and a member of the school community second (Clark, 2011; Weiler & Cray, 2011) and is a law enforcement officer serving primarily within a school community whose mission is to ensure safety, order, and discipline through conflict mediation and critical incident response (Clark, 2011).

*Social Construction*: According to Schneider & Ingram (1993), “Social constructions [as it relates to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity] are stereotypes about particular groups of people that have been created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion, and the like” (p. 335).

*Structural Forces*: Structural forces involve the arrangement of social positions, social roles, and networks of social relationships (e.g. routines and rules in schools) (Wilson, 2009). *Social acts* in racial relations are considered by Wilson (2010) to include the behaviors of individuals that contribute to inequities in a society, such as stereotyping, discrimination in hiring, and housing. *Social processes* are the vehicle by which the status quo is maintained that exclude individuals based on race or ethnicity, including laws, policies and institutional practices (Wilson, 2010).

*Racial Profiling*: Racial profiling occurs when the race and ethnic backgrounds of residents may lead to police stopping, questioning, searching or arresting someone, without having reasonable suspicion to do so (Chan, 2011).

*Racism*: 1. A belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race; 2. Racial prejudice or discrimination (Merriam-Webster, 2015).

## **Organization of the Study**

Chapter one introduced literature associated with zero tolerance and school security measures in American public schools and proposed a study to examine the relationship between school security officers and student behaviors that include insubordination and violence. Additionally, the theoretical framework of this study discussed the interplay between the following structural forces: social construction of urban and adolescents, broken windows theory of crime, incrementalism, zero tolerance policies, and school security measures. The influence that structural forces have on culture, particularly in inner city, urban spaces was also included. Chapter two will explore the literature involving all of the aforementioned topics to argue that these relationships may have led to an increased police state within American public schools. Chapter three involves the methodology to answer research questions involving the impact of school security guards on student behaviors, over time, in urban, suburban, towns and rural public schools in Ohio, at all levels (e.g. elementary). Chapter four includes the findings from the study. Lastly, chapter five details the discussion of the findings related to the reviewed literature, conclusions, implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

With the fear of school violence intensifying following a number of mass school shootings (e.g. Sandy Hook), a school police presence has been established in about 35% of all schools, regardless of their location or level, in the United States (Weiler & Cray, 2011). However, inner city, urban schools, with large minority populations experience school policing to a greater extent than their counterparts (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012; Fuentes, 2012). Despite the widespread use of school policing, it is unclear how effective these measures are at reducing problematic student behaviors.

Examined literature involving school policing often focuses on the perceptions of students experiencing policing measures in inner city, urban schools with large minority populations, which note a potentially contentious relationship between police and students that can exacerbate existing problems within schools (Weiss, 2007; Nolan, 2011). Students may respond to assessments of unfair treatment from school police officers by refusing to comply with instructions and becoming defiant, which may lead to arrest (Nolan, 2011). In order to understand the potential impact these security measures have on student behaviors, the

following literature review considers the interplay between structural and cultural forces that may have contributed, over time, to the notion that inner city, urban schools require more policing than their counterparts.

Structural forces involve the arrangement of social positions, social roles, and networks of social relationships (e.g. schools) (Wilson, 2009). *Social acts* are considered, by Wilson (2009) to include the behaviors of individuals that contribute to inequities in a society, such as stereotyping, discrimination in hiring, and housing. *Social processes* are the vehicle by which the status quo is maintained that exclude individuals based on race or ethnicity, including laws, policies and institutional practices (Wilson, 2009). Structural forces may exist within America's public schools in the form of zero tolerance and school policing practices. This portion of the literature review will argue that the relationships between structural forces including Labeling Theory and the social construction of inner city, urban and minority populations, the Broken Windows theory, incrementalism, zero tolerance, and school policing practices have led to the criminalization of student behaviors in American public schools, particularly for minority populations in inner city, urban spaces.

### **Social Construction and Labeling Theory**

According to Schneider & Ingram (1993), "Social constructions are stereotypes about particular groups of people that have been created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion, and the like" (p. 335). The social construction of groups is closely intertwined with Labeling Theory, which is viewed as being significant to the understanding of criminology and recidivism as it is concerned with the potential impact of defining an individual as deviant on their future behaviors (Becker, 1963), and

will be discussed together. Labeling Theory holds that deviant behaviors may be associated with dominant narratives that negatively label minorities, or those defined as deviant, by the majority (Becker, 1963). In short, behavior is deemed deviant or non-deviant when society labels it as such. There are two types of deviance, including primary and secondary deviance (Farrington & Murray, 2014).

Primary deviance is viewed as an initial act of some form of deviant behavior that may be the result of any combination of cultural, psychological, and physiological factors (Lemert, 1967). These behaviors can be identified as being situational or idiosyncratic in nature (Lemert, 1967). Individuals who are typically conceived as “law abiding” may commit acts that can be considered criminal by society but are not serious enough to label them as *deviant* (Lemert, 1967). For example, people who speed are violating a law, but dominant society does not deem this as being a serious enough crime to label individuals who do so as criminals. How society responds to initial acts of deviance may have future implications for individuals or groups.

Secondary deviance is an individual’s or group’s response to how society responds to primary deviance (Farrington & Murray, 2014) where a negative response to a person’s actions such as stigmatizing, punishing or segregating the individual may have consequences for the offender’s social roles, self-identity, and personality (Lemert, 1967). Meaning, if a behavior, such as loitering, is criminalized, an individual punished for this behavior may begin to act in accordance with their criminal label, potentially committing future deviant acts. As mentioned, the social construction of groups is closely intertwined with Labeling Theory. There are two divergent groups that can be socially constructed by society including those that are positively and negatively constructed and

are defined by policy (Schneider & Ingram, 1993). A positively constructed group may be defined as intelligent while a negatively constructed group could be classified as dishonest (Schneider & Ingram, 1993). Similar to Labeling Theory, one such negatively constructed group is known as “deviants” (e.g. criminals) (Schneider & Ingram, 1993).

These individuals are often placed in undesirable positions and are punished through agendas and policy designs, of which they are not in control (Schneider & Ingram, 1993). As Alexander (2010) points out, those who have been convicted of a felony are no longer able to vote in some states, and, as a result, these individuals are powerless to affect change in policies that may impact them. In turn, the *social roles*, *self-identity*, and *personality* of these past offenders may be altered. Such fundamental changes may increase the likelihood that an individual will commit future secondary deviant acts (Lemert, 1967). For instance, a person who has to identify on an application that they committed a felony may be less likely to find work and may turn to crime, such as selling drugs, as a means of survival. Similarly, students, particularly in inner city, urban schools, have been constructed by dominant society as being deviants who are in need of policing to *control* their behaviors (Hyman & Snook, 2000) and may act out accordingly, perhaps by defying authority (Nolan, 2011).

Labeling Theory as related to the social construction of a group can be applied to perceptions of problematic student behaviors, punishment policies, and recidivism within American public schools. For instance, responding to “deviant” student behaviors, such as insubordination, through zero tolerance policies and school policing, defines noncompliance as a criminal offense. Criminalizing these behaviors through suspensions, expulsions, and court summons may define a student’s *social roles*, *self-identity*, and



*personality* as these punitive measures have been associated with recidivism, truancy, higher dropout rates, and poor projected life outcomes (Nolan, 2011). In other words, labeling certain American public school student behaviors as deviant and responding to their behaviors in a punitive way through zero tolerance policies and school policing may be related to acts of secondary deviance. Therefore, secondary deviance by youth in American public schools, which will be discussed further in the “Cultural Forces” portion of this paper, contributes further to the social constructions of these students through policy development, often forming divergently by race, SES, and geographic location.

**School discipline policies and the media.** With respect to the social construction of inner city, urban, and poor minority students in particular, the media has perpetuated the notion that these areas experience higher rates of crime or more deviant behaviors than their suburban and rural counterparts (Wilson, 2009), which may have led to dominant society’s concern that these same threats exist within schools in these settings (Smith, 2011). As a result of such perceptions, many inner city, urban schools have armed themselves with such security measures as police officers, metal detectors, and video surveillance, to a greater degree than their counterparts in the suburbs, in effort to deter perceived threats of violence (Bracy, 2011; Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). The relationship between school security practices and zero tolerance policies may exist to promote the overrepresentation of suspended and expelled minority and special education students and can further contribute to the idea that these students require policing to mediate against their problematic student behaviors. The dominant narrative’s tendency to lean towards this notion as an explanation for issues surrounding violence in inner city, urban public schools can increase the likelihood that the use of harsh

disciplinary measures will persist as a means to mediate against such issues, leading to increasingly high acts of secondary deviance within these settings.

Nolan (2011) contends that the media may feed into the notion that students require harsh punishments to deter crime in public school settings. The following excerpt was taken from a New York Post article entitled *Thugs Run Wild in Troubled HS* and illustrates this point:

A defiant 17-year old ninth grader refused to go to class and spewed profanities as he clashed with a school safety officer. The unruly student, who refused to show his identification card to security officers, was arrested for disorderly conduct (Nolan, 2011, p. 1).

Adjectives like *defiant*, *spewed*, *clashed*, and *unruly* may paint a vivid picture in the readers' minds of a criminal deserving of arrest, despite the fact that his offense was the refusal to show his identification card. Though this description involves an interaction with one student, dominant society may use this example to define the entire population of students attending schools in inner city, urban spaces.

Similarly, in *War on School Gangs- Cops Plan Crackdown*, Celona (2004) states that the New York Police Department (NYPD) is "getting ready to clean up the Blackboard Jungle... where dozens of specially trained cops would be sent to hunt down and prosecute hallway gang-bangers" (p. 1). *Blackboard Jungle* (1955) is a movie where students were shown as delinquents, going as far as to attempt to rape and murder a teacher. This comparison, coupled with the idea that students are being *hunted* by law enforcement may contribute to the social construction of these students as being less than human and in need of policing. As noted by Hyman and Snook (2000), if adolescents are

constructed as being dangerous, other citizens will determine that harsh punishments are necessary (Hyman & Snook, 2000). To reiterate, minority, inner city, and urban populations have been socially constructed as “deviants” in need of school policing to mediate against perceived threats of violence. While violence may exist in some form in all schools, the question, is: how did we come to the point where children, particularly inner city, urban minorities, are arrested for being “disorderly” or insubordinate (Nolan, 2011)?

Perhaps the social construction of minority and adolescent students in urban school settings has contributed to and justified the use of policing in America’s inner city, urban public schools (Nolan, 2011). As mentioned, the terms “urban” and “minority” have been linked and used interchangeably by dominant society; therefore, it is important to first consider how the dominant narrative involving this relationship has been constructed over time. It is important to note that the theoretical framework for this research does not intend to portray the terms “urban” and “minority” or “poor” as synonymous; however, the narrative involving these relationships seems to impact perceptions of urban school violence and the divergent use of policing practices to mediate against perceived threats in urban, suburban, and rural school settings. As such, this paper will elaborate on this narrative as it relates to the increased reliance on school policing to mediate against problematic students in American public schools, particularly those in inner city, urban spaces. As will be discussed, these settings often have higher rates of minority students, and may be the result of past discriminatory practices that are responsible for segregating and stereotyping these populations. The next section will begin with how the term “urban” has been constructed by dominant society.

**Social construction of “urban.”** There is often confusion as to what the term “urban” denotes. The word “urban” is broadly defined as “densely populated regions marked by more than 50,000 inhabitants who are often part of a relatively crowded, highly interconnected metropolitan regions that have strongly linked economic ties within the areas” (Creasey & Jarvis, 2013, p. 2). Though there is a distinct difference between affluent urbanized areas and those that are underserved or poor, prevailing discourse often link the word “urban” with socioeconomic variables, such as community income levels, and race (Creasey & Jarvis, 2013). When asked to describe underserved urban neighborhoods, many college students characterize these environments as low-income with high minority populations (Creasey & Jarvis, 2013). It is also widely accepted that higher rates of crime, poverty, gang violence, drugs, crisis, and failure are more likely to occur in urban neighborhoods (Alexander, 2010). In short, those residing in inner city, urban environments have been socially constructed as “deviants,” and students attending schools within these spaces are not immune to such stereotypes.

**Social construction of inner city, urban schools.** The dominant narrative involving urban schools suggests that they experience intense behavioral problems and are more dangerous than their suburban and rural counterparts (Alexander, 2010). It is often difficult to hire and maintain teachers in urban, inner city schools, as students are often stereotyped as being violent and gang-involved (Jacob, 2007). This assertion may be associated with the view that urban students exist as extensions of their neighborhoods (Smith, 2011), which are often branded as dysfunctional and saturated with joblessness, crime, delinquency, drug trafficking, dysfunctional schools and broken families (Wilson, 2009). Negative connotations associated with the word “urban” have been perpetuated in

media reports that portray these neighborhoods with images of high-rise housing projects that are “littered” with “packs of young men lurking on street corners” (Creasey & Jarvis, p.2 2013).

Smith (2011) contends that the perception of “urban culture” may, by extension, invite the idea that students residing in urban, inner city communities will bring such aggressive tendencies into their schools. Subsequent stereotypes associated with urban school violence could also have impacted how security officers, administrators, teachers, and communities perceive minority students, particularly in inner city, urban school settings. In a qualitative study, conducted by Smith and Smith (2006), to determine the reasons teachers leave schools in inner city, urban neighborhoods, interviews with former teachers in these settings revealed a link between attrition rates and the perceptions of violence. Many teachers in this study viewed their experiences negatively, describing the context of the school as overwhelmed by drug trafficking and violence (Smith & Smith, 2006). Racial conflicts were also a cited problem, leading to classrooms being under “lockdown,” or not allowing students to leave their assigned rooms for any reason (Smith & Smith, 2006). Despite the fact that many of the lived experiences of the teachers who left urban school settings did involve instances of violence, many shared past stories described by veteran teachers that potentially increased their perceptions of violence in urban schools (Smith & Smith, 2006). Fear of urban school settings, then, seems to be bred, generationally, through “horror stories” that are often told through secondary sources (Smith & Smith, 2006). Media reports involving school shootings also seem to influence and perpetuate stereotypes involving inner, city, urban and minority students.

In *Ominous Signs Hover Over School Violence Statistics*, Cseper (2008) explains that there are feelings of urgency to address problems in Cleveland schools after a student shot two teachers at Cleveland's Success Tech Academy in October of 2008, a predominately Black inner city, urban school. In response, the district hired more security officers, social workers, nurses, and psychologists, and put metal detectors in all of their schools. Highlighted within the article is the assault on James Cappetto, a teacher that was hurt breaking up a fight. Bell, a biology teacher and union representative at South High School, suggests that issues of school violence are not commonplace, but that hiring more security officers would create safer learning environments (Cseper, 2008). Bell states that "When you get this gang-thug element that decides they want to act crazy, you don't have enough [security] to respond" (Cseper, 2008) and goes on to posit that students committing violent acts should not only be moved to another school after an expulsion, they should be permanently removed from the district (Cseper, 2008). Referring to inner city, minority students in this manner places the blame on these students while not considering the potential causes of problematic behaviors exhibited by students in these settings may reify the notion that these students are dangerous and in need of policing.

In contrast, reports involving mass school shootings or physical acts of violence that occur within suburban or rural, predominately White schools often include expressions of disbelief that such acts of extreme violence could take place within these settings. The mass school shooting that took place at Columbine High school in Little Rock, Arkansas, a predominately White town, that left 14 students and 1 teacher dead, for example, had news outlets stunned and searching for answers. In her article *Good*

*Grades, Good Teams and Some Bad Feelings*, Riner (1999) laments on the positive aspects that exist within Columbine High School including high SAT scores and winning sports teams. Interviewed students reportedly did not consider their safety prior to the shooting and thought that metal detectors were designed solely for urban schools (Riner, 1999). Despite the fact that Columbine experienced such a tragic event, this school has not armed itself with such measures as metal detectors or additional security officers (Fuentes, 2012).

By diminishing the severity of the Columbine shooting as a rare phenomenon and deferring attention to problematic behaviors as being an “urban school problem,” news outlets perpetuate such stereotypes, or social constructions of inner city, urban minority students as deviants. Mass school shootings have occurred less often in urban school environments, but the dominant narrative believes that these spaces are more problematic than their counterparts. As a result, students in urban schools continue to experience policing to a greater degree than their counterparts (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). As mentioned, the dominant narrative links the term “urban” with “race,” particularly Black and Latino populations. This connection may explain the higher rates of disciplinary practices, such as suspensions, used to mediate against problematic behaviors in schools with larger minority populations (Hyman & Snook, 2000).

In order to understand the current notions involving inner city, urban school violence and how American schools increasingly incorporate school policing practices to a greater degree than their counterparts in effort to mediate against problematic student behaviors within these spaces, one must first understand past contributions to the standpoint that urban schools, and subsequently minority students, are more violent than

their rural and suburban counterparts, which, as illustrated, was further perpetuated in the media. Notions of urban school violence may have led to the view that students, namely minorities, require more policing than their counterparts. As such, the next section discusses historical contributions to this view and includes racial and economic hardships, as one cannot separate these compounding factors from the disparate use of security practices between school locales.

### **Historical Analysis Regarding the Urban and Minority Relationship**

This analysis will discuss the historical ramifications of structural forces that may be associated with the social construction of inner city, urban school students as being more violent than their counterparts, beginning with the 1954 *Brown v. the Board of Education*'s call for desegregation and ending with the notion of the super-predator (Diliou, 1995) in 1995. The proceeding histories are in no way exhaustive as the interactions between structural forces are complex and difficult to study (Wilson, 2010). It is important to make mention that although the origins associated with the notion that urban schools are more violent than their counterparts may precede the 1950s and extend beyond 1995, such an analysis is beyond the scope of the present paper.

**1950s -1960s.** The perception that violence was an emerging problem in urban public schools seems to have developed in parallel with the call the desegregation of America's schools and the end of the Jim Crow era in *Brown v. the Board of Educations* . In 1954, The Supreme Court ruled in favor of *Brown* declaring that racial segregation was unconstitutional (Labaree, 2010). Preceding and accompanying the *Brown* decision, Whites with financial capital began a rapid movement out of urban areas, a phenomenon



known as the “White flight,” in response to housing marking incentives that were offered in the form of mortgages for veterans and mortgage tax exemptions (Wilson, 2010).

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) responded to mortgage foreclosures that took place during the Great Depression by underwriting mortgages, allowing many Americans to own homes (Bier, 1995; Wilson, 2009). Though these housing incentives on the surface appeared nonracial, they increased the movement of Whites from urban to suburban environments and isolated poor and minority groups in inner-city neighborhoods (Bier, 1995; Wilson, 2009). The FHA withheld mortgage capital to those in inner-city neighborhoods, suggesting that a loss of investment would result in these areas (Wilson, 2009). This practice, known as redlining, was racially biased towards minorities who were often denied mortgages, regardless of whether or not they were financially qualified (Wilson, 2009).

Redlining contributed to the deterioration of buildings in urban, inner city neighborhoods and has been credited with the dominant narrative that associates the term urban with poor black neighborhoods (Wilson, 2009). Although this discussion is focused on the 1950s, exclusionary housing practices date back much farther (Kusmer, 1976). In 1917, when Black Americans attempted to move into all white neighborhoods in the Cleveland, Ohio, area, they were met with White resistance through the refusal to sell homes to Blacks, harassment, and property destruction (Kusmer, 1976). The implications of redlining and other exclusionary practices increased the concentration of Blacks and other minorities in inner city, urban spaces. A mass movement of Whites out of cities across the United States occurred between 1955 and 1965 (Orser, 1994). The Watts, a neighborhood located in southern Los Angeles, for instance, had an equal distribution of

Black, White and Mexican Americans at the beginning of WWII, but had become 95 percent Black by 1958 (Nash, 1985).

Real estate agents played on White's fear and prejudice of Blacks by using Blockbusting for profit (Orser, 1994). Blockbusting occurs when a real estate agents move a Black resident into a house on an all-White block in hopes of causing feelings of panic, encouraging Whites to sell their homes low, yielding a profit to realtors who would then sell high to Black residents (Orser, 1994). Such practices further contributed to the racial segregation between Black and White Americans.

The development of freeways also increased racial segregation by acting as barriers between poor and minority neighborhoods and central business districts (Wilson, 2009). Birmingham, Alabama's interstate highway system, which was constructed in 1956, followed boundaries set by racial zoning laws established in 1926 (Wilson, 2009). Similarly, in 1956, Richard J. Daley used the Federal-Aid Highway Act for the development of freeways through predominantly Black neighborhoods in Chicago resulting in greater segregation and isolation (Wilson, 2009). These highways make it difficult for individuals living in inner city, urban areas that do not own a car to travel to work in the suburbs, contributing further to the economic hardships and isolation of minority populations residing in poor inner-city neighborhoods (Wilson, 1996). This phenomenon, known as spatial mismatch, results in a lack of access for those in the inner city to employment opportunities in suburban communities and residents of predominantly Black urban neighborhoods, subsequently, become socially, racially, and economically isolated (Wilson, 1996). To be clear, inaccessibility of transportation, and

subsequent job opportunities, puts a financial burden on those residing in inner city, urban spaces. This situation is not easy to escape from (Wilson, 2009).

Around this same time, the National Education Association's conducted a study in 1957, which indicated that violence was an emerging problem in schools (Bybee & Gee, 1982). Twenty-eight percent of teachers in large cities reported acts of physical violence towards teachers (Bybee & Gee, 1982). Issues regarding violence were reportedly more prevalent in inner city urban areas (Bybee & Gee, 1982). As mentioned, the demographics within these spaces began to change soon after the *Brown v. The Board of Education's* call for the desegregation of schools, where a higher concentration of Black Americans became isolated in inner city, urban areas, the effect of redlining practices. As such, the focus on school violence in these settings may have contributed to the notion that inner city, urban residents, and subsequently Black students, were more violent than their counterparts. This narrative was likely perpetuated during the 1960s.

The 1960s signaled a time of resentment wherein Whites began to feel economic sacrifices brought about through the Civil Rights Movement (Wilson, 2009). It was also a time when Black citizens grew impatient with the slow pace of change and assassination of Black leaders (Wilson, 2009). Racial tensions were heightened in Los Angeles as new industries and career opportunities emerged in developing neighborhoods that were not available to poor and minority populations. The effect was a high unemployment rate for Black men that angered an older generation that felt the loss of their hard-earned economic gains and a discontent younger generation who had anticipated increased growth and opportunity (Kafka, 2011). In effort to gain support from White voters, Republican's focus turned to crime prevention in inner city, urban spaces (Wilson, 2009).

These crime reduction efforts were felt most by minority populations (Wilson, 2009). This effort persisted through gains including The Civil rights act of 1964, forbidding discrimination from federally funded agencies, and an increasingly Black high school population (Wilson, 2009).

News media reports involving school violence became most prominent in 1966 when racial conflicts in public schools, namely in cities, were high (Fuentes, 2011). Racial conflicts, for example, were intensifying due to the segregating and deterioration of the physical conditions of New York City schools in 1966 (Fuentes, 2011). Similar instances were happening in Los Angeles when Black and Mexican American parents boycotted and protested against the poor conditions of their children's schools (Kafka, 2011). These protests, termed the 1968 blowouts, in East Los Angeles, became violent with the arrival of law enforcement (Kafka, 2011). Media reports brought national attention to these incidents and fueled concerns of Mexican Americans and the notion of Brown Power (Fuentes, 2012). During that same year, in response to Martin Luther King's assassination, riots broke out in Chicago. The reports of this incident also suggested that in Chicago's predominately Black, west side ghetto, school violence was ever present and rising at an alarming rate (Fuentes, 2011). Efforts to mediate against perceived disorder in inner city, urban spaces became a focal point during Reagan's presidency in the 1980s.

**1980-1995.** Reagan's presidency marked the beginning of spending cuts involving aid to cities, unrestricted funds, urban mass transit, economic development assistance, urban development action grants, social service block grants, local public works, compensatory education, public service jobs, and job training (Wilson, 2009). The

aforementioned spending cuts are felt most by the disadvantaged and have exacerbated existing problems in urban neighborhoods (Wilson, 2009). As previously discussed, redlining practices and a lack of public transportation for those in inner city, urban areas resulted in a concentration of minority populations in these spaces. Such actions impede social mobility (Wilson, 2009), thus preventing those residing in urban areas from providing quality education for their children; schools in urban areas have a higher dropout rate and are less likely to employ quality teachers (Heck, 2007).

Another potentially devastating effect on disadvantaged urban populations was the enactment of zero tolerance measures, which began with state and federal efforts during Reagan's "War on Drugs" of the 1980s. The philosophy behind this effort stems from the Broken Windows Theory of Crime, which posits strict punitive measures prevent crime and protects law-abiding citizens by removing criminal offenders from the general populous. This theory will be discussed in more detail in a later portion of this literature review. As a result of the War on Drugs effort, media turned its attention to the crack-fueled drug wars, which were credited, by Reagan, with the increase of incidents of violence and gun use in many inner-city urban areas (Fuentes, 2011).

Bruce Western (2006) explains that the War on Drugs efforts of the 1980s created a culture of surveillance for the most economically disadvantaged, where police officers were encouraged to make monthly quotas for arrests. A police officer may arrest someone for a minor infraction in a heavily monitored area in order to meet the quotas outlined by their department. Western explains that there is no evidence to suggest that high incarceration rates are linked to crime reduction. Instead, mass imprisonment, particularly for the most disadvantaged, increases the likelihood of recidivism (Western,

2006). Once individuals are incarcerated, when they are released and attempt to seek job opportunities, they are often not hired due to discrimination of offenders (Alexander 2010; Western, 2006). Consequently, they may turn to crime for economic reasons. Adding to the disparities between Black Americans and their counterparts is the relationship between incarceration and educational attainment.

Schools were not immune from these environmental changes and any reports on school crime exacerbated the perception that youth, namely in city schools, were dangerous; however, these fears were unfounded as there were no data to prove such notions (Fuentes, 2011). Efforts to enact tough on crime measures involving Zero Tolerance within the justice system increased during the 1990s (Fuentes, 2011). These measures inspired the implementation of the Zero Tolerance policies in American schools following a string tragic mass school shootings in the early 1990s with the passage of the GFSA of 1994 (Fuentes, 2011). These measures have contributed to an increased rate of suspensions, expulsions, and court summons, particularly for minority populations (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). Similar to the decrease in educational attainment for incarcerated individuals, youth who are removed from the school may feel less connected to their school environment, potentially leading to underperformance and drop out rates. School safety concerns, particularly in urban areas may have been exacerbated by a projected increase in violent youth crime (Fuentes, 2011).

In 1995, John Diliou wrote an article entitled, *The Coming of the Super-Predator*, forecasting a new breed of violent male youth, or super-predators, who would commit crimes in groups and lack remorse and respect for human life (Diliou, 1995). Diliou (1995) indicated that all demographics would likely experience a rise in youth crime;

however, super-predators would be most prevalent in predominately Black inner city, urban neighborhoods. He explained that between 1985 and 1992, White males ages 14 to 17 saw an increase of 50 percent in murders as compared to 300 percent for black males within the same demographic and were projected to double within the next ten years (Diliou, 1995). This contributed to the public perception that youth crime was intensifying, particularly in cities (Fuentes, 2011).

In reviewing past and present literature surrounding the development and implementation of policing practices in schools, a timeline of events emerges indicating structural forces may be responsible for the notion that urban areas are more violent than their counterparts (Wilson, 2009). Notions of urban violence could be linked to the idea that violence is more prevalent in urban spaces with predominately minority populations (Smith, 2011) Violence does not seem to have been documented as being prevalent in schools until the 1950s when *Brown v. the Board of Education* signaled the end of Jim Crow (Bybee & Gee, 1982). As zero tolerance measures of the 1980s have trickled down into schools, the used of security practices seems to be justified by the view that problems involving crime and violence in urban neighborhoods will bleed into the school environment (Smith, 2011; Toldson, 2012) and the social construction of adolescents as “deviants,” particularly those residing in inner city, urban locations (Fuentes, 2012). As a result of the dominant narrative’s link between communities and schools, where the environment in the community mirrors the environment in the schools, it is not unreasonable to compare practices used in attempt to mediate against crime in both settings, including the Broken Windows Theory.

The following begins by looking at the Broken Windows theory in isolation. As mentioned, the use of this theory to inform crime reduction policies has trickled into school environments in the form of zero tolerance policies and school policing practices. This relationship will be discussed after the Broken Windows segment. By looking at research that considers the plausibility of this theory, where attention to low level offenses is said to deter more serious ones, connections can be made regarding the use of zero tolerance and school security practices to mediate against problematic student behaviors within America's public schools. Additionally, the implementation of zero tolerance policies and policing practices and continued use to mediate against problematic student behaviors without evidence of its effectiveness may stem from this theory and the use of incrementalism.

**Broken windows.** The Broken Windows philosophy suggests that an abandoned building begins with a few broken windows, but if left unrepaired will give way to high rates of criminal activity (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). In other words, signs of physical disorder, such as broken windows, graffiti, and boarded-up buildings may indicate a lack of concern for a neighborhood (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Such indifference may make unrepaired buildings ideal sites to conduct criminal or antisocial activities and contribute to residents being fearful of their neighborhood (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Under the auspices of the Broken Windows theory, law-abiding citizens are thought to respond to this fear by avoiding one another, allowing criminal acts to persist (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The proceeding begins with the limited literature that supports the Broken Windows Theory, followed by a number of studies that criticize this approach to crime



reduction as being a too simplistic and/or an inaccurate view of the disorder-crime relationship.

Wilson & Kelling's (1982) proposed disorder-fear relationship stems from an experiment conducted by Philip Zimbardo (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) where he sought to determine whether anonymity, or the inability for one to be identified, could result in antisocial behaviors within settings that are considered to foster aggression (Zimbardo, 2007). Zimbardo's experiment involved the placement of two cars with their hoods up and license plates removed, suggesting their abandonment, in two different communities (Zimbardo, 2007). The first car was parked in the Bronx, and the second was parked across from Stanford University in Palo Alto. The car in the Bronx experienced twenty-three separate incidents of vandalism that began within minutes of the car being parked (Zimbardo, 2007). In contrast, the car parked in Palo Alto did not experience any vandalism and the residents even protected the vehicle from rain damage, by closing the hood, and by calling the police to report a potential theft of an abandoned car when the researcher drove it out of the community at the conclusion of the experiment (Zimbardo, 2007). Zimbardo posits that the Bronx and other neighborhoods similar to it do not have a strong sense of community, which he operationally defines as a sense that people care and will report unusual or illegal events in their neighborhood because they have a strong belief that others would reciprocate if the situation was reversed. According to Zimbardo, a lack of community within a space may increase feelings of anonymity, thus absolving individuals of civic responsibility for their behaviors. By not having to reveal one's identity, they are more likely to participate in criminal acts.

Wilson and Kelling (1982) and Kelling and Coles (1996) both used Zimbardo's findings, although limited, to support their theory that physical disorder leads to social disorder that must be tended to in order to deter more serious crime. Kelling details his observation in what he deemed a "tough inner-city minority neighborhood in a large Eastern City" (Kelling & Coles, 1996, p. 1), where he emphasizes the pride expressed by the residents after they took legal action to clean up vacant areas, which no longer experience a presence of drug dealers (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Despite this apparent gain, a major intersection in this same area is termed an "open-air drug market" that scatters at the mere sight of a police officer, only to return again in their absence. In other words, crime does not go away, it merely moves to areas unoccupied by police. Kelling and Coles (1996) suggest that such actions lead residents to question the credibility of governmental authority, as it is the drug dealers that seem to be in control of such spaces.

Despite Wilson's and Kelling's (1982) and Kelling's and Coles' (1996) reliance on this theory to explain crime in communities, it is important to note here that Zimbardo has acknowledged that his experiment is the only empirical evidence used to support the Broken Windows Theory of Crime in 1982, which he criticizes as not being a one-size-fits-all strategy, particularly when residents do not feel police and society treat them fairly, but rather experience inequities and ensuing feelings of contempt. As discussed, structural forces have isolated poor minority populations in inner-city areas, where police and society are not thought to treat them fairly (Wilson, 2009). This notion can be demonstrated through current issues facing inner-city areas, including, but not limited to the 2015 protests that occurred in Baltimore following the "not guilty" verdict in the shooting of an unarmed Black man by a police officer.

The Baltimore [riots] are the latest warning sign of the need to address the stew of problems facing African-Americans in major urban centers that are feeding both alienation and anger -- from economic inequality and lack of opportunity to perceived racial bias on the part of government officials, especially police ("Baltimore Riots," 2015).

Based on the aforementioned opinion with respect to Zimbardo's suggestion that the Broken Windows Theory may not be a viable option in all instances, Baltimore and other cities similar to it would not likely see reductions in crime rates by tending to physical and social disorder through the use of policing. Although police vigilance is often increased in communities experiencing high rates of criminal activity with the purpose of order maintenance, such practices do not necessarily mediate against crime, as policing is incident-oriented (Yili, Fiedler, & Flaming, 2005). In other words, a crime has to be committed before police action can take place (Yili, et al., 2005). Despite this, policing to mediate against problems in communities is often considered the most effective, most viable option, regardless of the fact that there is little evidence to support this notion.

Kelling and Coles (1996) express dissatisfaction regarding disorderly behaviors that are often deemed misdemeanors by state laws and/or city ordinances that are punishable only by fines or community service, which, in their view, contributes to the perpetuation of social disorder within spaces. From this perspective, calls made to the police department to report disorderly behaviors that seemingly go unpunished may eventually lead to the resident's view that police officers are ineffective or do not care about a community, as petty crimes, particularly for first time offenders, are considered

misdemeanors (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). This lack of trust and the criminalization of minor offenses are thought to increase the likelihood that crime will persist and become increasingly more severe (Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2009).

The police are thought by these authors to respond in kind, viewing the residents as “animals who deserve each other” (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Mistrusting relationships between the police and residents ensues that only contributes further to disorder and fear within these spaces (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Rather than trying to process offenders into the system, they believe that police officers would be more effective if they focused their attention on order maintenance within urban communities to mediate against disorderly behaviors, which they posit would lower overall instances of crime. Wilson and Kelling (1982) and Kelling & Coles (1996) claim that “fixing broken windows,” or attending to physical disorder, can decrease criminal activity in a neighborhood.

To determine this crime reduction strategy’s effectiveness, Kelling shadowed foot patrol officers during The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, which found that citizens typically accept police presence and the informal rules that result, such as being allowed to sit, but not lay down, in a stoop (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Residents reportedly felt more secure and were less likely to avoid their neighborhood (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Kelling and Coles (1996) subsequently suggest that tending to disorderly behaviors will contribute to a decrease in the fear of crime and an increase in the trust of the police. While citizen’s perceptions of the safety of their neighborhood improved with the presence of foot patrol, findings from The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment indicate that their presence did not lower actual incidents of crime (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Despite this result, Kelling & Coles stand behind the use of community policing to mediate

against disorder. This crime-reduction strategy has received a lot of media attention and support as being a crime-fighting revolution (Page, 1997). Kelling & Coles (1996) blame the decriminalization of mental disabilities and public drunkenness for decreasing the effectiveness of community policing. In other words, mental health care, rather than punishment, became the focus for individuals with mental disabilities and those who struggled with alcoholism who committed a crime.

**Mental disabilities and public drunkenness.** Kelling and Coles (1996) believe that the proliferation of unconstrained disorder in inner-city communities can also be attributed to the deinstitutionalization of the “mentally ill” and the decriminalization of public drunkenness. They assert that prior to the 1970s, police were charged with handling the mentally disabled and drunkenness, which helped reduce the level of disorder in the cities. These authors cite the *O’Connor v. Donaldson* Supreme Court case as setting the precedent for thinking about the law in individualistic terms, which, they say, has undermined police authority and their subsequent ability to mediate against disorder. This court case is outlined below.

According to the case file, Kenneth Donaldson was kept against his will as a “mentally ill” patient at the Florida State Hospital. The court ruled in his favor, stating that an individual cannot be kept in a mental institution against their will if they are not a danger to themselves or others. Additionally, mentally disabled individuals can no longer be confined in effort to increase their standard of living or to shield citizens from those that are mentally disabled. This ruling, according to Kelling and Coles (1996), resulted in the dismissal of a “mentally ill” status and gave these individuals the freedom to refuse medical treatment and the option of living on the streets rather than being hospitalized or

institutionalized. Kelling and Coles (1996) assert that the *O’Conner v. Donaldson* case spurred the decriminalization of drunkenness.

Reformers redefined drunkenness as an illness rather than a criminal act in the 1950s and 1960s, but still agreed that long-term involuntary treatment could be used in lieu of jails and prisons. However, Kelling and Coles (1996) contend that civil libertarians contributed more to urban decay and crime by denouncing involuntary treatment in the 1970s, suggesting that forcing someone to do so would be akin to permanent incarceration. These authors claim that allowing the mentally ill to choose to live on the street and the decriminalization of drunkenness blurred the line between civil and lawful behaviors. Kelling and Coles (1996) state that,

Neither the mentally ill and substance abusers, nor those who live on the streets by hustling and unlawful activity, should be permitted to threaten the viability of social and commercial life in our cities by repeatedly crossing the boundaries of civil and lawful behavior. Our responsibility to them is not met by allowing our cities to deteriorate in furtherance of the mistaken notion that we are protecting their-and our own-liberties. Failing to do anything lead to more drunks that can destroy a neighborhood (p. 49).

Those that support individual rights and liberties, such as those arguing for the rights of the mentally disabled are thought, in this case, to justify society’s preoccupation with more serious crimes while tolerating nonviolent offenses. Therefore, if allowed to present behaviors termed as “disorderly, it is thought to impact the environment, regardless of whether or not these behaviors are the result of a mental illness. Kelling and Coles (1996) link the focus on civil liberties to urban decay and crime. They suggest that

police officers are now limited in their authority because they cannot, for instance, arrest gang members for recruiting others and congregating, as these behaviors are not considered illegal (Kelling & Coles, 1996). In sum, by not tending to disorderly behaviors presented by those with a mental disability or other “illness,” these authors believe that more serious crimes will result and proliferate in American Cities.

**Support of broken windows.** A study conducted by Skogan (1990) established a link between disorder and fear of crime and disorder and the perception of crime. For the purposes of his study, Skogan (1990) compiled 13,000 data points involving neighborhood disorder, crime rates, and socioeconomic status (SES), collected from five separate studies that occurred between 1977 and 1982. Rather than rely on official offense or arrest data and census figures for blocks or census tracts, Skogan (1990) used extant data involving personal and telephone interviews from residents in forty different neighborhoods in Chicago, Newark, Houston, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Atlanta in effort to counteract issues related to the underreporting of crimes (Skogan, 1990).

A multiple regression analysis that controlled for race, socioeconomic status, and residential stability, or how long an individual resides in an area, was conducted to determine the extent to which disorder predicted robbery victimization, levels of crime, and perceptions of crime. Survey questions involving loitering, drugs, vandalism, gangs, public drinking, and street harassment were combined to form a “social disorder” variable. While the following were combined to form a “physical disorder” variable: 1. noise, 2. abandoned buildings, 3. litter, and 4. trash. The aforementioned variables were highly correlated (+0.83), and subsequently added together, forming one independent variable, denoted as the “global disorder index.”

Findings from Skogan's (1990) study revealed that stable neighborhoods were negatively correlated (-0.49) to levels of disorder. According to this finding, the more stable a neighborhood is, the less likely they are to experience disorder. Poverty was positively correlated (+.58) with levels of disorder. In this case, neighborhoods experiencing low-income, high unemployment, and low education, were more likely than their counterparts to experience disorder. Neighborhood minority concentration was positively related to poverty (+0.47) and negatively correlated to stability (-.30). The more minorities in an area, the more likely they were to be poor and to experience instability, which, according to Skogan (1990), may explain why a high concentration of minorities in a neighborhood were found to be positively correlated with disorder (+0.32). Neighborhood Fear at Night was negatively correlated with the poverty score ( $p=0.04$ ,  $B=-0.04$ ) and positively correlated with disorder ( $p=0.02$ ,  $B=0.66$ ). As the poverty score went down, or the higher the income, the less likely residents would experience fear at night. The more disorder reported by residents, the more likely they were to feel fear at night ( $p=0.02$ ,  $B=0.66$ ). Residents' fear of their neighborhood at night was not correlated with stability or percent minority. The fact that residents were more fearful at night in areas denoted as "disorderly" is similar to Zimbardo's idea that those who can be anonymous are more likely to commit crimes. Therefore, a person who intends to commit a crime may feel more inclined to do so, when it is dark, making it more difficult to be identified.

Skogan (1990) credits the breakdown of neighborhoods with changes in policing practices following the twentieth century. He suggests that the centralization of police departments and a shift from foot patrolmen to a central headquarters due to two-way



radio dispatching and landline telephones resulted in a disconnect between police officers and the residents they served. Additionally, Skogan (1990) asserts that because police officers began to narrow their focus away from problems of disorder to more serious crimes a shift from police effectiveness, to police efficiency or how fast they could respond to a crime. Skogan (1990) also posits that in effort to ensure professionalism and limit corruption, police officers could no longer arrest based on suspicion or to pick up vagrants or individuals who were loitering, allowing problems of disorder to worsen, causing an uptick in crime. This idea supports Kelling and Coles (1996) assertion that a focus on civil liberties, such as giving rights to the mentally ill and the homeless.

**Arguments against broken windows.** Despite Skogan's (1990) assertions, Harcourt (1998) replicated this study using the same data set. Findings show that although Skogan's (1990) disorder index remained statistically significant with respect to indices for poverty, stability and race, Harcourt criticizes Skogan's (1990) use of drug trafficking and gang activities to develop the independent variable denoted "global disorder index." Harcourt suggests that by including these crimes in the aforementioned independent variable may result in an overlap with the dependent variable, as some residents may include these crimes when reporting the level of criminal activities.

Additional criticism of Skogan's (1990) study involves his exclusion of other crimes, besides robbery, such as purse snatching, physical assault, burglary, and sexual assault. Harcourt found that sexual assault was not correlated with levels of disorder ( $p=0.66$ ,  $B= 0.001$ ). Purse snatching was marginally, negatively correlated with disorder ( $p=0.16$ ,  $B= 0.025$ ), suggesting that the more disorder experienced by a neighborhood, the less likely purse snatching will occur. Robbery was the only variable that was

positively correlated to disorder ( $p=0.004$ ,  $B=0.038$ ). However, when Harcourt held poverty, stability, and race, no statistically significant relationship was found ( $p=0.011$ ,  $B=0.670$ ). Therefore, findings from Skogan's (1990) study lose credibility. Additionally, while Skogan's (1990) findings suggest that minorities in poor inner city, urban spaces are more prone to disorder and a change in police tactics is responsible for increased crime rates, he does not include the notion that structural forces, such as redlining, may be responsible for the overrepresentation of these individuals in such neighborhoods and crime within these spaces.

Sampson & Roudenbush (2004) criticize the Broken Window's theory further, suggesting the link between social disorder, physical disorder, fear, and crime, is that not that simple. These authors posit that cultural stereotypes, resulting from implicit biases, or sweeping generalizations about a population, which can stem from exposure to historically and structural inequities, are more salient in society than visual cues of disorder in and of themselves (Sampson & Roudenbush, 2004). The dominant narrative involving inner city, urban neighborhoods, for instance, suggests that higher rates of crime, poverty, gang violence, drugs, and crisis are more likely to occur in these spaces when compared to their suburban and rural counterparts (Godstein, 2007). This notion may be the result of negative connotations associated with the word, "urban," which has been perpetuated in media reports that portray these neighborhoods with images of high-rise housing projects that are littered with "packs of young men lurking on street corners" (Creasey & Jarvis, p.2 2013). In addition, when asked to describe underserved urban neighborhoods, many college students characterize these environments as low-income with high minority populations (Creasey & Janis, 2013). As a result, race, income, and

urban crime become inextricably linked by dominant society. Sampson & Roudenbush (2004) suggest that perceptions of physical disorder may be filtered through these stereotypical lenses involving racial, ethnic and socioeconomic structure of a neighborhood. To test their assumptions, Sampson & Roudenbush (2004) conducted a study to determine whether individual perceptions of disorder vary within and between neighborhoods using four sources of data.

The first source of data included a neighborhood survey conducted in 1995 for 3,585 residents in 478 block groups with a response rate of 78%. Participants in this study were asked questions regarding the degree to which indications of physical disorder (e.g. graffiti) and social disorder, such as panhandling, were a problem in their city. The second involved twelve demographic or background characteristics, which were comprised of race/ethnicity, SES, sex, marital status, homeownership, residential mobility (how often a person moved in the past five years), residential tenures (years in the neighborhood), and age to help determine if observable characteristics of disorder is viewed through different lenses at the individual level. Third, census data was collected for the block groups during 1990 and considered the following:

- Proportions of families in poverty
- Population size
- Population density
- Proportion Black and Latino

Police records that showed the number of violent offenses, such as robbery and homicide were geocoded in order to log rates of violent crimes in the included areas. Finally, Systematic Social Observations (SSO) were used that involved videos of almost 500

block groups and researcher observations. Researchers viewed and coded the videos for signs of physical and social disorder to determine whether or not residents' perceptions of disorder were based on observable conditions or if they were influenced by implicit bias. A secondary check involving additional observers reviewing 10% of all coded face blocks resulted in 98% interpersonal agreement.

Sampson & Roudenbush's (2004) study involved two types of disorder: Physical and social disorder. Physical disorder included the following:

1. The presence of absence of cigarettes or cigars
2. Garbage or litter on the streets or sidewalk
3. Empty beer bottles visible in the street
4. Tagging graffiti
5. Graffiti painting over graffiti
6. Gang graffiti
7. Abandoned cars
8. Condoms on the street or sidewalk
9. Needles/syringes on the sidewalk
10. Political message graffiti.

Social disorder involved:

1. The presence or absence of adults loitering or congregating
2. Drinking alcohol in public
3. Peer group with gang indicators
4. Public intoxication
5. Adults fighting or arguing in a hostile manner

6. Selling drugs

7. Street prostitution

A separate condition to perceived disorder termed “physical decay” was also examined, which focused on such characteristics as vacant houses and dilapidated residential units.

Findings from this study showed that age was negatively related to perceptions of disorder (coefficient =  $-.002$ ,  $t = -3.13$ ). As the age of the resident increased, the less likely they were to perceive disorder in an area. Females were more likely than males to perceive disorder (coefficient =  $0.41$ ,  $t = 2.06$ ). Blacks and “other races” were less likely than whites to perceive disorder (coefficient =  $-1.57$ ,  $t = -4.45$ ; coefficient =  $-.116$ ,  $t = -2.89$ ). From this, the researchers posited that Blacks and Latinos were more likely than Whites to have a higher threshold for neighborhood disorder. Sampson & Roudenbush (2004) suggest that since minority populations are more likely to live in cities characterized by disorder than their white counterparts, they may have a higher threshold for disorder. In other words, perceptions of physical and social disorder are relative to those experiencing the disorder.

After controlling for social and ethnic composition of an area, findings revealed that areas characterized by concentrated poverty (coefficient =  $.756$ ,  $t = 7.43$ ) and predominately Black (coefficient =  $.414$ ,  $t = 8.03$ ) and Latino populations (coefficient =  $.442$ ,  $t = 6.63$ ) were found to relate positively to perceptions of neighborhood disorder, regardless of the race of the participant or actual indicators of disorder. Latinos were more likely than Whites to perceive an area that had a population that was 75% or more Black as being disorderly (coefficient =  $.59$ ,  $t = 2.54$ ). These researchers highlight

this coefficient as being doubles that of the perceived disorder for Black participants (.29).

The abovementioned findings support the authors' hypothesis regarding perceptions of disorder as being filtered through stereotypical lenses. Contrary to the Broken Window's theory, residents in this study avoid an area or move away because they perceive these areas to be disorderly based on their implicit bias towards predominately Black or mixed areas (Sampson & Roudenbush, 2004). Although observable disorder may contribute to the fear of an area, this study suggests that perceptions of disorder are more heavily affected by the racial and economic context of an area (Sampson & Roudenbush, 2004).

Gau, Corsaro, & Brunson (2014) also do not view the disorder-crime relationship as being that simple. These authors investigated whether a direct or indirect relationship exists between physical disorder and crime as mediated by the social cohesion of an area. Social cohesion, in this study, was measured by residents' willingness to call police for help if a problem arises (Gau et al, 2014). These researches used a Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) to determine the extent to which social cohesion affect the disorder-fear relationship. Data were collected via phone interviews and census tracts in a low-income area in Illinois. Areas where concentrated disadvantage was more prevalent, levels of fear also increased ( $b=.243, p<.05$ ).

Social cohesion was found to significantly minimize feelings of fear of a neighborhood at the individual ( $b=-.146, p < .01$ ) and neighborhood ( $b=-.543, p<.01$ ) levels. Fear of crime was found to be significantly less prevalent when individuals felt their neighbors would cooperate with police ( $b=-.152, p<.05$ ). Findings suggest that

physical signs of disorder are a symptom of a breakdown of social cohesion amongst residents, inspiring feelings of fear and hesitation to intervene through 911 calls when criminal acts are observed. As such, police effectiveness is not what these authors suggest mediates against physical disorder, social cohesion, or residents looking out for one another and helping to enforce laws, is (Gau et al, 2014).

Further criticism of the Broken Windows Theory questions the notion that physical disorder attracts criminals to a place. In the same way that it does not make sense that a wound on one leg will cause the other to become injured, Jean (2007) argues that it does not seem plausible that tending to minor offenses, such as panhandling will deter more serious incidents (i.e. murder). Research involving the Broken Windows Theory of Crime is detailed in his book, *Pockets of Crime: Broken Windows, Collective Efficacy, and The Criminal Point of View* (2007). To test the assumptions of this theory, namely, that signs of physical disorder indicates that residents do not care for their neighborhood, creating ideal areas for criminal acts to take place, St. Jean conducted an ethnography and used multiple data sources including official crime statistics, mapping, a neighborhood survey, in depth interviews, and systematic social observation (SSO), all of which will be detailed below.

Jean (2007) chose to focus on the city of Chicago, Illinois, where he used official crime statistics to determine which neighborhood had:

1. The highest incidents of serious crime
2. Lowest income
3. Highest concentration of Blacks

Wentworth was identified as having the highest index crime rate from 1998-2002 and had experienced high rates of joblessness and crime between 1950 and the 1990s. Wentworth was further divided into beats, which range from 50-125 street blocks. Wentworth contains twelve beats and, as noted by Jean (2007), crime rates between blocks varied between 1999 and 2002. This researcher further limited his observed space through the use of Random Selection Procedure to limit his study to one of the twelve beats. Beat 213, Grand Boulevard, which contains 59 blocks, was subsequently chosen. Beat 213 had a population of 3,386 and was 98.3% Black in 2000.

Jean (2007) considered the Broken Windows and Collective Efficacy theories to crime with respect to street narcotics, robberies, and battery, because these crimes fall into three different categories. The selling of street narcotics are described by Jean (2007) as an example of an entrepreneurial crime, robbery as a violent, predatory crime, and battery as a violent, interpersonal crime. He accounted for unreported crimes through interviews with “neighborhood experts,” or those that are familiar with the city. Jean (2007) asked these individuals to identify “hotspots,” or areas experiencing high rates of crime, and as such, was able to determine areas more prone to criminal acts within the examined” beat”.

Additionally, Jean (2007) interviewed both active and former offenders, and the police in effort to determine the reasons that the selected crimes occur more frequently on some blocks over others within the same beat. Through these interviews, Jean (2007) findings reveal that consideration for ecological advantages are missing from the Broken Windows Theory and that physical disorder does not appear to be directly linked to crime. Jean’s (2007) study suggests that since cities develop disproportionately, they



differ in a criminal's perceived gain for conducting activity there. The ecological advantages a neighborhood has to offer provides an explanation regarding why some areas characterized by physical disorder experience high rates of crime while others do not.

Physical disorder is suggested to signal to criminals that the government does not care about a place (Jean, 2007). Drug dealers, in this study, indicate that they capitalize on this deficit by recruiting young unemployed people to peddle drugs and sell to depressed residents who seek self-medication to manage their difficulties. However, some areas in the same neighborhood are suggested to offer ecological advantages over others. Interviewees reported that robberies often take place in busy areas where people are likely to be carrying money and be distracted, such as at an intersection. If correct, these findings could explain the "open-air drug market," which was mentioned earlier and discussed in Kelling and Coles (1996), that existed on a street corner near a neighborhood that had recently cleaned up signs of physical disorder. Areas of high disorder, including those with abandoned buildings, are not posited to experience criminal activity, because these spaces do not provide any ecological advantages (Jean, 2007). Moreover, while some spaces may experience high instances of violent and predatory crimes, the majority of the blocks within the same beat may be characterized by low incidences of these criminal acts.

Jean's (2007) findings are important to consider in relationship to the present study involving the use of zero tolerance policies and policing practices in schools, which are posited by policy makers to punish minor offenses, such as insubordination, in effort to deter more serious crimes, such as bringing a weapon to school or fighting. This

mirrors Kelling and Coles (1996) emphasis on punishing disorderly behaviors, such as public intoxication, more harshly to discourage more serious crime, such as murder. However, Jean's (2007) study disproves this notion by suggesting that crime occurs as the result of opportunity and the economic depression of an area.

In his paper, Harcourt (1998) criticizes the New York City's 1993 quality-of-life initiative, which is premised on the Broken Windows theory, where order-maintenance is used to target misdemeanor offenses, such as public drinking and turnstile jumping to deter more serious criminal acts. Harcourt suggests that a focus on disorder may ignore the role that these factors play in crime and explores the idea that order-maintenance policing may maintain community norms, rather than creating moral cohesion and lower crime rates in areas characterized as disorderly (Harcourt, 1998). Harcourt (1998) suggests a link between the Broken Windows theory and the social influence of deterrence, which suggests there is a social dichotomy that assumes fixed identities between honest people and criminals in disorderly environments, wherein the law-abiding residents avoid a neighborhood, awarding criminals the opportunity to move in. An alternative view of this reality is included in his proposal, whereby the act of denoting a behavior, such as laying down in a stoop, as disorderly, and criminalizing it, results from past and present forms of punishment including excessive force and surveillance, respectively (Harcourt, 1998). In short, order-maintenance policing practices have created and defined the disorderly person and their tendencies as needing to be controlled, justifying the use of aggressive police tactics to control minor offenses.

Rather than considering psychotherapeutic rehabilitation to help individuals displaying problematic behaviors, the quality-of-life-initiative and other policies

premised on the Broken Windows Theory include, according to Harcourt (1998), relocating and excluding the disorderly from the general populous. This idea proliferates, in this case, because it is difficult for the general public to argue that disorderly behaviors such as public urination should not be punished, despite the fact that evidence to support the Broken Windows theory is lacking (Harcourt, 1998). Acceptance of the quality-of-life-initiative and other punitive strategies that operate under the auspices of the Broken Window's theory may cause society to ignore the implications of such policies (Harcourt, 1998). Meaning, in effort to minimize crime, harsh punitive measures are used because policy makers and dominant society deems them to be effective, despite the fact that little is known about the long-term consequences of their use.

**Police brutality and racial profiling.** In areas denoted as disorderly, the focus on order-maintenance may have led to an increase in complaints of police brutality following the implementation of the quality-of-life-initiative in New York City (Harcourt, 1998). Harcourt cites the New York Times article that reported an increase from 5,983 complaints involving police brutality in the three years prior to the implementation of the initiative to 8,316 complaints between 1994 and 1996 (Cooper, 1996). Harcourt (1998) contends that attending to crime in neighborhoods may need to reconsider the use of categorizing people as law-abiding or as criminals and consider alternatives that mediate against the factors that contribute to neighborhood decline, including poverty and crime, that are ignored because of the emphasis on the aesthetic appearance of neighborhoods and the criminalization of minor offenses. In other words, society has defined what is considered disorderly or criminal, which puts people into categories, rather than understanding the systemic causes of such issues.

Adding more police, then, does not increase residents' feelings of safety, but, instead, increases mistrust towards police and criminalizes minor offenses. Such feelings and implications can be intensified in situations when racial profiling is considered to have played a role in a police officer apprehending individuals. Racial profiling occurs when the race and ethnic backgrounds of residents may lead to police stopping, questioning, searching or arresting someone, without having reasonable suspicion to do so (Chan, 2011).

Bell, Hopson, Craig, and Robinson (2014) examined the stories and perceptions of both Black and White participants and their experiences with racial profiling while driving. In the following story, a Black participant explains how the police, in a position of power, may abuse their authority.

I have been pulled over more than I care to imagine by police officers. I've had my car searched for drugs countless times and I have never once tried or experimented with illegal substances. It has happened everywhere I've ever lived: Delaware, Northern Virginia, North Carolina. I've had my car searched for drugs. I've never owned a car that I would identify as a drug dealer's car. Yet, I have had dogs go through my car a couple of times...Police officers scare me in a really big way...they walk around with guns and sticks. So they are already in a position of power because I don't carry a gun or a stick. Police officers are in a position to exert their power with very little repercussions or restraint in the moment. (Bell, et al., 2014, p. 36-37).

This participant's story further illustrates the feelings of mistrust towards police officers by Black Americans and the police stops of Black drivers for reasons that have little to nothing to do with an actual crime.

The divergent application of police traffic stops, do not go unnoticed by the White participants in this study. One White participant points out, "I've seen Black people get pulled over for absolutely nothing...I mean, if I would have been doing the same thing, I don't think that I would have gotten pulled over" (Bell, et al., 2014, p. 38). If White individuals also notice that Black drivers are profiled, then one cannot conclude that racial profiling is a myth perpetuated solely by Black communities, strengthening the idea that Black individuals are often pulled over by police for their race alone.

Bell, et al. (2014) suggest that police abuse of power, along with such historic events as the Jim Crow era, stories from friends, and the media, can be responsible the feelings that Black drivers hold regarding their mistrust of law enforcement. If Black Americans do not trust police, then it would make sense that they would not rely on them for protection, causing cultural forces, such as the cool pose culture, to form as a means of protection.

**Summary.** Despite the proposed relationship between structural and cultural forces and crime in cities (Wilson, 2009), the United States seems to ignore the crime problem as being a systemic issue, rather it is a commonly held assumption that crime should be dealt with harshly, as suggested by the Broken Windows Theory, in order to deter criminal acts from occurring in the first place (Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Kelling & Coles, 1996). In other words, if the issue is that high rates of criminal activity exists in areas characterized by physical disorder and harsh punishments are theorized to deter

crime, then, theoretically, there is no need to address larger societal problems, such as the isolation of minority populations in poor, inner city, urban areas. The idea here is that if crime is reduced, then more law-abiding citizens will move into cities to create safer environments, solving the problem (Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Kelling & Coles, 1996). This notion relates to Harcourt's (1998) assertion that the Broken Windows Theory only seeks to rid neighborhoods of "disorderly people", rather than providing opportunities for rehabilitation or to understand the systemic causes of crime.

There is a paucity of empirical evidence to support and contention from many scholars regarding the Broken Windows Theory; however, this theory continues to inform disciplinary measures both in the community and in schools in the form of zero tolerance policies and school policing practices (Nolan, 2011; Teske, 2011). Mark Naymik (2015) reports the views of a former Cleveland police officer that contends that community policing is, in its various forms, including foot patrol, effective in mediating against crime in the city. The Cleveland clergy also believe that Cleveland should bring back the use of foot patrol to improve relationships between the police and citizens (Attasi, 2015). From this, it can be assumed that although there is no evidence to suggest that community policing decreases crime, the support for it persists.

Therefore, the proliferation of punitive measures to mediate against crime may be the result of past and present crime reduction policies, including the idea of community policing, which seem to have been informed by incremental policy development as presented in Lindblom's *The Science of Muddling Through* (1959). As mentioned, the broken windows theory has been associated with such crime reduction policies as the War on Drugs and subsequently, zero tolerance policies (Teske, 2011). This paper will

argue that policy development in the form of incrementalism may have led to crime reduction policies used to mediate against problematic behaviors in inner city, urban communities: zero tolerance and the use of school security guards.

### **Incrementalism**

Incrementalism involves ongoing efforts to correct current, explicitly defined issues of social concern (Lindblom, 1959). The use of illicit drugs, for instance, could be described as an issue of social concern. Future policies, in this case, put a lot of emphasis on the past to inform future policies that do not vary much from one another and are measured *solely* by the agreement of decision makers to determine its quality (Lindblom, 1959). In other words, empirical evidence is not necessary when making decisions regarding policies that are developed through incrementalism. With respect to the aforementioned example involving illegal drug use, policy makers have chosen to apply strict, one-strike measures that remove criminals from the general population, such as the War on Drugs as recourse to mediate against these “broken windows” without providing evidence to support the assertion that such practices will alleviate the issue.

It can be argued that Incrementalists’ policy efforts to reduce crime rates in the cities may vary from those that target cities specifically, including the Broken Windows approach to crime and community policing in the form of foot patrol, to those that are applied more broadly such as the “War on Drugs and “Three-Strikes” laws. Since the incrementalist approach to policy development requires only an agreement regarding its use as a measure of quality (Lindblom, 1959), it would not matter that the Broken Windows Theory has not been proven. In this case, it is only important that policy makers agree that minor offenses must be dealt with harshly. In other words, those that

refuse to obey the law should be punished even if doing so does not lower actual incidents of crime.

In contrast to the notion that crime-reduction policies may develop incrementally, some could suggest that zero tolerance policies and school policing in schools are not the result of incrementalism, but, rather, punctuated equilibrium. Punctuated equilibrium is a drastic change in policy following a significant event (Baugartner, Jones, & Materson, 2014). Since zero tolerance policies and school policing practices were enacted after mass school shootings, one may assume that schools changed their discipline policies drastically to deter such behavior. Although this could be true to an extent, it seems that only some schools, namely those in urban settings with high minority populations, experienced drastic increases in policing practices as a result of these fears, (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012), despite the fact that these shootings occurred in suburban areas and small towns with a majority white population. As will be illustrated in the proceeding, zero tolerance policies and school policing practices could be derived from preexisting policies, such as the War on Drugs, a policy that was informed by the Broken Windows Theory (Teske, 2011).

As mentioned, critics of the “Broken Windows” theory suggests that the implementation of order maintenance policing, or zero tolerance policies, has resulted in a “war on the poor”, leading to increasing numbers of unemployed residents and has done little to reduce crime rates while increasing the population of minority populations, particularly males, in our nation’s prisons (Nolan, 2013). Wilson (2009) contends that many Americans do not completely comprehend the social and economic conditions that have contributed to the plight of Black males and may rely more on stereotypical



narratives to inform their perceptions of violence in underserved urban spaces. Dominant society often fears Black males and believes that they are to blame for problems within inner city neighborhoods (Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2009). As discussed, this notion may be the result of structures that have led to the social construction of minorities as “deviants” in need of policing, the isolation of minority populations in inner city, urban spaces (Wilson, 2009), and the use of order maintenance policing to mediate against crime in these communities (Cook, 2009; Kelling & Coles, 1996; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Such measures were gradually introduced into American public schools, first in inner city, urban schools in the 1960s and then later, in all school locales, following a number of mass school shootings in the early 1990s (Fuentes, 2012).

**School discipline.** Historically, American teachers and principals have had considerable autonomy in terms of the establishment of behavioral norms, expectations and disciplinary actions (Kafka, 2011). Despite schools’ past ability to self-govern, behavioral expectations and disciplinary practices did not differ much between districts or schools (Kafka, 2011). Teachers had the right under the doctrine of *in loco parentis*, or “in place of the parent,” to determine what actions were necessary, corporal punishment or otherwise, for purposes of moral development of their students (Kafka, 2011). However, during the late 1960s and 1970s, in response to an increase in perceived student aggression and crime in and around schools, teachers sought a reprieve from the responsibility of *in loco parentis* and asked policy makers for a centralized discipline policy, particularly in racially segregated urban schools (Kafka, 2011). Their efforts received national attention that resulted in the widespread interest of many educators and contributed to the decline of the doctrine of *in loco parentis*, particularly in inner city,

urban spaces (Kafka, 2011). More recently, events, including a number of mass school shootings in the early 1990s, to be discussed, has contributed to the notion that safety is compromised in all school locals, though the dominant narrative still leans towards the notion that inner city, urban schools are the most violent, and resulted in a shift in school safety approaches from in loco parentis to zero tolerance policies and the use of school policing practices (Fuentes, 2012).

**Safety policies.** An examination of existing literature regarding safety policies in today's schools indicate that school and police officials are two approaches used in public schools in effort to reduce school violence: 1.the removal of problem students through zero tolerance policies and 2.surveillance, in the form of school policing practices that include SROs, the use of metal detectors, locked campuses, and random searches (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). With respect to the current study, the following section will focus solely on literature involving zero tolerance policies, SROs, and metal detectors. It is important to note that the GFSA is one form of zero tolerance that has been credited with introducing harsh disciplinary practices into American public schools that originally dealt with the most severe behaviors, such as bring a weapon to school, but have more recently been applied to minor infractions, including suspensions for "disorderly conduct" (Nolan, 2011). This notion is similar to how society has defined what is criminal in communities through Labeling Theory and as expressed by Harcourt (1998), where students are defined as either, "delinquent" or "rule abiding."

Zero tolerance policies, such as the GFSA, can be considered structural forces as they disproportionately affect low-income students, minorities and students with disabilities. These policies have also been attributed to the "Broken Windows" theory of

crime (Teske, 2011) and, as argued, may have leaked into American Public schools through the process of incrementalism, justified by the social construction of adolescents, particularly inner city, urban minority populations, as “deviants,” in the form of zero tolerance policies and policing practices.

**School safety and broken windows.** As mentioned, the notion that zero tolerance policies and a police presence in American’s public schools can mediate against violence in schools may be premised on the “Broken Windows” theory of crime (Teske, 2011). The Broken Windows philosophy suggests that an abandoned building begins with a few broken windows that, if left unrepaired, will give way to high rates of criminal activity (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). In other words, signs of physical disorder, such as broken windows, graffiti, and boarded-up buildings may indicate a lack of concern for a neighborhood (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Such indifference may make unrepaired buildings ideal sites to conduct criminal or antisocial activities and contribute to residents feeling of fear in their neighborhood (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Kelling & Coles (1996) suggest that the best way to “fix the broken windows,” or mediate against problematic behaviors in neighborhoods, is to employ the use of foot patrol to patrol the neighborhoods and ensure the safety of the residents.

When applied to American public schools, zero tolerance policies are one-strike measures with the goal of deterring problematic behaviors in schools and, similar to the Broken Windows Theory, are often applied to minor infractions with the hope of deterring more serious problems (Teske, 2011). In addition, employing the use of school security to patrol a school’s hallways can be viewed as akin to the foot patrol championed by Kelling and Coles (1996). The addition of SROs in schools represents another form of

discipline imposed on students and can also be considered a structural force as the use of these policing practices are more prominent in inner-city, urban schools, with predominately Black populations, which some contend increases the likelihood of problematic student behaviors and recidivism in these spaces (Nolan, 2011).

**School policing and foot patrol.** Similarly, the use of SROs in America's public schools seems to be related to Wilson and Kelling (1982) and Kelling and Coles (1996) hypothesis that the use of community policing in the form of foot patrol can deter crime. Foot patrol that walk around and interact with citizens in a community, rather than distancing themselves in a vehicle, were championed by these authors as a way to reduce signs of social disorder (Wilson & Coles, 1982). Social disorder involves such "threatening behaviors" as, aggressive panhandling and drunkenness that can cause residents to fear their neighborhoods, particularly in inner-city urban communities (Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Kelling & Coles, 1996). Attending to low-level offenses, or signs of social disorder, according to these authors, is thought to deter more serious criminal acts, such as murder, in neighborhoods experiencing concentrated poverty (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The same is true in schools, where police officers attend to such minor infractions as insubordination, which can include such behaviors as failing to reveal an identification badge, in effort to reduce incidents of violence (Nolan, 2011). Some scholars contend that focusing on minor infractions may, instead, increase problematic student behaviors in public schools (Nolan, 2011).

Many instances of problematic student behaviors occur during disagreements between the security guards and students in their school, where students are said to act out against the cultural of control imposed upon them in urban public school settings

(Nolan, 2011). Although, many inner-city urban schools experienced some form of policing prior to the 1990s, perhaps one of the most defining moments regarding the use of harsh disciplinary practices, in all school locales, may be the result of a number of tragic mass school shootings, most notably, Columbine (Fuentes, 2012). As mentioned, Columbine, a school in a predominately White town resulted in the deaths of 14 students and 1 teacher and incited fears that school safety is compromised in all school settings (Fuentes, 2012).

### **The Gun Free School Act and Zero Tolerance Policies**

Zero tolerance policies were introduced in American public schools in 1994 in response to a number of tragic mass school shootings. The use of harsh disciplinary measures stem from the GFSA, or, more generally, zero tolerance policies in schools, which mandates a minimum of a one-year expulsion for any student in the possession of a weapon. The GFSA mandated school districts adopt zero tolerance policies or risk losing funding, however limitations of the statute became the responsibility of each individual state (Mongan & Walker, 2012). This has led to ambiguity and subjectivity when it comes to suspending and/or expelling students and, as such, the goal of GFSA to deter violence in schools is compromised (Mongan & Walker, 2012). As a result, students may feel that punishments are handed out arbitrarily and unfairly. In Bracy's (2011) study, to be discussed in more detail later, students felt that they were targeted and punished by staff based on whether or not they felt they were liked. In other words, since GFSA as a punishment policy does not explicitly outline the behaviors that will require disciplinary measures, and to what extent the punishment will be experienced, it will likely fail to deter problematic behavior.

In a 2011 nationally representative youth survey of grades 9–12, conducted by the Center for Disease Control (CDC), 32.8% of students reported having been in a physical fight in the preceding 12 months. The prevalence of fighting was slightly higher for males (40.7%) than females (24.4%). Of the students surveyed, 16.6% self-identified as having carried a weapon (gun, knife, or club) on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey. Males were more likely to carry a weapon (25.9%) than females (6.8%). Of the students who carried a weapon, 5.1% reported carrying a gun on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey. Males reported carrying a firearm more often (8.6%) than females (1.4%). In the 12 months preceding the survey, 7.4% of students reported being threatened or injured one or more times with a weapon on school property (Center for Disease Control, 2012). These behaviors persist despite the implementation of zero tolerance in American public schools.

**Effectiveness and consequence of zero tolerance policies.** Mongan & Walker (2012) used the Model Penal Code and the theory of social control, as outlined by Hirschi (1969), to analyze the effectiveness and consequences of zero tolerance policies in schools. The Model Penal code was developed by the American Law institute in 1962 to standardize penal codes (Mongan & Walker, 2012). Social control is thought to be achieved through social mechanisms such as punishment to avoid that which is thought, by Hirschi (1969), as being innate: the ability to participate in crime. With respect to Mongan & Walker's (2012) analysis of the effectiveness and consequences of zero tolerance policies, four components of social control were investigated that include a) attachment, b) commitment, c) involvement, and d) belief.

In terms of attachment, students that are suspended or expelled are likely to lose any feelings of connectedness to their school (Mongan & Walker, 2012). A child's increased amount of time at home could cause a burden to the family by their need for supervision (Mongan & Walker, 2012). In the case where a child already lacks attachment to their home, their suspension or expulsion may increase their time spent in an environment that lacks cohesion (Mongan & Walker, 2012). As Taras et al. (2003) point out, suspended and expelled students often are those that already lack adult supervision and may be in need of professional assistance, perhaps in the form of counseling. By removing these children from the school environment, which may be the only structured environment they experience, existing behavioral problems may be exacerbated and any positive attachments these students had to their school could be severed (Mongan & Walker, 2012).

Next, commitment and involvement are examined together in Mongan & Walker's (2012) work, because they are considered by these authors to be highly related concepts. Commitment involves socially acceptable means to increase one's status, while involvement includes pursuing and participating in activities that are considered socially acceptable (Wiatrowski, Griswod, & Roberts, 1981). From this definition, Mongan & Walker (2012) conclude that both commitment and involvement are damaged from the implementation of zero tolerance policies, as students that are excluded from the school environment cannot participate in activities within the school. So, in addition to being removed from academic instruction, a student also would not be eligible to participate in extracurricular activities, such as playing basketball or dram club, decreasing their involvement and thus their commitment to their school.

The last aspect of social control theory discussed by Mongan & Walker (2012) in relationship to zero tolerance policies is “belief,” or “the agreement with the rules, values, and norms of the society an individual resides in” (p.235). Suspended and expelled students may begin to feel disconnected and lose trust in their school system, subsequently increasing the likelihood of recidivism. McGinnis (2003) contends that suspensions exacerbate, rather than reduce, students’ problematic behaviors. When a student is excluded from school, they are more likely to struggle academically and since peers may consider “acting bad” more socially acceptable than appearing to lack competence, students who are suspended may continue to display disruptive, aggressive behaviors to avoid difficult classwork (McGinnis, 2003). Students subsequently return to school exhibiting the same or more severe behaviors (Martinez, 2009). In other words, students that do not believe in or understand their school’s discipline policy may act out against it as they fall behind in school and get caught up in a feedback loop where the more they are punished the more they display problematic behaviors (Majors & Billson, 1992). This relationship may be the result of the subjective and arbitrary use of suspensions and expulsions under zero tolerance policies (Mongan & Walker, 2012). The harsher the punishments and the more arbitrarily they are enforced, the more likely students will act out against the system (Bracy, 2011; Nolan, 2011).

Mongan and Walker (2012) point to a number of court cases that have led up to the perception by some that there is a lack of due process for students suspended or expelled under zero tolerances policies beginning with *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District* (1969). This case involved the suspension of students for protesting the Vietnam War. This punishment was considered in violation of the student’s right to free



speech under the first amendment. In another court case, focused on the civil rights of students, *Goss v. Lopez* (1975), students were suspended for disruption and destruction of property. The court ruled that schools could not exclude students without due process, as states require their attendance. Therefore, education was ruled a “property right” of the students (Mongan & Walker, 2012). These court cases precede the implementation of zero tolerance, which originally required schools to determine if students were aware that they were doing something wrong and /or had intent, or *Mens Rea* (Mongan & Walker, 2012). In the end, however, zero tolerance policies have allowed for strict liability, where the constitutional right of *Mens Rea* is not awarded to students. Under strict liability an individual that is participating in an illegal act or is in possession of contraband is considered guilty (Mongan & Walker, 2012). Comparisons between two court cases were used to illustrate this point in Mongan and Walker’s study.

In the first, *Seal v. Morgan* (2000), a student was suspended for possessing a knife in his vehicle, but insisted that he did not know it was in his car. The court ruled in his favor, suggesting that apprehending the student when he did not have knowledge that the knife was or have intent to use it to cause harm was unreasonable under *Mens Rea*. From this, school districts would need to be cautious when suspending or expelling a student, ensuring that the child had *intent* and knowledge of wrongdoing when caught in violation of their school’s rules.

In contradiction to *Seal v. Morgan*, Mongan and Walker (2012) discuss the outcome of *Bundick v. Bay City Independent School District*. In this case, a student also had a knife in his car, and upon a search for suspicion of drug possession, was found in a toolbox. The student suggested that he did not intend to do harm; however, the court

suggested that the school had the right to search his car. The fact that the student knowingly possessed a weapon on school grounds, whether or not there was intent to harm, was found to be a justification for expulsion. Strict liability, rather than Mens Rea, took precedence regarding how schools dealt with students' violations of school rules with respect to zero tolerance policies (Mongan & Walker, 2012).

Despite its widespread use in American public schools, it has been suggested that zero tolerance measures as a punishment policy is ineffective at mediating against problematic behaviors because of the perceived subjectivity and arbitrary use of such measures to enforce school rules (Mongan & Walker, 2012). Under the Model Penal code, a punishment policy must be able to determine the correct perpetrator and severity decided based on the given behavior. Mongan and Walker (2012) suggest that, in terms of school discipline under zero tolerance, randomly assigning punishment without understanding the reason behind the punishment may not act as a deterrent for the student or the general student body. Put another way, without Mens Rea, GFSA and the subsequent use of zero tolerance policies in schools do not meet the criterion for an effective punishment policy under the Model Penal Code as it not able to deter problematic student behaviors, because students could receive punishments arbitrarily under this policy.

Adding to this confusion, Martinez (2009) suggests that school administrators are applying the policy to behaviors, such as "insubordination," which were not designated a concern to be dealt with harshly under the zero tolerance policy. At the same time, harsh disciplinary measures associated with zero tolerance policies do not appear to be differentiated according to the severity of the offense and are often applied to a wide

range of behaviors from possession of a weapon to writing a violent story (Melvin, 2011). Therefore, a student that commits a minor offense could be punished to the same degree as a peer that is involved in more problematic behaviors.

Not only is the severity of punishment for school rule violations under scrutiny, there seems to be a divergent application of zero tolerance policies, where minority and special education students are thought to be punished more frequently and more severely than their White counterparts (Nolan, 2011). Miller et al. (2011) found that during the 2006-2007 school year 51 percent of suspensions served were by Black students, whereas only 8 percent were White. Additionally, of the students suspended for insubordination, 57 percent were black and 7 percent were white. As such, zero tolerance policies can be considered structural forces that marginalize minority populations.

**Zero Tolerance and inner city, urban, minority students.** The examined literature surrounding zero tolerance policies also suggests that disciplinary measures are more severely applied to urban minority students who are often suspended and expelled more frequently than their white counterparts (Fuentes, 2012; McGinnis, 2003; Nolan, 2011). As mentioned, zero tolerance policies in school have been indicative of the precedent set by prisons in that the policy disproportionately affects Black and Hispanic students at a rate approximately three times the rate of their white peers (Dupper, 2010). More recently, it has been reported that Missouri suspends over 14% of Black elementary students and has the highest Black/White discipline gap (UCLA, 2015). These numbers show that there are disparities regarding the application of zero tolerance policies and race. Behind the numbers are the stories of the students that experience zero tolerance policies.

In Bracy's (2011) qualitative study involving direct observations and interviews with students about their school, students felt their perspectives were not being heard and expressed frustration in perceived inconsistent rule enforcement (Bracy, 2011). Black students in this study suggested racial discrimination in their schools' disciplinary process is conscious and deliberate and teachers unfairly enforce rules, targeting students they dislike (Bracy, 2011). Breunlin, Cimmarusti, Bryant-Edwards, and Hetherington (2002) discuss profiling as a security approach focused on established characteristics used to identify potentially violent youth; however, such divergent application of disciplinary measures can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein those youth begin to act in accordance with authority's perceived expectations. The discipline gap issue regarding minority students may be compounded by the fact that Black male students are more likely to be identified as needing special education services, and, in particular, are identified as having emotional behavior disorders (EDB) (Miller et al., 2011). Students identified as having EDB are more likely than their nondisabled peers to be removed from the school environment (Miller et al., 2011).

Miller et al. (2011) analyzed data obtained from the New York City School Report Card and discipline, which was collected by the Department of Education. Descriptive statistics were used to determine suspension rates by demographic between 2001-2010 in New York City Schools. Findings showed that Black students represented more than 50% of suspended students with disabilities and serve longer suspensions than their counterparts for more subjective "offenses" including "disorderly conduct." Students identified as needing special education services are four times more likely to be suspended than their non-disabled peers (Miller et al., 2011). Therefore, if more Black

male students are identified as having EDB, then this may also perpetuate the number of these students involved in the criminal justice system due to zero tolerance and school policing practices.

When examining the disparate use of zero tolerance policies between minorities and those with disabilities, such as EBD, and their counterparts, a link seems to emerge related to Kelling's and Coles' (1996) assertion that focusing on civil liberties, such as allowing those with a mental disability to make their own decisions regarding treatment, can lead to a breakdown of communities when disorderly behaviors are disruptive to other residents. Attending to behaviors presented by the mentally ill to ensure they do not become disruptive to communities as outlined by Kelling and Coles (1996) could justify the high rates of suspensions and expulsions experiences by students with EBD in American Public Schools. Students with EBD are suspended and expelled at a rate not representative of their overall population (American Psychologist Association [APA], 2008). Students with EBD are considered to have a mental disability where they experience challenges that include deficits in their academic and communication skills, as well as co-morbid disabilities in the form of Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and mood and language disorders. More specifically, students with EBD may present behaviors such as somatic complaints, attention difficulties, bullying, threats to physically harm another, and, in more severe cases, physical aggression. Under the Broken Windows, and subsequently, zero tolerance, mindset, students with EBD who display disruptive, "disorderly" behaviors are often removed from the general student body (APA, 2008). This removal may be justified by the notion that such behaviors may *deteriorate* the school environment, criminalizing behaviors presented by those with

mental disabilities within the public school setting. The outcome is not more sensitivity to the mentally ill, but harsher disciplinary reactions to behaviors, including the use of school policing practices.

**School Policing.** The presence of SROs in schools represents the second approach to school safety in American public schools. The federal government defines a SRO as,

a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community oriented policing, and assigned by the employing police department to a local educational agency to work in collaboration with schools and community based organizations to

1. Address crime and disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school
2. Educate likely school-age victims in crime prevention and safety to train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness
3. Assist in the identification of physical changes in the environment that may reduce crime in and around the school; and
4. Assist in developing school policy that addresses crime and to recommend procedural changes (“School Resource Officer Law & Legal Definition,” n.d).

Currently there are no national standards to oversee the use or effectiveness of SROs in American public schools (McDaniel, 2001). Instead, the evaluation of the SRO program as being effective is often related to perceptions rather than objective criteria (Miller et al., 2011). This supports the argument that the implementation of school resource officers may be the result of incrementalism, where only an agreement, not

evidence is required to determine whether or not a policy is effective and should continue. What is known about SROs is as follows:

1. SROs are assigned to one school considered his or her “beat”
2. Most SROs have served some time as a traditional officer
3. Officers assigned to work as SROs usually volunteer for the position
4. Most SROs employed by a police department wear police uniforms while in schools
5. The vast majority of SROs are white males (McDaniel, 2001)

The presence of SROs in schools are thought to mirror street policing (Nolan, 2011), or the idea of using community policing to “fix broken windows” will help control disorder and mediate against future, more serious issues within the school setting.

However, it appears, based on the examined literature, that the opposite could be true. As mentioned, community police officers, or “foot patrol” are assigned a “beat,” or block, to patrol. This same terminology, outlined above, is used to describe the SROs assignment in schools. Although SROs are not able to suspend students, they are often involved in disciplinary infractions, criminalizing student behaviors (Miller et al., 2011). If more police are present in inner city, urban spaces, with large minority populations, and many of the officers are White males, a cultural mismatch between the police and the students could increase the likelihood that students will be detained for misunderstandings between parties. A student may feel that being asked to show their identification badge is the result of racial profiling and become “defiant” or “disorderly”, causing the officer to react in a way that escalates, such as by threatening a summons or arrest, rather than reduces, problematic student behavior (Nolan, 2011).

Additionally, the SRO program's overall effectiveness is thought to be difficult to quantify, as much of their job is to prevent crime and promote a safe learning environment (Clark, 2011; Weiler & Cray, 2011). As a result, the inability to assess the SRO program may jeopardize the overall sustainability of the initiative, as federal grants generally cover three years of finance and when federal dollars dissipate, local agencies must be willing to step forward to finance the continuation of having officers in their schools (Weiler & Cray, 2011). This increased financial burden of the use of policing to mediate against problems, seems counterintuitive when it is unclear whether or not such measures are effective. Critics of the SRO program suggest that a police presence in schools may increase the likelihood that students are arrested or summoned to court and have been said to disproportionately affect inner city, urban minority population (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012).

Many inner city, urban schools are viewed as synonymous with correctional facilities (Nolan, 2011; Smith, 2011; Toldson, 2012), as students within these spaces are more often than their counterparts required to walk through a metal detector and are received by a security guard or police officer (Nolan, 2011; Smith, 2011, Toldson, 2012). In fact, some schools, particularly in inner, city urban locations, have police departments larger than many major cities in the United States (Peak, 2015). Many states, including California and New York, are allocating more economic resources toward prison construction than toward education, hiring more prison guards than teachers (Giroux, 2003). If compared to police forces in the United States, New York City's public school's police department would be the fifth largest (Miller et al., 2011). Additionally, Miller et al. (2011) reports that the NYPD division in the New York City school system trumps the



number of guidance counselors by 70 percent. Comparisons such as these may be used to highlight the fact that street policing that occurs in communities has become commonplace in American inner city, urban schools, which rely heavily on such measures to mediate against problematic student behaviors (Nolan, 2011). In addition, the use of military-grade weapons to protect citizens in communities has instead been used to control them, and the same may be said for the militarization of police in schools (Peak, 2015).

The more military-like the police become, the more community members resist their presence, and the ability of police to protect others may be impeded by such community resistance (Peak, 2015). Current events in American can be used to reinforce this notion, where the deaths of a number of unarmed black Americans at the hands of White police officers have received international attention. When residents feel threatened by police officers, it is unlikely that they will trust them. This lack of trust can result in resistance and lack of respect for the officers, making their presence ineffective (Peak, 2015). These feelings may not exist in a bubble and could extend into the school environments within these communities (Peak, 2015).

With the increased presence of school policing practices comes an increase in student involvement in the criminal justice system (Peak, 2011). Precautionary measures, such as school policing, may give students the impression that safety is compromised in their schools and the populations within require increasingly harsh disciplinary practices to combat their behaviors (Smith, 2011; Elsaesser, Gorman-Smith, & Henry, 2013). Students, in turn, may feel that they need to protect themselves and resort to violence (Gastic, 2011). When local police forces become more militarized, schools begin to as

well and resistance from some students as a reaction to feelings of mistrust between the police and the students is more probable (Peak, 2015). Evidence suggests that militarized environments have harmful effects on students, where they are more likely to avoid going to school and may dropout all together (Nolan, 2011). For others, the adverse relationships between the school security and some students could lead to more suspensions, expulsions, and arrests (Nolan, 2011). Schools with police officers and metal detectors are said to have more frequent disciplinary incidents than those without, which are thought to contribute to the school-to-prison-pipeline (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012).

Nolan (2011) conducted an Ethnography involving interviews with school security guards, administrators, and students to determine how police in the school's hallways influence student behaviors. Through Nolan's (2011) observation and documentation of events within a large inner city, urban school, which included a "familiar image" of students in handcuffs and the threat of police intervention, summons, and arrests for misbehavior, she suggests that a culture of control has been bred within the school as the result of the systematic use of order-maintenance-style policing. She outlines three outcomes of her findings, which include a) the criminalization of student behaviors, such as insubordination; b) police intervention for problematic behaviors that were once managed within the school setting; and c) the use of heavy police state indicative of street policing, making the differences between school, the street, and institutions of the criminal justice system difficult to discern. The implementation of these practices, according to Nolan (2011), has resulted in adverse relationships between

students and authority figures within the school involving, teachers, administrators, and the school security officers.

The number of children arrested or referred to court as a result of school discipline is increasing (Kim & Geronimo, 2010). Kim and Geronimo found that, in Florida, 15 percent of all delinquency referrals were related to minor student infractions, 40 percent of which involved disorderly conduct or misdemeanor assault and battery, which relates to the Broken Window's Theory that suggests minor infractions should be dealt with harshly to deter more serious crimes. Although Black students represented only 22 percent of the juvenile population in this sample, 47 percent received delinquency referrals, perhaps the result of the structures surrounding the use of zero tolerance and policing to mediate against problematic student behaviors in areas where mistrust of police is high. It is thought that the act of being arrested has grave psychological consequences for children who are consequently at an increased risk of dropping out, having lower standardized test scores, poor projected life outcomes, and an increased likelihood of recidivism (Nolan, 2011). As mentioned, youth involvement in the criminal justice system often stems from breaking minor school rules, or being "disorderly," such as refusing to show an officer their student identification badges (Nolan, 2011). Such "criminal acts" can occur during these confrontations between administrators or police officers and the students, particularly minorities, leading to more problematic behaviors and subsequent arrests (Nolan, 2011).

According to Nolan (2011), the refusal by students to reveal their identification badges results from their perception that security officers approach students in a rough manner, appearing to challenge them. Such interactions are influenced by the desire for

students not to appear weak in front of their peers and security officers (Nolan, 2011). Nolan (2011) details how a student, Carlos, received a summons after he arrived late to lunch and refused to reveal his ID badge to the security guard, because he felt disrespected as he was not given an opportunity to explain why he was late. Additionally, gang members and street oriented students may be more susceptible to confrontations with security officers, because acts of compliance could increase the probability that they could become victims of peer violence (Nolan, 2011). In other words, to protect their reputations and dignity, students will *resist* the culture of control presented in their schools (Majors & Billson, 1992) that operate under a zero tolerance mindset and use of school policing, potentially exhibiting “disorderly” or violent behaviors (Nolan, 2011). This idea relates to how members of a community may resist the police in areas that become increasingly militarized, which may create feelings of mistrust and dissent (Peak, 2015).

**Security guards and violence in schools.** Jennings, Key, Moskaly, and Donner (2011) conducted a study to determine the relationship between the number of SROs and security guards and the following dependent variables: 1. serious school violence, and 2. school violence. Serious school violence included rape, sexual battery, robbery, aggravated assault, and threats of aggravated assault, while, serious school violence involves all of the aforementioned behaviors and physical assaults or fights. Using a negative binomial regression model, findings showed that that the number of security guards was a statistically significant for school violence ( $b= 0.050$ ,  $SE = 0.013$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (Jennings, et al., 2011). When schools had uniformed security guards, school violence was statistically lower ( $b= -0.292$ ,  $SE=0.112$ ,  $p < .01$ ), but higher in schools when the

guards had firearms ( $b=0.456$ ,  $SE=0.108$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (Jennings et al., 2011). Other school security measures, such as weapon-detection devices and critical incident plans were also significant in this study (Jennings, et al., 2011). Weapon detection devices revealed statistically lower levels of school violence while school violence increased in schools with critical incident plans ( $b=-0.114$ ,  $SE=0.053$ ,  $p < .05$  and  $b=0.053$ ,  $SE=0.003$ ,  $p < .10$ , respectively) (Jennings, et al. 2011).

School violence was significantly lower in cities over a rural area and higher in all schools, regardless of size including small ( $b = 0.740$ ,  $SE = 0.140$ ,  $p < .001$ ), medium ( $b = 1.207$ ,  $SE = 0.137$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and large ( $b = 1.590$ ,  $SE = 0.140$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (Jennings, et al., 2011). School crime was found to be higher in school surrounded by a high-crime area ( $b = 0.635$ ,  $SE = 0.241$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (Jennings, et al., 2011). Schools that had higher levels of ethnic heterogeneity, bullying, racial tension, student disrespect, and gang crimes had significantly more instances of school violence (Jennings, et al., 2011).

Serious school violence was higher in schools that had more security guards ( $b = 0.095$ ,  $SE = 0.071$ ,  $p < .05$ ) (Jennings, et al., 2011). When schools had a higher number of SROs, incidents of serious violence decreased ( $b = -0.139$ ,  $SE = 0.071$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (Jennings, et al., 2011). Larger schools ( $b = 0.622$ ,  $SE = 0.313$ ,  $p < .05$ ), ( $b = 0.157$ ,  $SE = 0.093$ ,  $p < .10$ ), racial tensions ( $b = 0.326$ ,  $SE = 0.113$ ,  $p < .01$ ), student disrespect ( $b = 0.218$ ,  $SE = 0.076$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and gang crimes ( $b = 0.027$ ,  $SE = 0.010$ ,  $p < .01$ ) were all related to higher levels of serious school violence (Jennings, et al., 2011). Schools that experienced a homicide had more incidents of higher serious school violence.

Findings from the abovementioned study also relate to Peak's (2015) assertion that the militarization of school police may lead to resistance from students within spaces

experiencing such measures. Uniformed guards by themselves were not related to serious violence, but when guards carried a firearm, they increased the likelihood of such behaviors (Jenning, et al., 2011). Perhaps the more severe the approach to mediate against problematic student behaviors, the more students act out against it or resist the presence of school security guards, compromising their ability to reduce problematic behaviors. Interestingly, violence was lower in cities over rural areas, which is counterintuitive to the dominant narrative that suggests urban spaces experience more problematic behaviors than their counterparts. At the same time, areas surrounded by high-crime were more likely to experience school violence, which supports the notion that schools mirror the communities in which they are established, increasing the use of security in these settings (Smith, 2011). As mentioned, this shift is not always welcome by students.

**Student perceptions.** In *Eyes on Me Regardless* (Weiss, 2007) twenty minority youth between the ages of 15 and 20, half of which were from a large comprehensive high school in the Bronx and the other from an after school poverty organization, were interviewed to determine how students responded to security practices within their schools. Many students in inner city, urban schools suggest security officials harass them because they perceive them as hoodlums, delinquents, and troublemakers (Weiss, 2007). Students explained that they avoided particular guards that they felt did not like them or would harass them by taking another, often longer, route to class. Other students passively accepted the security guards perceived harassment, because, as they explained, they were more focused on graduating and not getting into trouble.

Avoidant behaviors and passivity are not the only reactions from students noted by researchers, as some respond in a confrontational manner, particularly when they feel they are being treated unfairly or are being harassed (Nolan, 2011). Heavy police states in American public schools have been shown to increase negative student behaviors involving insubordination and violence, which further perpetuates the notion that students are in need of harsh disciplinary practices to mediate against these issues (Nolan, 2011). Student behaviors involving insubordination and violence could be viewed as indicative of cultural forces, such as the cool pose culture, that are present within inner city, urban neighborhoods, which can result from the structures that have segregated these spaces.

### **Cultural Forces**

Police vigilance in inner city urban neighbors can be viewed as a structural force informed by the Broken Windows Theory that furthers racial inequities and contributes to the cool pose as a cultural force that does the same. Cultural forces involve attitudes or shared outlooks among a group and may also be associated with racial inequality (Wilson, 2009). The “Code of the Street” (Anderson, 1999; Wilson, 2009) and the “Cool Pose” culture (Majors & Bilson, 1992; Hall, 2009; Wilson, 2009) are examples of cultural forces. Anderson (1999) conceived the “Code of the Street” as unofficial rules that govern behaviors, particularly violence, in impoverished, inner city, and urban spaces that are neglected by police. Respect is the driving factor behind this code, which is difficult to obtain and easy to lose. When an individual feels disrespected by another, the code often suggests physical violence to avoid appearing weak and losing respect.

Similarly, “cool pose” behaviors are examples of cultural forces thought to stem from a desire to fulfill masculine roles and improve one’s self-presentation in a White

dominated society where social and economic mobility for Black males seem difficult if not impossible to obtain (Hall, 2009). The “cool pose” culture is defined as “a ritualized form of masculinity that entails behaviors, scripts, physical posturing, impression management, and carefully crafted performances” (Majors & Billson, 1992, p. 4). Behaviors associated with the cool pose culture include remaining poised under pressure and in disruptive environments as a way to ease anxiety (Majors & Billson, 1992).

“The Code of the Street” and the “Cool Pose” culture appear in the examined literature separately, with the exception of Wilson’s (2009) work where they are both mentioned but not discussed together. This paper examines them simultaneously as “cool” behaviors seem to be indicative of those focused on garnering and maintain respect, as emphasized by the “code of the street.” In other words, cool behaviors can be viewed as informal rules set by the “code of the street.” The difference between the two concepts is that cool behaviors are often associated with Black males whereas the code of the street includes the impact of structural forces on the cultural norms of those residing in inner city, urban and impoverished neighborhoods, including females. As mentioned, the “cool pose” culture suggests that remaining poised in difficult situations in attempt to maintain self-presentation in a White dominated society, a behavior that is also observed in females with respect to Anderson’s (1999) code of the street.

In his work, Anderson (1999) sheds some light on the cultural norms developed by some Black females residing in inner city, urban spaces in response to structural forces and mistrust of police. Anderson (1999) includes actual accounts of individuals, including females, and their response to their mistrust of police and the structures of society. The female accounts reveal that many Black female experience peer rejections if



they work to better themselves by attending to academics. Similar to her male counterparts, fighting for status is not unheard of, but females tend to experience conflicts that stem from jealousy of physical appearances and competition for boyfriends (Anderson, 1999). Additionally, females may attempt to influence the opinions of others during group gossiping, where something derogatory is stated about one girl by another. When that information gets out to the girl, she may attempt to get even by involving a number of her friends, escalating to verbal arguments or physical fights (Anderson, 1999). Backing down from a fight can be considered a sign of weakness and many feel that they are forced to defend themselves, even if they would rather avoid a conflict (Anderson, 1999). In other words, a Black female may also resort to violence, interpersonal or otherwise, as a way to maintain respect, similar to the “cool pose” culture.

Behaviors associated with the code of the street and the cool pose culture, regardless on gender, may have motivational underpinnings within underserved urban neighborhoods; wherein the more controlled an individual feels the more likely they are to engage in behaviors that negatively influence their projected outcomes (Deci, 1995). Majors and Billson (1992) describe the “cool pose” culture as a paradox that allows some Black males to cope with this reality while, at the same time, contributes to issues with authority figures, such as police officers. In this case, to attempt to protect their self-image, when faced with a conflict with someone in authority, such as a police officer, some Black males will refuse to back down, even if doing so may result in violence or arrest (Majors & Billson, 1992).

Ignoring cultural forces as directly shaped by structural influences, such as zero tolerance and policing paradigms, may only serve to perpetuate the prevalence of problematic behaviors in urban school settings. In the next section, the development of the cool pose culture in communities is discussed first and then is related to behaviors presented by students in inner city, urban schools. Those residing in these spaces may have developed cultural norms in response to harsh disciplinary practices in communities and in schools.

**Cultural forces in urban communities.** Suspicion seems to follow Black Americans as many are stigmatized, or socially constructed, as rebellious criminals, or *deviants*, a notion that they are very aware of and may act in accordance with through a self-fulfilling prophecy, which increases the use and justification of security methods by policy makers to mediate against perceived threats (Alexander, 2010). With respect to the cool pose culture and the code of the street, police vigilance may amplify acts of secondary deviance, as heavy policing and racial profiling lead to feelings of isolation and powerlessness, subsequently reinforcing the need for cultural norms within the Black community (Majors & Billson, 1992). The “cool pose” culture is thought to stem from a desire to fulfill masculine roles and improve one’s self-presentation in a White dominated society where social and economic mobility seems difficult if not impossible to obtain (Hall, 2009). Majors and Billson (1992) describe the “cool pose” culture as a paradox that allows some Black males cope with this reality while, at the same time, contribute to issues with authorities.

According to Majors and Billson (1992) and Anderson (1999), these behaviors can result in both positive and negative outcomes. A few positive qualities include

dignity, respect, control, self-esteem, and social competence (Major & Billson, 1992). At the same time, street behaviors can cause issues with authorities, which some view as a means of protection against White authorities (Majors & Billson, 1992). As a result of the misunderstanding of culture and the increased likelihood that minorities in lower income areas commit crime, middle and upper class groups often fear those living in poverty, particularly Black men who, when compared to their White counterparts, are at an increased risk of living in such circumstances (Majors & Billson, 1992).

High-risk behaviors, such as those associated with the code of the street and the cool pose culture may have motivational underpinnings within underserved urban neighborhoods (Majors & Billson, 1992; Anderson, 1999; Wilson, 2009); wherein the more controlled the Black male feels, the more likely they are to engage in behaviors that negatively influence their projected outcomes (Deci, 1995; Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2009). Black males often use cool behaviors to fit in, to mask their feelings of contempt for their current social and economic predicaments (Majors & Billson, 1992). In some instances, Black individuals will avoid appearing weak in front of others, even if doing so would avoid a fight, violence, or arrest (Majors & Billson, 1992; Anderson, 1999). Tough talk and aggressive posturing are considered ways to express “coolness,” or gain and maintain respect (Majors & Billson, 1992; Anderson, 1999), while girls engage in more interpersonal conflicts (Anderson, 1999). Additionally, lower income groups, which are heavily concentrated in inner city spaces, in the United States are thought to resort to such behaviors as violence, toughness, coolness, assault, and theft in response to their circumstances (Majors & Billson, 1992).

Despite hard work, the likelihood of social mobility appears unattainable to the Black Americans, perpetuating the use of street codes and cool behaviors for self-preservation (Majors & Billson, 1992; Anderson, 1999). One example of this relationship involves gang involvement in economically deprived inner city, urban spaces. Joining a gang can be viewed as a social achievement that allows members to feel belonging and acceptance and often exists as the result of marginalization (Majors & Billson, 1992). The option to join a gang exists in many inner city, urban spaces, in lieu of social mobility as defined by dominant culture, as many structural forces, including redlining and other discriminatory practices, may cause a strain on the ability of the Black male to overcome economic subordination (Wilson, 2009). Gang involvement, however, can increase the likelihood of arrests.

As Deci (1995) suggests, individuals who reside in densely populated poor inner city neighborhoods fall out of the system, as they feel incapable of functioning within it. The result is a feedback loop wherein controlling, punitive measures are employed to mediate against crime but instead generate increased levels of deviant behaviors, which exacerbate the existing social and economic disparities and the overrepresentation of Black males in the criminal justice system. In other words, when individuals are exposed to controlling environmental factors and treated as though they are barbaric and in need of reform, their actions increasingly meet these behavioral expectations and lead to the implementation of increasingly punitive measures (Deci, 1995). Just as crime reduction policies in schools mirror that of the communities in which they are situated, it is not unreasonable to assume that cool behaviors will exist in school environments, particularly

when they are becoming increasingly more punitive and reportedly lack cultural sensitivity.

**Cultural forces and inner city, urban schools.** School policies are developed through middle-class societal norms and do not seem take into account cultural differences that may be present in schools with large minority populations in inner city, urban spaces (Majors & Billson, 1992). Haberman and Post (1998) suggest that the way urban schools respond to violence often results in time wasted reacting to street values in lieu of the stated curriculum, as urban school employees may lack cultural insight to recognize the fact that black male students may not perceive their cool behaviors as being deviant or disruptive (Majors & Billson, 1992). Conflicts that arise between black students and school personnel may lead them to be “pushouts,” meaning, students are removed from the school rather than choosing to do so (Majors & Billson, 1992). Black males are often suspended for behaviors that may be considered culture-specific, such as rapping, using slang, wearing hats or expressive clothes, and playing the dozens (Majors & Billson, 1992). In short, suspended Black males are often being punished for behaviors that they do not believe are disrespectful or “disorderly,” but rather, “stylish” or “cool” (Majors & Billson, 1992). A lack of cultural insight on the part of teachers, counselors, and school administrators, could perpetuate negative student behaviors and reinforce the use of punitive measures to mediate against perceived threats (Majors & Billson, 1992).

Peak (2015) contends that institutionalized racism has had an impact on these harsh disciplinary decisions regarding minority students. Similar to the increasing crime-control policies aimed at reducing problems in inner city, urban environments, school safety policies, have moved, namely, into the racially segregated and underperforming

inner city, urban schools (Nolan, 2011). These come in the form of zero tolerance policies and school policing practices. Harsh disciplinary practices may result in behavioral outcomes that are indicative of the cool pose culture within inner city urban school settings. Additionally, examined literature reveals that suspensions, expulsions, and arrests are more often experience by Black students (Losen, et al., 2015; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012).

An established hierarchy exists between police and students, and in order to maintain this hierarchy, school police will use any method of control within their power to preserve it, including excluding students from school, which may cause students to feel unattached, uncommitted, and uninvolved in their school, increasing the likelihood of recidivism and dropout rates for the most at risk populations, minority and special education students (Majors & Billson, 1992). As such, feelings of isolation, powerlessness, and dissatisfaction with authorities' treatment may lead to cool pose behaviors within America's urban public schools (Majors & Billson, 1992).

When gang members go to school, they may participate in assaultive behaviors, substance abuse, theft, and possession of a weapon (Majors & Billson, 1992). Such behaviors can lead to suspensions and expulsions and may eventually cause the student to drop out of school (Majors & Billson, 1992). With regard to the cool pose culture as presented in schools, examples of behaviors that can be perceived as uncool can include studying and relating positively to teachers, which, in turn, can have negative consequences for Black males' projected life outcomes, particularly when limited education is linked to an increased likelihood of prison time (Majors & Billson, 1992).

McGinnis (2003) contends that suspensions exacerbate, rather than reduce, students' problematic behaviors. When a student is excluded from school, they are more likely to struggle academically and since peers may consider "acting bad" more socially acceptable than appearing to lack competence, students who are suspended may continue to display disruptive, aggressive behaviors to avoid difficult classwork (McGinnis, 2003). Students subsequently return to school exhibiting the same or more severe behaviors (Martinez, 2009). As mentioned, the examined literature surrounding zero tolerance policies also suggests that disciplinary measures are more severely applied to urban minority students who are often suspended and expelled more frequently than their white counterparts (McGinnis, 2003).

In Bracy's (2011) study involving direct observations and interviews with students about their school, students felt their perspectives were not being heard and expressed frustration in perceived inconsistent rule enforcement (Bracy, 2011). Black students in this study suggested racial discrimination in their schools' disciplinary process is conscious and deliberate and teachers unfairly enforce rules, targeting students they dislike (Bracy, 2011). The majority of SROs are White males, which may cause conflicts between security guards and students of color due to cultural differences, stereotypes and students' feelings that racial profiling and an unfair application of the rules exists within their school (Bracy 2011; Fuentes, 2011; Majors & Billson, 1992, Nolan, 2011,).

School policies are developed through middle-class societal norms (Majors & Billson, 1992). The way urban schools respond to violence often results in time wasted reacting to street values in lieu of the stated curriculum (Haberman & Post, 1998), as

urban school employees may lack cultural insight to recognize the fact that Black male students may not perceive their cool behaviors as being deviant or disruptive (Majors & Billson, 1992). In addition, since inner city, urban public schools are often inundated with security measures intended to mediate against violence in schools; students may assume that safety is compromised in schools. Smith (2011) and Elsaesser, et al. (2013) suggest that students' perceptions that their school is unsafe and in need of policing could cause emotional stress and actually increase the likelihood that negative student behaviors will persist.

As mentioned, the majority of SROs are White males (McGinnis, 2003). Many students in inner city, urban schools suggest security officials harass them because they perceive them as hoodlums, delinquents, and troublemakers (Weiss, 2007). According to Nolan (2011), students often refuse to reveal their identification badges because of their perception that security officers approach students in a rough manner, appearing to challenge them. Such interactions are influenced by the desire for students not to appear weak in front of their peers and security officers (Nolan, 2011). A White person may feel that the behaviors displayed by a Black male are deviant, while the Black male could feel that they are being "cool" (Wilson, 2009). Such interactions are influenced by the desire for students not to appear weak in front of their peers and school security (Nolan, 2011), similar to that of the Cool Pose culture. Gang members and street oriented students may be more susceptible to confrontations with security officers, because acts of compliance could increase the probability that they could become victims of peer violence (Nolan, 2011). At the same time, school security officers may apprehend students through racial profiling.



Racial profiling is thought to exist in heavily policed inner city, urban schools, with large minority populations, mirroring that which takes place in communities. Breunlin et al. (2002) discuss profiling as a security approach focused on established characteristics used to identify potentially violent youth. More specifically, racial profiling can be considered stopping, questioning, searching or arresting an individual based on race or ethnic background, without reasonable suspicion (Chan, 2011). ACLU (2015) reports that the United States Department of Education is investigating the disproportionate application of disciplinary measures of Black Latino, Polynesian and Native Americans in Salt Lake City. The report points to the use of SROs as being responsible for the overrepresentation of students of color involved with the criminal justice system.

Such divergent applications of disciplinary measures can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein youth begin to act in accordance with authority's perceived expectations. Moreover, feelings of isolation, powerlessness, and dissatisfaction with authorities' treatment may lead to cool pose behaviors within America's urban public schools (Majors & Billson, 1992). The literature base involving the cool pose culture and how a police state in underserved neighborhoods provides insight into how such practices exacerbate existing disparities between races and income levels. At the same time, it appears that many behaviors exhibited by Black male students in poor inner city urban schools are indicative of the cool pose culture presented in the surrounding community, both of which appear in areas characterized by neglect and repressive measures to mediate against crime. Despite this relationship, it is difficult to extend on the existing literature because research on the cool pose culture is dated at the time of

investigation. As mentioned, researchers tend to shy away from cultural forces, such as the cool pose, to explain disparities between groups, as doing so may be interpreted as blaming the victim (Wilson, 2009).

### **Summary**

By applying the “broken windows” theory as an approach to school safety in the form of zero tolerance and school security officers, schools may be avoiding addressing the root problems of violence. As such, urban schools are not differentiated from the culture of the streets and neighborhoods (Weiss, 2007). Thus, problems in the communities and mistrusting relationships between residents and police do not differ substantially from the school environments in which they are situated. Racial profiling is thought to exist in both settings and minority populations, particularly males, are more often affected by crime reduction policies as informed by the broken windows theory. Cool pose behaviors, then, seem to result as a response to feelings of subordination both in communities and in schools when these spaces are heavily policed.

Though cultural influences, such as the cool pose culture, could contribute to racial disparities, the potential role of structural forces as a contributor cannot be downplayed. In fact, as was shown, structural forces may impact the development of cultural traits and behaviors (Wilson, 2009). Underlying structural forces seem to blatantly and insidiously exist to promote an overrepresentation of Black males in poor underserved communities. For instance, politics, though often nonracial on the surface, may contribute to inequities that greatly impact the lives of the most disadvantaged (Wilson, 2009). Government mortgages, housing incentives and FHA redlining policies, to name a few, excluded the concentrated poor and contributed heavily to the “white

flight” in America, isolating Blacks and other minority populations in poor urban neighborhoods (Wilson, 2010). As a result of such policies, some Black Americans have learned that they are unlikely to experience the same opportunities as their White counterparts and may turn to crime as a means to cope with their oppression, causing an increased police presence.

With this seemingly never-ending cycle of punitive measures and cool behaviors, it is imperative that researchers examine how the presence of police may be impacting student behaviors within schools. Again, the majority of the research surrounding the use of police in schools is qualitative in nature. What we know is that there is often a contentious relationship between many students and the police officers employed within their schools that may increase the amount of summons and arrests, particularly for male, inner city, urban and minority students. What is still unclear is whether or not there is a decrease in specific behaviors, such as violence and insubordination. Defining a student’s behaviors as insubordinate or disorderly can be viewed as subjective. Court summons for these behaviors may increase with the presence of guards; however, the actual numbers associated with this increase are not known (Nolan, 2011). Violence may result from students not wanting to appear weak in front of their peers (Nolan, 2011). If confrontations between police and students are commonplace in inner city, urban spaces, then violence may also increase within these spaces.

As mentioned, the research on school policing focuses, namely, on inner city, urban environments. Although these schools are more likely to mirror correctional facilities than their counterparts, after a number of mass school shooting in the 1990s, many schools employ school security officers in some capacity. It is not clear, then, what

the implications of school security guards on student behaviors in *all* school locales including suburban and rural settings are. As mentioned, studying student behaviors solely in urban schools, would serve to further perpetuate the notion, that such issues are designated an urban problem. Therefore, the present study seeks to determine the extent to which incidents of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence in 2010 and the rate of change between 2010 and 2014 relate to the presence of security guards in Ohio public schools, including urban, suburban and rural schools.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

This chapter details my methods for examining the impact of school security guards on student behaviors in urban, suburban, and rural settings, at all levels, in 2010, and over a four-year time frame, between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years. The following will also detail a pilot study that was used to inform this dissertation, participants, research design, procedures, instrumentation, and data analysis. This section also explains that this study received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Cleveland State University.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to determine whether the presence of school security guards in schools is related to problematic student behaviors in all school locales, including urban, suburban, and rural schools as well as elementary, middle, and high school settings. Trends in student behaviors involving insubordination and violence over a four-year time frame as related to the presence of school security guards in urban,

suburban, and rural schools are included. This study was informed by a pilot, which is outlined below.

**Pilot Study.** The original purpose of the pilot study was to determine the impact of school security guards with 1. a firearm, 2. a stun gun, and 3. chemical aerosol spray as well as 4. metal detectors on student behaviors involving insubordination and violence. However, after discovering a high correlation between security guards with firearms, stun guns and chemical aerosol sprays, the study chose to focus on the number of guards present in a school. This suggested that school security guards may be in possession of all of these measures of deterrence and as such, the study focused on the number of guards in the school, regardless of what they were in possession of.

The pilot study required two trials before obtaining measurable results. The original intention of the pilot study was to determine the impact of school policing practices on student behaviors in inner city, urban school settings in Ohio, Illinois, and New York. However, after considering the literature and the outcome of the first trial of the pilot, it became clear that focusing solely on these settings would further perpetuate the notion that school discipline was designated an “urban” problem and limit the sample size. Additionally, Ohio has data involving student behaviors available to the public on their Department of Education website (ODE, 2014), as such, the researcher restricted data collection to Ohio public schools in urban, suburban, towns and rural schools.

Upon approval from the Internal Review Board (IRB), the first trial of the pilot study began by emailing 296 urban principals in school districts in Ohio, Illinois, and New York and asking them to indicate the total number of school policing practices in the form of guards armed with firearms and guards with armed with stun guns via

SurveyMonkey. They were also asked to include the total number of student behaviors experienced during the previous school year. These behaviors included 1. insubordination, 2. violence, 3. possession of a weapon, and 4. possession of drugs. This initial survey did not yield a large enough number of participants to answer the stated questions.

A second survey instrument was developed that focused solely on the presence of the number of school security officers present in each of the participating schools. The intention behind this was to increase the likelihood that principals would respond, because it may be more convenient and/or less time consuming to identify the number of school security officers present in their schools than it might be to search through school records to determine the number of student behaviors experienced in the past year. Student behaviors were derived from the ODE (2014) website.

This second trial focused on the follow school years: 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years and included the student behaviors involving insubordination and violence. The reason for limiting the study to these select years is the fact that federal grants funding of the presence of SROs generally last for three years (Weiler & Cray, 2011). Having four observed years may allow for a greater likelihood that schools that currently have security guards also did in the past three years. While the response rate was still low, this trial yielded a more substantive response rate than the first. 1,220 principals were emailed in all school locales in the state of Ohio. Of these, 91 responded. Those that responded needed to be matched with schools presented on ODE's website. As mentioned, any of the participating schools that did not appear on the ODE

website were removed from the study. In the end, 68 of the participating schools were included in the study.

Data obtained from SurveyMonkey and the ODE website were then imputed into SPSS spread sheets with respect to their school's name for each year. School names were then assigned a number based on the order in which their principals participated in the study to ensure confidentiality. Overall, recorded numbers for the possession of a weapon and illegal drugs were low for schools with and without policing practices and were subsequently removed from the study. The same was true for metal detectors. Additionally, school security measures involving armed guards, stun guns, and chemical aerosol spray were correlated, and as such, the pilot study focused solely on the total number of guards present as a predictor of student behaviors over time. Finally, data were transferred into separate level 1 and level 2 SPSS spreadsheets and copied into a Hierarchical Linear Modeling spreadsheet.

Descriptive statistics were run to understand the characteristics of each school. Following this, an individual change model (Williams & Raudenbush, 1989; Bagaka's, 2010) was deemed the most appropriate model to analyze the data in the pilot study, as the pilot was interested in the impact of school security guards on student behaviors in all school locales including rural, small towns, suburban, and urban at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014). Individual change modeling can be used in longitudinal studies to determine the impact of a given predictor on an outcome variable of interest over time. As such, an individual change model was used to make repeated observations of the aforementioned student behaviors at the individual school level with respect to the presence of school security guards. Additional control variables of interest



were also analyzed over the provided four-year time span using this model and included school poverty, school size, and percent minority for each observed school.

The data for the pilot study was examined using an individual change model. The findings from the pilot study shows that large schools and those with higher minority populations were statistically significantly related to student behaviors involving insubordination over time. Larger schools saw significantly more incidents of insubordination at the initial status (2010), but were more likely to show a decrease in these behaviors over time. At the initial status schools with larger minority populations were significantly less likely to experience insubordination; however, this was not true over time. Schools with larger minority populations reported significantly more incidents of insubordination than those with a smaller minority population over the four observed years. In terms of violence, poverty was the only predictor over time. Higher poverty rates were related to a statistically significant increase of violence over time.

Despite the contending notions that school security guards may be used to mediate against problematic student behaviors or exacerbate existing problems, the pilot study did not yield statistically significant findings for this predictor. However, these findings are limited to the small observed sample and generalizability is not possible. As mentioned, the pilot was used to inform the present study. The experience with this pilot allowed for a better understanding of the specific sample of schools that can be targeted in the proposed study. To obtain a large enough sample and to ensure that this study did not further contribute to the notion that problematic student behaviors are an urban school problem, principals serving in schools in suburban, town, rural, and urban across Ohio were contacted for their participation. The pilot also confirmed the use of an individual

change model as an effective measure of the relationships between school security guards and student behaviors overtime. The resulting research design for the proposed study is included below.

### **Research Design**

**Variables.** The independent variables of interest for this dissertation include the presence of SROs and police officers. Limiting the independent variables to SROs and police officers is the result of the pilot study and the examined literature. The literature regarding school policing does not make a clear distinction between police officers and SROs in schools. The literature discusses School Resource Officers (SROs), or officers that work primarily in the school (Weiler & Cray, 2011). To determine if there is there is a difference in terms of the relationship between those considered SROs and those who are police officers, the present study examined each of these measures in relationship to student behaviors involving insubordination and violence.

**Participants.** Participants included 164 Ohio public school principals from suburban, towns, urban, and rural locations. As mentioned, the use of security measures in the form of SROs and police officers have been present in many “troubled” inner city, urban schools, with large minority populations, since before the 1990s and may even extend as far back as the 1960s (Addington, 2009; Fuentes, 2012; Vera Institute of Justice, 1999;). Schools within these spaces were and are still considered by the dominant narrative to be hotspots for violence that require more interventions in the form of policing than their suburban and rural counterparts (Nolan, 2011). However, after the 1999 shooting at Columbine High School, which left 14 students and 1 teacher dead, the increased use of what Addington (2009) terms as “visible security measures,” or the

presence of metal detectors, security cameras, and law enforcement officers and private security guards began to be implemented in suburban and rural schools as well.

Therefore, it is important to consider the impact of such practices on student behaviors in all school locals, even though some schools, particularly in urban spaces, experience such measures to a greater degree than their counterparts (Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). As such, participants in the current study include principals in all public school locals in Ohio.

**Instrumentation.** A survey that was adapted from the SSOCS (2008) questionnaire, which was derived from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and developed as a result of extensive school crime research as well as regular internal and external reviews by a technical review panel (SSOCS, 2008) was used as a model for the current study. This SSOCS 2008 questionnaire was piloted in 14 schools to receive clearance from the Office of Management and Budget and the Education Information Advisory Committee of the Council of Chief State School Officers (NCES, 2008).

SSOCS (2008) suggests that variables, such as the presence of guards in American schools, can be used to determine the effectiveness of school policing practices in mediating against incidents of student behaviors. Specifically, survey questions asked whether or not schools had guards armed with a firearm and guards armed with a stun gun, a dichotomous variable. The original SSOCS (2008) survey also asked participants to identify the total number of student behaviors experienced within their schools including, but not limited to, physical violence and insubordination.

**Procedures.** An adapted survey modeled after the SSOCS (2008) survey was disseminated to principals in urban, rural, and suburban schools in Ohio via SurveyMonkey. Rather than asking them whether or not schools have policing practices, principals in the state of Ohio were asked to indicate the total number of school policing practices in their schools, a continuous variable. This change is the result of the notion presented in the examined literature that school locales differ in the severity of school policing practices used, where inner city, urban schools are more likely to experience these measures than their counterparts (Nolan, 2011; Toldson 2012). Principals were asked to indicate the following: (a) the total number of SROs present in their schools and (b) the total number of police officers present in their schools.

The second source of data was used to determine the total number of incidents of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence present at each school. Student behaviors were obtained from the ODE (2014) school building discipline reports. Ohio schools are required to provide their annual discipline reports to the Ohio Department of Education. These reports are made available to the public on the ODE website. These data extend as far back as 2001; however, the current study will focus on the following school years: 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. The reason for limiting the study to these select years is that, depending on federal grants and funding, the presence of SROs may only last for three years (Weiler & Cray, 2011). Having four observed years may allow for a greater likelihood that schools that currently have security guards also did in the past three years.

***Institutional review board.*** The data collected from principals as well as from the ODE Website was gathered with approval from Cleveland State University's (CSU)

Institutional Review Board (IRB). CSU's IRB is charged with the responsibility ensuring that researchers comply with federal and state mandates involving human subjects.

Specific to the present study, IRB approval to email principals in the state of Ohio a survey as well as the use of the extant data spreadsheets that are open to the public on ODE's website was granted prior to the study.

**Data processing and analysis.** The adapted survey that was used in the study focused on questions involving the total number of SROs and police officers. These variables served as independent variables and are continuous in nature. Upon further analysis, these measures were determined to be highly correlated. As a result, these variables were combined into one independent variable, denoted as "school policing" in the present study. Based on the literature surrounding zero tolerance policies and school policing practices, the outcome variables involving student behaviors included (a) insubordination and (b) violence. These variables are also continuous. Control variables involving the percentage minority, school size, and poverty were also examined in this dissertation.

School size was controlled for when determining whether student behaviors differ based on school security guards. More specifically, the impact of school security guards on student behaviors involving insubordination and violence will be measured per every 1,000 students. Additionally, based on the existing literature base, differences in terms of school security practices are suggested to differ by school locale. Toldson (2012) and Nolan (2011), for instance, both suggest that schools in inner city, urban environments experience policing to a greater degree than their counterparts. As such, the typology

code for each participating school will be obtained from the ODE website and used to disaggregate the data from participating schools.

ODE (2013) determines the typology of each school through the stratification of their school districts for research purposes and includes distinct categories based on school size and poverty levels. There are two sets of categories for each of the following school locales which results in a total of eight typology categories:

- Rural
- Small town
- Suburban
- Urban

Rural categories include schools with high student poverty and small student populations as well as average student poverty and very small student population. Small towns are divided into those with low student poverty and very small student population or low student poverty and small student population. Suburban schools include those that have low student poverty and an average student population size or very low student poverty and a large student population. Urban schools are also placed into categories, which include high student poverty and average student populations or very high student poverty with very large student populations. It is important to note that each typology is not created equal in terms of the number of districts or the number of students under each category in the entire state of Ohio.

Rural areas with high poverty and a small student population have 124 districts and 170,000 students, while rural schools with average student poverty and a very small student population includes 107 districts and 110,000 students. Small towns with low

student poverty and a small student population have 111 district and 185,000 students, while small towns with high poverty and average student population size includes 89 districts and 200,000 students. Suburban schools with low student poverty and average student population size have 77 districts and 320,000 students, while suburban schools with low student poverty and large student population includes 46 districts and 240,000 students. Finally, urban schools with high student poverty and an average student population have 47 districts and 210,000 students, while urban schools with very high student poverty and very large student populations include 8 districts and 200,000 students.

The aforementioned typology categories will also be used to determine the descriptive characteristics of the sample. Schools in the categories involving rural, small towns, suburban, and urban will be separated by their designated poverty status. Ultimately, due to a low sample size, differences in terms of student behaviors with respect to school policing practices was not examined by location. The present study included the percentage minority and the percentage of students identified as being economically disadvantaged.

An individual change model was used in the current study. As mentioned, individual change modeling can be used in longitudinal studies to determine the impact of a given predictor on an outcome variable of interest over time. The individual change model allows for repeated observations involving student behaviors including insubordination and violence, at the individual school level, with respect to the presence of school security guards. Additional control variables of interest were also analyzed over a four-year time span using this model and included school poverty, school size, and

percent minority for each observed school to determine whether or not these variables impact student behaviors independent of school security guards.

**Model specification.**

*Level 1 model.* At Level One, the model regresses student behaviors at the individual school level for student behaviors involving insubordination and violence onto school years for each school building. The following equation represents this relationship.

$$\gamma_{ij} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{ij} (a_{ij}) + \epsilon_{it}$$

Where  $\gamma_{ij}$  is the average number of behaviors documented for insubordination and violence for individual school  $i$  in group  $j$ . The  $\gamma$ -intercept,  $\pi_{0i}$  is the average number of student behaviors at the initial status (2010).  $a_{ij}$  represents each of the school years analyzed for the same school. In other words, the parameters for each of the  $j$  groups is estimated separately.  $\epsilon_{it}$  represents random individual error in the model.

*Level 2 model.* In the second stage of the Individual Change Model, the level one parameters, which are indicated above, were used as dependent variables for analysis at the individual level. Level 2 investigated how student behaviors in 2010 can be predicted by school size, the percentage of minority students, the total number of school policing, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged student. The equation format at level two for student behaviors involving insubordination and violence is as follows:

$$\pi_{0j} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01}(Size_j) + \beta_{02}(Minority_i) + \beta_{03}(Security_i) + \beta_{04}(SES_i) + r_{0i}$$

Where  $\beta_{00}$  is the expected average number of student behaviors for participating schools at the initial status. The regression coefficients,  $\beta_{01}$ ,  $\beta_{02}$ ,  $\beta_{03}$ , and  $\beta_{04}$ , represent the strength of the relationship between student behaviors and predictor variables including



school size, percentage minority, the total number of school security, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, respectively.

Likewise, individual change modeling at Level 2 was also used to determine the rate of change in the average number of student behaviors over a four-year time period as related to school size, the percentage of minority students, the total number of school policing, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students. This equation is represented below.

$$\pi_{0j} = \beta_{10} + \beta_{11}(Size_j) + \beta_{12}(Minority_i) + \beta_{13}(Security_i) + \beta_{14}(SES_i) + r_{1i}$$

Where,  $\beta_{10}$  is the estimated intercept of the expected rate of the change in the average number of student behaviors for a typical school. The coefficients,  $\beta_{11}$ ,  $\beta_{12}$ ,  $\beta_{13}$ , and  $\beta_{14}$ , are the contribution of school size, the percentage of minority students, the total number of school policing, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students to the rate of change in student behaviors by school building.  $r_{1i}$  represents the random error associate with the rate of change for school  $i$ . Assumptions associated with this model include independent and normal distribution with a mean of 0.

### **Summary**

Chapter III described the research methodology, including the use of individual change modeling to determine the impact of school security measures on student behaviors involving insubordination and violence over time. The chapter also detailed a pilot study that was used to inform this dissertation.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDINGS**

#### **Introduction**

Chapters I through III introduced the study and the theoretical framework, a review of the literature, and the research methodology. Chapter IV will provide a descriptive analysis of the characteristics of the participating schools and the results from an individual change model. This analyses focused on the extent to which the presence of school security measures involving SROs and police officers impact student behaviors that include: insubordination and violence, at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014). Other variables of interest included the percentage of students identified as economically disadvantage, the percentage minority, and school size.

Data collection for the current study included a survey that was disseminated to principals in Ohio public schools in suburban, rural, and urban locales as well as towns via SurveyMonkey. Specifically, principals were asked the following questions: 1. the total number of SROs present in their schools and 2. the total number of police officers present in their schools. Incidents of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence were obtained from the ODE (2014) website. This study had a low response rate of 6.5% as 2,583 principals in the state of Ohio were emailed the survey and, of

these, 167 principals responded. As mentioned, school principals were asked to indicate the total number of police officers and security officers that were on duty in their schools while the student behavior data was obtained from the ODE (2014) website. Schools that did not appear in the ODE dataset were excluded from the study. Also, a number of principals did not provide their school and/or their schools' district, making it impossible to determine the number of student behaviors for these schools. In the end, of the 167 principals that participated in the study, data from 148 of these schools were able to be examined in the study.

As previously discussed, this dissertation was informed by a pilot study, which was analyzed using an individual change model. This was an appropriate model to analyze these data as individual change modeling can be used in longitudinal studies to determine the impact of a given predictor on an outcome variable of interest over time. In the present study, an individual change model was used to make repeated observations of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence at the individual school level with respect to the presence of school security measures. Additional variables of interest were also analyzed over the provided four-year time span using this model and included school poverty, school size, and percent minority for each observed school. The total number of school security guards were controlled for every 1,000 students. Although this study was informed by the aforementioned pilot study and many of the procedures remained the same in this dissertation, some changes were made to the proposed methods in the present study due to the number of participants and the characteristics of the sample.

In chapter III, the proposed method for disaggregating the data involved using the typology categories; however, due to the low response rate, it was not possible to analyze the data in this manner. Instead, all school locales were aggregated into one outcome variable. It was also proposed that consideration to school level (e.g. elementary) should be given; however, since the sample size was low, it was also not possible to disaggregate the data in this manner. Therefore, elementary, middle, and high schools were all examined together with respect to the total number of school security measures.

Another notable difference between the pilot study and this dissertation was the fact that the pilot study asked principals to indicate the total number of security guards present in their schools, while the current study asked principals to distinguish between the total number of SROs and police officers in their schools. This distinction was made due to the literature presented by Nolan (2011) that discusses these job titles separately. However, upon examination, these variables were highly correlated and were merged together to form one predictor variable, denoted as school security measures in the present study. In addition, rather than adhering to the same process used in the pilot study involving disaggregating data by high and low poverty, this study examined the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in order to garner a more accurate data picture regarding the impact of poverty of students' behavioral outcomes. Schools that are identified as high or low poverty may differ in the percentage of students from economically disadvantage households within these distinct categories.

The next section will provide a detailed description of the characteristics of the data, followed by the findings of an individual change model used to determine the extent to which student behaviors involving insubordination and violence are related to school

security measures per every 1,000 students at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014). Findings also consider how these behaviors relate to school size, percentage minority, and percentage of schools that are economically disadvantaged. Conclusions regarding these findings and a summary of the chapter are also included.

### **Descriptive Characteristics**

The first step in analyzing the data was to determine the school characteristics of the sample. The mean school size was 538 students with a range between 108 and 2331. The mean for the percentage of minority populations in the sample was 14.98. This number is representative of minority groups in Ohio as only 12.6 percent of Ohio's population is comprised of Black Americans (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). The breakdown by Typology included schools in rural, towns, suburban, and urban settings. Twelve percent of the participating schools were identified as being in high poverty and 17 percent were considered low poverty rural areas. Fourteen percent were located in high poverty and 12 percent were located in low poverty towns. Eleven percent of participating schools were located in high poverty and 21 percent low student poverty suburban settings. Nine percent were considered urban schools with high and 5 percent very high student poverty rates. As mentioned, due to the low sample size, school typology was only used to understand the descriptive characteristics of the sample. The average percentage of students identified as being economically disadvantaged in the sample was 42.08.

### **Findings of the Study**

The total number of student behaviors for each participating school for the four years of interest, between 2010-2014, with respect to the school size, percentage

minority, percentage economically disadvantaged, and the presence of school security measures for the initial status and the rate of change were of interest in the present study. An individual change model (Williams & Raudenbush, 1989) was used to determine the relationship between student behaviors involving insubordination and violence and the presence of school security measures, percentage minority, percentage economically disadvantaged, and school size.

To answer questions involving the impact of these predictor variables on student behaviors at the initial status and over time, an individual change model was used. The variables used in this analysis are the total number of school security guards per every 1,000 students and the total number of student behaviors involving insubordination and violence, all of which are continuous. Other variables of interest included 1. size, 2. percentage minority, and 3. percent economically disadvantage. Findings with respect to student behaviors involving insubordination and violence appear below.

**Research questions #1.**

*To what extent do students' incidents of insubordination in 2010 (initial status) relate to the presence of school security measures in Ohio's public schools?*

Table 1 presents findings of an individual change model at the initial status (2010) for insubordination.

Table 1.

*Summary of an Individual Change Model regarding the extent to which students' incidents of insubordination in 2010 (Level 1).*

	B	S.E.	$\rho$
<u>Level 1</u>			
Minority	-.24	.44	.60
Size	.20	.04	.00
Security	61.36	12.68	.00
SES	1.36	.44	.01

For the dependent variable, insubordination, the individual change model revealed statistically significant findings for school size, school security, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students at the initial status ( $b = .20, p = .001$ ;  $b = 61.36, p = .001$ ; and  $b = 1.36, p = 0.01$  respectively). As school size, the total number of school security measures, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students increased, so did incidents of insubordination in 2010. The percentage of minority students was not found to predict insubordination at the initial status.

**Research questions #2.**

*To what extent does the rate of change in students' incidents of insubordination between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years relate to the presence of school security measures in Ohio's public schools?*

Table 2 presents results from an individual change model for the rate of change in students' incidents of insubordination between 2010 and 2014 relates to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools.

Table 2.

*Summary of Individual Change Modeling involving how the rate of change in students' incidents of insubordination between 2010 and 2014 (Level 2) relates to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools.*

Level 2	B	S.E.	$\rho$
Minority	.00	.11	.75
Size	.00	.01	.99
Security	-.08	3.31	.59
SES	1.80	.12	.46

The predictor variables were not statistically significant for the rate of change in student behaviors involving insubordination during the examined four-year period (2010-2014).

**Research question #3.**

*To what extent do students' incidents of violence in 2010 (initial status) relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools?*

Table 3 presents findings of an individual change model at the initial status (2010) for violence.



Table 3.

*Summary of Individual Change Model regarding the extent to which students' incidents of violence in 2010 (Level 1) relate to the total number of school security measures.*

	B	S.E.	$\rho$
Level 1			
Minority	-.02	.05	.72
Size	.04	.00	.00
Security	4.73	1.60	.04
SES	.13	.06	.11

For the dependent variable, violence, the individual change model revealed no statistically significant findings for the percentage minority or the percentage of economic disadvantage. Statistically significant findings were revealed for school size ( $b = .04, p = .001$ ) and the presence of school security ( $b = 4.73, p = .04$ , respectively). As school size and the total number of school security measures increased, so did violence in 2010.

**Research question #4.**

*To what extent does the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools?*

Table 4 presents results from an individual change model for the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between 2010 and 2014 relates to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools.

Table 4.

*Summary of Individual Change Modeling regarding how the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between 2010 and 2014 (Level 2) relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools.*

<u>Level 2</u>	B	S.E.	$\rho$
Minority	.00	.03	.90
Size	-.00	.00	.41
Security	-.45	.87	.61
SES	.01	.03	.60

The predictor variables were not statistically significant for the rate of change in student behaviors involving violence during the four-year period (2010-2014).

### **Overview**

There were four research questions that guided this study including: 1. To what extent do students' incidents of violence in 2010 (initial status) relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools? 2. To what extent does the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools? 3. To what extent do students' incidents of violence in 2010 (initial status) relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools? 4. To what extent does the rate of change in students' incidents of violence between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 relate to the presence of school security guards in Ohio's public schools?

The data for the present study was examined using an individual change model. The presence of school security measures increased problematic student behaviors involving insubordination at the initial status (2010), but not over time (2010-2014). The presence of school security measures also increased student incidents of violence at the initial status but was not statistically significantly related to these behaviors over time. This finding indicates that school security measures did not effectively reduce violence within the examined schools.

The percentage of students who are economically depressed was statistically significantly related to the increase of student behaviors involving insubordination but was not found to be statistically significant for violence or over time for the examined behaviors. School size was statistically significantly related to problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence at the initial status only. Findings also revealed that the percentage of minorities present in Ohio's public schools was not linked to high rates of problematic student behaviors at the initial status or the four-year period (2010-2014). The following will focus on conclusions regarding these findings

### **Summary**

Chapter IV revealed the findings of the study as well as the data analysis. This chapter included an analyses of the extent to which student behaviors involving insubordination and violence are related to the presence of school security, percentage poverty, percentage economically disadvantaged, and the percentage minority at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014). Findings showed that school size, socioeconomic status, and school security were statistically significant predictors for both insubordination and violence at the initial status. There were no statistically significant changes in student behaviors overtime with respect to any of the predictor

variables. The next chapter will focus on the conclusions of the study and includes a discussion and recommendations for future research regarding school discipline in American public schools.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

This chapter details the discussion, conclusions, recommendations for future research, and the strengths and limitations of this dissertation. The findings from this study and their relationship to the theoretical framework are examined to explore the systemic issues related to the use of school security measures and their impact of student behaviors. Such discussions may allow policy developers to make informed decisions related to the disciplinary practices in American public schools.

When examining policing practices as a measure of deterrence, it is important to consider the potential effects they have on student behaviors within the schools they serve. According to the examined literature, the use of school security measures in schools, originally put in place to protect students from dangerous outsiders, has become more focused on policing the students within schools (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011). There is a paucity of research examining the impact school security measures have on student behaviors over time and not enough is known regarding the effectiveness of these practices on reducing problematic behaviors.

The present study sought to determine the extent to which student behaviors involving insubordination and violence are related to the presence of school security measures at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014) in Ohio's public schools. Specifically, the following research questions were examined:

1. To what extent are student incidents of insubordination in 2010 related to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
2. To what extent does the rate of change in student incidents of insubordination between 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years relate to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
3. To what extent are student incidents of violence in 2010 related to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?
4. To what extent does the rate of change in student incidents of violence between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 school years relate to the presence of school policing in Ohio's public schools?

Additional variables of interest included school size, percentage minority, and percentage of economically depressed students and their relationship to student behaviors at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014).

### **Discussion of Findings**

The review of the literature highlights the relationship between the following structural forces: a. Labeling Theory and the social construction of inner city, urban and minority populations, b. the Broken Windows theory, c. incrementalism, d. zero tolerance, and e. school policing practices has led to the criminalization of student behaviors in American public schools, particularly for minority populations in inner city,

urban spaces. Through the social construction of inner city, urban minority students as experiencing more problematic behaviors than their counterparts and the implementation of zero tolerance and school policing as informed by the Broken Windows Theory and justified through the incrementalist approach to policy development, American public schools may have exacerbated existing cultural forces within these settings, where some students may respond contentiously to repressive approaches to discipline. Findings from the present study involving the relationship of school policing measures and student behaviors involving insubordination and violence will be discussed with respect to the aforementioned theories. Discussions related to minority students, school size, and the percentage of economically depressed students will also be discussed.

**Labeling theory, social construction, and minority students.** The percentages of minorities within schools in the present study were not found to be related to an increase in problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence at the initial status (2010) or over time (2010-2014). This finding holds in stark contrast to the dominant narrative that suggests minorities tend to present more problematic behaviors than their counterparts (Alexander, 2010; Smith, 2012). The social construction and subsequent labeling of inner city, urban minority students suggests that they are “deviants” who are in need of policing to control their behaviors (Hyman & Snook, 2000). According to the literature, “Social constructions are stereotypes about particular groups of people that have been created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion, and the like” (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, p. 335). The social construction of groups is closely intertwined with Labeling Theory, which is viewed as being significant to the understanding of criminology and recidivism as it is concerned

with the potential impact of defining an individual as deviant on their future behaviors (Becker, 1963). Labeling Theory holds that deviant behaviors may be associated with dominant narratives that negatively label minorities, or those defined as deviant, by the majority (Becker, 1963). The dominant American narrative often defines and socially constructs minority students in inner city, urban schools as being problematic, or deviant, and in need of reform.

The media tends to feed into the notion of minorities in inner city, urban locations as “deviants” (Nolan, 2011), often taking a divergent approach to how they create narratives of the students in inner city, urban schools and their counterparts. In *Thugs Run wild in Troubled HS* student in a predominately Black inner city, Urban school, is described as defiant and unruly (Clyde, 2003). In contrast, Riner (1999) wrote about students at Columbine High School in a positive light, highlighting their good grades and winning sports teams, following the tragic mass shooting in 1999. Discussing students from these contrasting standpoints creates notions that problematic behaviors are an inner city, urban school, minority problem, increasing the perceptions that policing practices are required to mediate against problematic behaviors within these settings. Although perception has been shown not to be reality, the dominant discourse seems to continue to inform disciplinary decisions in American public schools, which has implications for how problematic student behaviors are managed within and between schools.

This dominant discourse may contribute further to the labeling and social construction of inner city, urban schools as deviants, creating behaviors associated with secondary deviance. Secondary deviance is a response to how society responds to initial acts of deviance (Farrington & Murray, 2014) where a negative response to a person’s



actions such as stigmatizing, punishing or segregating the individual may have consequences for the offender's social roles, self-identity, and personality (Lemert, 1967). The literature involving policing in schools suggest that such measures are more likely to be present in inner city, urban schools with large minority populations, an underrepresented group in the current study's sample. Findings from the current study show that school security measures increased incidents of what can be termed secondary deviance (insubordination and violence) in all locales, with predominately White student populations, a finding that holds in stark contrast to the discourse involving students within these settings.

By responding to an initial behavior, such as insubordination (primary deviance), in a punitive manner, through the use of school policing and zero tolerance policies, students could begin to respond negatively to the punishment and act out against it, creating incidents of secondary deviance, regardless of race and school locale. In other words, students may respond to repressive approaches to discipline by displaying more problematic behaviors. These students may feel that they have been socially constructed or labeled as "deviants" by their school administrators, teachers, and school police officers and begin to act in accordance with their perceived behavioral expectations.

**School security measures and broken windows.** With an increase in the total number of school police measures, incidents of insubordination and violence at the initial status (2010) also increased. The presence of school security measures were not correlated with a change in student behaviors involving insubordination or violence over time. This finding indicates that school security measures were not effective in reducing

problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence within the examined schools.

The findings from the present study run contrary to the Broken Windows Theory of Crime, which suggests that foot patrol must attend to physical and social disorder, such as broken windows and public drunkenness, respectively, to mediate against more severe crimes (e.g. murder) (Kelling & Coles; 1996; Wilson & Kelling 1982;). When applied to students, authority figures must attend to minor student behaviors, such as insubordination to avoid more severe behaviors (e.g. violence). In findings from the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, which sought to determine the effectiveness of the Broken Windows Theory of crime, Kelling shadowed foot patrol officers and found that citizens typically accept police presence and the informal rules that result, such as being allowed to sit, but not lay down on a stoop are considered. Residents reportedly felt more secure and were less likely to avoid their neighborhood (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Kelling and Coles (1996) subsequently suggest that tending to disorderly behaviors will contribute to a decrease in the fear of crime and an increase in the trust of the police.

While citizen's perceptions of the safety of their neighborhood improved with the presence of foot patrol, findings from The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment indicate that their presence did not lower actual incidents of crime (Kelling & Coles, 1996). As such, perceptions do not necessarily match reality where safety is concerned. Police in the Newark Experiment gave residents the perception that they were safer, but in actuality, their presence did nothing to deter crime. The same may be true for school security measures where it may seem that adding these measures to schools should result in lower incident of problematic behaviors, the opposite appears to be true.

Critics of the “Broken Windows” theory suggest that the implementation of order maintenance policing has resulted in a “war on the poor,” leading to increasing numbers of unemployed residents and has done little to reduce crime rates while increasing the numbers of minority populations, particularly males, in our nation’s prisons (Alexander, 2010). Similarly, schools in the sample with higher rates of students identified as being economically disadvantaged were significantly more prone to experience both insubordination and violence at the initial status and over time. Some schools, particularly those in impoverished inner city, urban locations with large minority populations are suggested to have police departments larger than many major cities in the United States (Peak, 2015). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that schools located in inner city, urban spaces with large minority populations may be at an increased risk for insubordination and are more likely to be *excluded* from the school environment, contributing to the discipline gap and the perpetuation of the labeling and social construction of these students as “deviants.”

Black and Hispanic students are disproportionately affected by zero tolerance policies at a rate approximately three times the rate of their White peers (Dupper, 2010). Additionally, Nolan’s (2011) ethnography regarding school policing and student behaviors in an inner city, urban school suggests an adverse relationship between police officers and students exists that may result in confrontations between the two parties, potentially leading to court summons and arrests. This could increase notions of inner city, urban minority students as experiencing more problematic behaviors than their counterparts. However, their presence may do more harm than good (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012;).

The findings from the study indicating that school security measures did not effectively mediate against problematic behaviors is also related to Harcourt's (1998) suggestion that a focus on disorder may ignore the role that these factors play in crime and explores the idea that order-maintenance policing may maintain community norms, rather than creating moral cohesion and lower crime rates in areas characterized as disorderly (Harcourt, 1998). Therefore, if school security measures are put into schools already identified as being "disorderly," then they will not reduce problematic behaviors but may actually normalize them. Adding more police, then, does not increase residents' feelings of safety, but, instead, increases mistrust towards police and criminalizes minor offenses. In addition, the use of order maintenance policing in schools may have created and defined the "disorderly" students and their tendencies as needing to be controlled, justifying the use of these measures to control minor behavior incidents.

Consistent with the examined literature, behaviors involving insubordination in this study were increased with the presence of guards at the initial status (2010), a finding that may transcend race and school location. Nolan's (2011) ethnography showed that students in an inner city, urban school with a large minority population often perceived school security guards as adversaries rather than trusted staff members and interactions between these two groups were described as confrontational. The majority of the participating schools in the present study had low percentages of minorities, but were found to have increased rates of insubordination at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014) with the increased presence of school security officials, suggesting that a contentious relationship between students and security officers may exist in all schools, regardless of demographics and school typology.

**Incrementalism.** Incrementalism only requires an agreement between policy makers that a particular measure is effective to support its use (Lindblom, 1969). Although zero tolerance policies have been present in school since 1994 and policing in some schools as far back as 1960 (Fuentes, 2012), it remains unclear if these policies do anything to mediate against problematic student behaviors. Instead, the examined literature suggests the opposite is true in areas with large minority populations (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011), as previous research focuses namely on this population when studying security measures in schools. However, in the present study, it is difficult to determine whether the findings generalize to inner city, urban schools with large minority populations, as many did not participate in the study, an issue that will be elaborated on in a subsequent section of this document.

Without representation from all school locales in studies regarding school discipline, policy makers could continue to use zero tolerance policies and school policing to combat problematic student behaviors through incrementalism, where the past is used to inform future policies and an agreement, rather than evidence, can be used to support their use (Lindblom, 1959). If schools continue to use zero tolerance policies and school policing without knowing the impact of these measures on student behaviors over time, they may not be able to mediate against existing problems within the school environment and may instead exacerbate these issues.

**School size and student behaviors.** School size was statistically significantly related to problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence at the initial status only. As school size increased, so did the number of problematic student behaviors at the initial status. When examining school size in American schools, many

high schools located in large suburban and urban areas have populations larger than 1,500 students (Shakrani & Michigan State University, 2008). In fact, schools designated as urban may have as many as 4,000 students (Shakrani & Michigan State University, 2008). Large school size is related to decreased feelings of connectedness to one's school, impedes relationship development with teachers, and makes individualized instruction difficult (Shakrani & Michigan State University, 2008) and may have implications related to student behaviors. Students who are bored in school may display problematic behaviors in response to inadequate instruction (Linson, 2011). Additionally, Pearson and Demand Media (2016) suggests that large class sizes may have implications regarding classroom management where teachers struggle to maintain a consistent environment. Therefore, teachers who teach large populations of students may see an increase in negative student behaviors including insubordination and violence due to boredom when teachers cannot accommodate the needs of all their students, making managing the classroom environment effectively difficult.

Expanding on our discussion of school size, revisiting the Ohio school typology codes in relationship to school size may allow for an understanding of why the dominant narrative suggests that urban schools are more problematic than their counterparts (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Smith, 2011). Rural areas in Ohio with high poverty and a small student population have 124 districts and 170,000 students, while rural schools with average student poverty and a very small student population includes 107 districts and 110,000 students (ODE, 2013). Small towns with low student poverty and a small student population have 111 district and 185,000 students, while small towns with high poverty and average student population size includes 89 districts and 200,000 students (ODE,

2013). Suburban schools with low student poverty and average student population size have 77 districts and 320,000 students, while suburban schools with low student poverty and large student population includes 46 districts and 240,000 students (ODE, 2013). Finally, urban schools with high student poverty and an average student population have 47 districts and 210,000 students, while urban schools with very high student poverty and very large student populations include 8 districts and 200,000 students (ODE, 2013).

These differences in student populations with respect to school typology highlight the concentration of our most economically disadvantaged youth in one area. When compared to other districts, urban schools tend to have higher rates of student poverty rate coupled with large student population in the state of Ohio. Although there are only eight districts classified as being in this urban category, there are 200,000 students within this typology, while, for example, suburban schools with very low student poverty and large student populations have 46 districts and 240,000 students. If school size is a predictor of problematic student behaviors and urban schools in the most impoverished areas, an underrepresented group in the sample, experience the largest student populations, then schools in these areas may be at an increased risk for inadequate education, decrease in individualized instruction, and subsequently, more problematic student behaviors. However, due to the lack of participating schools from inner city, urban schools in Ohio, this study can only speculate on this matter. This brings the discussion to cultural forces, such as the “cool pose” culture, which literature focuses on as being the result of structural forces imposed on inner city urban, Black Americans.

**Cultural forces and student behaviors.** Data in the present study revealed that problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence may be

exacerbated by the presence of school security measures in all school locales, regardless of racial composition. This finding mirrors previous research, which posits the presence of repressive measures may lead to misbehavior through alienation and feelings of mistrust (Nolan, 2011). The difference between the findings of this study and the examined literature is that rather than focusing on inner city, urban spaces with large minority populations, as much of the literature does, the current study examined all school locales in Ohio including rural, towns, suburban, and urban settings, and the majority of the participating schools had low percentages of minority students. As mentioned, previous studies suggest that inner city urban schools with large minority populations experience more policing and more problematic behaviors than their counterparts (Dupper, 2010; Nolan, 2011; Toldson, 2012). Findings from this study suggest that all school locales and schools with predominately White populations also may respond negatively to repressive approaches to school discipline. Therefore, the presence of school security measures may cause students to react defensively or “disorderly,” regardless of their race or school location.

Additionally, findings from the current study found that the percentage of minorities did not increase problematic student behaviors involving insubordination and violence at the initial status or over time. This is a noteworthy finding as the dominant narrative suggests that minorities are more prone to negative behaviors than their counterparts (Alexander, 2010, Nolan, 2011, Smith, 2011). Therefore, it may be perception, not reality, that leads to such notions and disparities between groups. At the same time, it is important to note this study cannot make generalizations of the findings to inner city, urban spaces, with large minority populations as the percentage of



minorities in participating schools were low. Perhaps schools with predominately White populations outside of inner city urban spaces do not profile minorities within their settings in the same manner that is suggested by the literature in schools with large minority populations. Many students in inner city, urban schools suggest security officials harass them because they perceive them as hoodlums, delinquents, and troublemakers (Weiss, 2007). Black students in Bracy's (2011) qualitative study involving observations and interviews with students about their schools suggested racial discrimination in their schools' disciplinary process in conscious and deliberate. Therefore, minority students in inner city, urban areas may be at an increased risk of being labeled and socially constructed as "deviants".

A student who is unwilling to submit to authority is considered disobedient/disruptive by ODE (2012), defined as "insubordination," in the present study. This definition suggests a repressive approach to students, which as the examined literature suggests, may cause students to develop cultural attitudes towards authority figures, including security officers, that seem to be indicative of the street codes suggested by Elijah Andersen (1996) and Mateu-Gelabert and Lune (2007). The Code of the Street discussed in Wilson (2009) and Majors and Billson (1996) is focused on the behaviors associated, namely, with in inner city, Black males' responses to economic suppression in a White dominated society.

"Submitting" to authority could be viewed as a weakness by students and could result in a loss of respect from peers and as a result, many Black males in inner city, urban spaces will engage in confrontations with police officers even if doing so will result in arrest and/or a physical altercation (Majors & Billson, 1996). As mentioned,

Nolan (2011) found that students in an inner city, urban school with a large minority population responded similarly to security officers, where contentious relationships between the school officers and the students were commonplace and acts of noncompliance escalated to more severe, violent behaviors (Fuentes, 2012).

In contrast, participating schools had a mean population of 14.98 percent for minority students and findings suggest that an increase in the percentage of minority students was not a statistically significant predictor of insubordination and violence at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014). Although one should be cautious in making generalizations regarding this finding since the participating sample had a low percentage of minorities present in their school, what is interesting is that cultural forces may exist within schools that use repressive approaches regardless of race and school location. Findings from the study revealed that the participating schools saw an increase in insubordination at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014) and the majority of schools in the sample were predominately White. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that students, regardless of race, who experience repressive approaches to discipline may act out against it, potentially exacerbating issues within these settings. Gastic (2011) corroborates these findings when he suggests that the presence of repressive approaches within schools may lead students to perceive their environment as more violent than it actually is, leading to a self-fulfilling prophecy where students act in accordance with these norms, acting defensively to these policing measures. Students may subsequently take preemptive measures involving violent and insubordinate behaviors as a means of protection from the perceived danger. In the present study,

students from economically disadvantaged families in particular also saw an increase in insubordination.

**Poverty and student behaviors.** The percentages of students from economically depressed areas were found to increase negative student behaviors involving insubordination at the initial status (2010). This is consistent with research that found that low socioeconomic status was significantly associated with higher rates of problematic behaviors when compared to their more affluent counterparts (Hopson & Lee, 2011). With respect to the reviewed literature, students from impoverished areas may act out behaviors indicative of the “cool pose” culture, such as responding aggressively to authority figures, in response to barriers to upward mobility (Hall, 2009; Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2011), regardless of race.

With respect to the examined literature involving cultural forces, Black males from inner city, urban spaces developed “cool” behaviors often in response to their economic subordination where they see social mobility as being difficult if not impossible to obtain (Hall, 2009; Majors & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2011). Cool behaviors may include “toughness” in the presence of authority figures (Hall, 2009; Major & Billson, 1992; Wilson, 2011). The dominant narrative involving poverty status suggests that the blame lies with the individual and the use of government aid to help individuals requiring aid is widely accepted as enabling poor choices, such as drug use, and a lack of motivation to work (Wilson, 2009).

Findings from Jean’s (2007) study suggests that crime results from opportunity and the depression of an area, which aligns with the results of the current study regarding poverty. Jean’s (2007) suggests that crime occurs as the result of a lack of opportunity

and the economic depression of an area. Although the current study did not study the physical disorder of the buildings as Jean's (2007) study did, or the drug use by students, it did find that the more students from economically depressed areas were present in a school, the more likely they were to experience insubordination and violence at the initial status (2010) and over time (2010-2014).

### **Strengths and Limitations**

There are many strengths within the current study. This research adds to the paucity of research regarding the effectiveness of school security measures on mediating against problematic student behaviors. Previous research is namely qualitative in nature and involves the perceptions of inner city, urban, minorities involving the effectiveness of school policing (Nolan, 2011). This study examines such issues quantitatively and casts a wide net when sending out the school security survey to principals, including all school locales (suburban, towns, rural, and urban) in Ohio. The findings add to the qualitative research by attaching numbers to the stories regarding the relationships between school policing and student behaviors. Studying the impact of these measures on student behaviors in all school locales may begin to put limitations on the dominant narrative that assumes problematic behaviors exist primarily in inner city, urban schools with large minority populations.

In addition, the present study is longitudinal, which allows for a better understanding of the long-term implications of school policing and the other variable of interest. Findings from this study indicate that problematic behaviors increased or remained stagnant due to poverty, school size, percentage minority, and with the presence of school security guards in a sample of predominately White students. Therefore,

conversations involving interventions for problematic behaviors such as insubordination and violence may benefit all students in all school locales.

Despite the strengths of the present study, there are limitations as well. As with any extant data source, there are limitations regarding the reporting of student behaviors, where those who are required to indicate the total number of incidents to ODE may view behaviors subjectively. Research suggests that minority students receive harsher punishments for the same behaviors that are not viewed as problematic in predominately White schools (Fuentes, 2012; Nolan, 2011). Therefore, there may be an increase in the number of behaviors reported at schools with larger minority populations, despite the fact that the actual number of occurrences of a behavior may not be more or less prevalent by the racial composition of a school, but rather the recorded incidents could be the result of implicit bias of those administering the consequences per zero tolerance policies.

Although the data regarding student behaviors was obtained over a four-year time frame, information involving the total number of school policing measures in Ohio's public schools was self-reported by principals who were asked how many of each they have in their schools at the time of the study. As such, the total number of school police may have varied between the examined years for the participating schools. It is also unclear what the role of the school police officers were within each of the participating schools. Perhaps some are patrolling the hallways while others are in their cruisers in the parking lot. Additionally, a veteran SRO and/or police officer may approach a situation with a student in a different manner than a new hire. At the same time, behaviors of security officers may differ based on the personalities of these school officials. Therefore,

some school security officers may be more effective than others at mediating against problematic behaviors.

The low sample size when compared to Ohio as a whole decreases the generalizability of findings both nationally and in Ohio. The participating schools were predominately White, making it difficult to generalize the findings to minority populations. Therefore, findings from this study may not be representative of the cross section of American schools, which may vary between schools and within districts. Due to the low participation of schools in inner city, urban locations and those with large minority populations, findings cannot speak directly to school policing as a structural force.

Schools in these areas are often placed under scrutiny for their lack of control over the school environment and large population of students not performing proficiently on state exams. For example, recent media coverage in Cleveland, Ohio, an urban school district in Ohio, highlights the low school ratings, where achievement on state tests show achievement grades in the “D” and “F” range (O’Donnell, 2016). Schools in urban areas may subsequently shy away from participating in research that could highlight another perceived deficiency when compared to their counterparts. The limited research on school policing shows contentious relationships between students and security (Nolan, 2011; Fuentes, 2012). The underreporting of schools from low-income areas with large minority populations in this study can be described as a structural force. By not participating in studies regarding the effectiveness of school policing on student behaviors, it will remain unclear if the use of these measures do anything to reduce problems within these spaces. To reiterate, by ignoring systemic causes of disciplinary

disparities between school locales and between and within groups, it is likely that any well-intended effort to mediate against problematic student behaviors will be ineffective. As Wilson (1987) contends, if policy programs to mediate against social dislocations were developed with the view that these issues were the result of racism, they would differ, substantially, from those that insist that such issues have nothing to do with race.

### **Implications for Practice**

By failing to address behaviors in a comprehensive manner, many schools are reacting to behaviors that may be a symptom of a larger, potentially systemic issue, using zero tolerance and school security measures as a means of control. As mentioned, structural forces, including redlining practices, blockbusting, and job discrimination to name a few, all have contributed to the segregation and isolation of minority populations in inner city, urban spaces (Wilson, 2009). Consequently, those residing in these areas may adopt cool behaviors as a reaction to the feelings that social mobility is difficult if not impossible to obtain (Wilson, 2009). However, schools in the current study, including those with predominately White populations, may not be immune from this phenomenon and behaviors indicative of the cool pose culture may result in students being suspended for “insubordination” under a zero tolerance mindset and through confrontations with security guards, regardless of race and school location.

The repercussions of discipline in school may have implications regarding the overall wellbeing of student life and community for the students displaying problematic behaviors and their counterparts. The role of education as it relates to incarceration is a significant concern in the United States. Attending school is commonly accepted as a preventative factor related to the avoidance of criminal behavior. Therefore, the removal

of students through zero tolerance measures and the use of policing in all but the most extreme circumstances may be counterproductive (Teske, 2011). A child's connection to school is significantly related to a decrease in violence, substance abuse, suicide attempts, pregnancy, graduation rates, and academics (Teske, 2011).

It is also recommended that schools replace or become more reliant on evidence based practices over zero tolerance policies and school policing to promote positive school environments and limit the amount of exclusionary discipline practices. Students that are suspended or expelled are likely to lose any feelings of connectedness to their school and may be at an increased risk for recidivism (Mongan & Walker, 2012). When suspended students return to school they are behind academically and may consider "acting out" more acceptable than appearing to lack competence (McGinnis, 2003). Suspensions, expulsions, and court summons under a zero tolerance mindset may be exacerbated by the presence of school security officers through confrontations with students (Nolan, 2011). Instead, schools can help create positive structures that may reduce the number of school suspensions, expulsions, and court summons. Two alternatives include Schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) and restorative justice.

SWPBIS is an intervention strategy to mediate against problematic student behaviors in a proactive manner. SWPBIS can be considered an alternative to zero tolerance and the use of school policing to mediate against problematic behaviors. According to Horner, Sugai, and Anderson (2010), SWPBIS can reduce the exclusion of students from school, improve the school climate, and improve student academic and behavioral outcomes. SWPBIS consists of three levels of behavioral supports that



include: a. Primary, b. Secondary, and c. Tertiary. The Primary level is generally geared towards the average student, about 80-90% of the student body, while the Secondary and Tertiary levels are focused on small groups (10-13%) and individual students (1-5%), respectively. This evidence based program limits the amount of students being excluded from school as interventions can be tailored to the individual needs of a student, potentially contributing to increased feelings of connectedness and reducing recidivism.

The use of Restorative Justice in schools can also be used to create a positive, less punitive school environment. Restorative Justice practices encourage community service or restitution for offenders in order to learn from their behaviors (Sherman, 2003). Rather than suspending or expelling students, offending students are provided with individualized solutions that may involve conflict mediations between the offender and the victim for purposes of closure (Morrison, 2003). The adoption of restorative justice has worked best in situations where the entire school adopted this practice as a philosophy, allowing schools to build and maintain positive relationships between students, reducing peer and school community victimization (Morrison, 2005).

If policy makers feel that they must employ school policing measures in American public schools, they may require that their officers receive extensive training involving conflict resolution and how to interact with students in need of special education services. This suggestion stems from the new training required for Cleveland, Ohio police officers who are now mandated to take a psychological test before they are hired and receive training regarding how to work with those with mental illnesses (Pelzer, 2015). Calling for police officers to participate in these training is the result of a number of police shootings of unarmed Black citizens (Pelzer, 2015), such as Tamir Rice, a 12-

year-old boy, who was shot within seconds of police arriving on the scene after reports that he was pointing a gun at individuals near a local recreation center in Cleveland, Ohio; it was a toy gun (Ly & Hanna, 2014). The goal of the initiative in Cleveland is to create trusting relationships between the police and the residents (Pelzer, 2015), an aim that does not deviate much from Kelling & Coles (1996) Broken Windows Theory of Crime. Although the goals of increased training for police officers and the Broken Windows Theory are similar in nature, the difference is that the focus for police in training is how police officers approach behaviors. It is not the use of punitive measures to deter more serious behaviors of residents as is suggested by the Broken Windows Theory. By providing this same comprehensive training as the Cleveland police officers are now required to negative interactions between school security guards and students. Of course, studies both in the community and in schools to determine the effectiveness of this training is imperative.

As mentioned, there was an underreporting of schools from inner city, urban schools with large minority populations, making it impossible to generalize the findings of the study beyond predominately White schools. Information regarding the total number of school security officers for each school and district is not currently made available on the ODE website. It is recommended that these data be reported annually to the state and be made available to the public. Researchers could use this data to determine the extent to which the total number of student behavioral incidents at the school and/or district level is related to the total number of school security measures in schools. This will allow for a more accurate data picture regarding the relationship between school security officers and student behaviors, as well an ability to draw comparisons between

school locales and student populations. Policy makers could then make more knowledgeable judgments regarding the use of school security measures in American public schools.

### **Conclusions**

Despite the widespread use of zero tolerance and school policing as informed by the Broken Windows Theory, there is a paucity of empirical evidence to support and contention from many scholars regarding the Broken Windows Theory. American public schools tend to turn to school policing to manage problems within their schools, measures that may be unnecessarily employed without consideration to the data surrounding problematic behaviors in American schools. For instance, violence was shown to be on the decline prior to the implementation of the GFSA of 1994 (CDC, 2012). However, as tragic incidents occur and are highlighted in the media, public fear drives the national dialogue and perceptions of violence in American public schools, potentially feeding into the agreement of policy makers that school policing measures are necessary to combat such issues. The Broken Windows continues to inform disciplinary measures both in the community and in schools in the form of zero tolerance policies and school policing practices (Nolan, 2011; Teske, 2011).

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

It is highly unlikely that the debate regarding school safety will end any time soon; however, the research community can help public policy makers by giving them a clear data picture on which to form future options. Despite the widespread use of school security measures, little is known about student recidivism, long-term effects on student quality of life, or the overall impact of these measures on school climate. More research

is needed regarding the impact of school policing on student behaviors in all school locales to allow for policy makers to make informed decisions regarding the use of such measures. The research community can help public policymakers by giving them a clear data picture from which to form future options. The link between school location and the police state in American schools, and the continued success of students may require an examination through a large-scale longitudinal study.

In order to understand how school security officers are utilized and differences regarding their use in and between all school locales, including suburban, rural, and urban settings, qualitative research may wish to explore this further. Researchers may extend on this with a focus group of students to document their perceived experiences with law enforcement in all schools and student populations. This would add to the existing literature base as much of the literature involving student perceptions focuses on inner city, urban schools with large minority populations.

In addition, research may wish to explore how current events impact the culture within American schools as related to student behaviors and the presence of school security measures. For example, current events surrounding Black Americans and police officers suggests a mistrusting relationship as there have been a number of shootings of unarmed Black males at the hands of police officers (Pelzer, 2015). A researcher may ask whether the media coverage of these events lead to more contentious relationships between security officers and students and does it differ by school location and student population.

## REFERENCES

- Addington, L. (2009). Cops and cameras: public school security as a policy response to columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(10), 1426-1446.
- Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2013). School-to-prison pipeline. *ACLU*. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/school-prison-pipeline>
- American Psychologist Association. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychological Association*, 63(9), 852–862. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.63.9.852
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Angle, P. M. (1958). *Created equal? The complete Lincoln - Douglas debates of 1858*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Atassi, C. L. (2015). Cleveland clergy: bring back police foot patrols, mini-stations and community policing. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from [http://www.cleveland.com/cityhall/index.ssf/2015/02/cleveland\\_clergy\\_bring\\_back\\_po.html](http://www.cleveland.com/cityhall/index.ssf/2015/02/cleveland_clergy_bring_back_po.html)
- Bagaka's, J. G. (2010). Many districts left behind: An individual change analysis of inequity in the Kenyan primary educational opportunities (2001–2007). *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(6), 586-591.
- Baumgartner, F.R., Jones, B.D., & Mortensen, P.B. (2014). Punctuated-equilibrium theory: explaining stability and change in public policymaking. In P.A. Sabatier &

- C.M. Weible (Eds.), *Theories of the policy process* (pp.59-103). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bell, G. C., Hopson, M. C., Craig, R., & Robinson, N. W. (2014). Exploring black and white accounts of 21st-century racial profiling: riding and driving while black. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 15*(1), 33-42.  
doi:10.1080/17459435.2014.955590
- Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, a division of the Macmillan Company.
- Bier, T. E. (1995). Housing dynamics of the Cleveland area 1950-2000. Edited by. Keating, W. D., Krumholz, N., & Perry, D. C. (1995). *Cleveland: A metropolitan reader*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Blade, E. (2015). Ferguson school police found to be too heavy-handed with students. *Education Week, 34*(24), 14.
- Bracy, N. L. (2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society, 43*(1), 365-395. doi:10.1177/0044118X10365082
- Breunlin, D. C., Cimmarusti, R. A., Bryant-Edwards, T. L., & Hetherington, J. S. (2002). Conflict resolution training as an alternative to suspension for violent behavior. *Journal of Educational Research, 95*(6), 349.
- Brown, C., & Lambrecht, L. (2002). Suspensions and detentions in an urban, low-income school: Punishment or reward? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 30*(4), 361-371.
- Bybee, R., & Gee, G., (1982). *Violence values and justice in the schools*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Center for Disease Control. (2012). Understanding school violence fact sheet. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention. *CDC*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/>.
- Celona, L. (2004). War on drugs-cops plan crackdown. *The New York Post*. Retrieved from <http://nypost.com/2004/07/15/war-on-school-gangs-cops-plan-crackdown/>
- Chan, J. (2011). Racial profiling and police subculture. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 53, 75-78.
- Clark, S. (2011). The role of law enforcement in schools: The Virginia experience: A practitioner report. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 129, 89–101.  
doi:10.1002/yd.389
- Connor, T., & Isikoff, M. (2012). *NRA: only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun*. Retrieved from [http://usnews.nbcnews.com/\\_news/2012/12/21/16069016-disbelief-in-some-quarters-after-nra-calls-for-armed-guards-at-every-school-blames-movies?lite](http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/12/21/16069016-disbelief-in-some-quarters-after-nra-calls-for-armed-guards-at-every-school-blames-movies?lite)
- Clyde, J., (2003). Thugs run wild in troubled HS (what a great place to send your kids!!!). *Free Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/1041339/posts>
- Cook, P.J. (2009). Crime: Crime in the city. In R.P. Inman (Ed.), *Making cities work: Prospects and policies for urban America* (pp. 297-327). Princeton, NJ: Princeton.
- Cooper, M. (1996). An incident on Amsterdam: A case of police brutality? Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/06/23/nyregion/neighborhood-report-manhattan-valley-incident-amsterdam-case-police-brutality.html>

- Creasey, G., & Jarvis, P. A. (2013). *Adolescent development and school achievement in urban communities: Resilience in the neighborhood*. New York: Routledge.
- Cseper, C. (2008). Ominous signs hover over school violence statistics. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from [http://blog.cleveland.com/metro/2008/01/ominous\\_signs\\_hover\\_over\\_schoo.html](http://blog.cleveland.com/metro/2008/01/ominous_signs_hover_over_schoo.html)
- DeLeon, A. (2011). A perverse kind of sense: urban spaces, ghetto places and the discourse of school shootings. *Urban Review*, 44(1), 152–169.  
doi:10.1007/s11256-011-0174-1
- Deci, E. (1995). *Why we do what we do*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Dilulio, J., (1995). The coming of the super-predators. *The Weekly Standard*. Retrieved from <http://www.weeklystandard.com/the-coming-of-the-super-predators/article/8160>
- Dupper, D. (2010). Does the punishment fit the crime? The impact of zero tolerance discipline on at-risk youths. *Children and Schools*, 32(2), 67–69.
- Elsaesser, C., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. (2013). The role of the school environment in relational aggression and victimization. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 42(2), 235-249. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9839-7
- Fuentes, A. (2011). *Lockdown high: when the schoolhouse becomes a jailhouse*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Farrington, D. P., & Murray, J. (2014). Empirical tests of labeling theory in criminology. In D. P. Farrington & J. Murray (Eds.). *Labeling theory: Empirical tests Advances in criminological theory*, (pp. 1-9). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.



- Gastic, B. (2011). Metal detectors and feeling safe at school. *Education and Urban Society*, 43(4), 486–498. doi: 10.1177/0013124510380717
- Gau, J. M., Corsaro, N., & Brunson, R. K. (2014). Revisiting broken windows theory: A test of the mediation impact of social mechanisms on the disorder–fear relationship. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(6), 579-588. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.10.00
- Giroux, H. A. (2003). Racial injustice and disposable youth in the age of zero tolerance. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(4), 553–565. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000099543
- Gould, S. J. (1996) *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Gregory, A., & Cornell, D. (2009). “Tolerating” adolescent needs: Moving beyond zero tolerance policies in high school. *Theory into Practice*, 48(2), 106–113. doi: 10.1080/00405840902776327
- Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1998). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 96-104.
- Hall, R. (2009). Cool pose, black manhood, and juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*. 19(5), 531-539. doi: 10.1080/10911350902990502
- Harcourt, B. E. (1998). Reflecting on the subject: A critique of the social influence conception of deterrence, the broken windows theory, and order-maintenance policing New York style. *Michigan Law Review*, 97(2), 291.
- Heck, R. H. (2007). Examining the relationship between teacher quality as an organizational property of schools and students' achievement and growth rates.

*Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(4), 399-432.

Hirschi, T (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Hopson, L. M., & Lee, E. (2011). Mitigating the effect of family poverty on academic and behavioral outcomes: The role of school climate in middle and high school. *Children & Youth Services Review*, 33(11), 2221-2229.

doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.07.006

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus On Exceptional Children*, 42(8), 1-14.

Hyman, I. A., & Snook, P. A. (2000). Dangerous schools and what you can do about them. (Cover story). *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(7), 488.

Jacob, B. A. (2007). The challenges of staffing urban schools with effective teachers. *Future of Children*, 17(1), 129-153.

Jean, B., S. (2007). *Pockets of crime: Broken windows, collective efficacy, and the criminal point of view*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jennings, W. G., Khey, D. N., Maskaly, J., & Donner, C. M. (2011). Evaluating the relationship between law enforcement and school security measures and violent crime in schools. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, 11(2), 109-124.

doi:10.1080/15332586.2011.581511

Johnson, I. M. (1999). School violence: The effectiveness of a school resource officer program in a southern city. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(2), 173.

doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.02.002

- Kafka, J. (2011). *The history of "zero tolerance" in American public schooling*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kelling, G., & Coles, C. (1998). *Fixing broken windows*. New York: Free Press.
- Kim, C. Y., & Geronimo, I. (2010). Policing in schools. *Education Digest*, 75(5), 28-35.
- Kleck, G. (2009). Mass shootings in schools. The worst possible case for gun control. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 52(10). 1447-1464. Doi: 10.1177/0002764209332557
- Kusmer, K. L. (1976). *A ghetto takes shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2010). *Someone has to fail: the zero-sum game of public schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lemert, E. M. (1967). *Human deviance, social problems, and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The "science" of muddling through. *Public Administration Review*, 19, 79-88.
- Losen, D., Hudson, C., Keith, M., Morison, K., & Beway, S. (2015). Are we closing the discipline gap? *UCLA*. Retrieved from <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/are-we-closing-the-school-discipline-gap>
- Ly, L., & Hanna, J. (2014, December 12). *Cleveland police's fatal shooting of Tamir Rice ruled a homicide*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/12/12/justice/cleveland-tamir-rice/index.html>

- Majors, R., & Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool pose: The dilemmas of black manhood in America*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Martinez, S. (2009). A system gone berserk: how are zero-tolerance policies really affecting schools? *Preventing School Failure*, 53(3), 153-158.
- Mayer, M. J., & Leone, P. E. (1999). A structural analysis of school violence and disruption: implications for creating safer schools. *Education & Treatment of Children (ETC)*, 22(3), 333-356.
- McDaniel, J. (2001). *School resource Officers, what we know, what we think we know, what we need to know*. Report for the School Safety Strategic Planning Meeting, US Department of Justice.
- McGinnis, E. (2003). Aggression replacement training: a viable alternative. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 12(3), 161-166.
- Melvin, B. (2011). Zero tolerance policies and terroristic threatening in schools. *Journal of Law & Education*, 40(4), 719-724.
- Merriam-Webster. (2015). Racism. *Merriam-Webster*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/racism>
- Miller, J., Ofer, U., Artz, A., Bahl, T., Foster, T., Phenix, D., Sheehan, N., & Thomas, H.A. (2011). *Education interrupted: The growing use of suspensions in New York City's public schools* (NYCLU Report). Retrieved from [http://www.nyclu.org/files/publications/Suspension\\_Report\\_FINAL\\_noSpreads.pdf](http://www.nyclu.org/files/publications/Suspension_Report_FINAL_noSpreads.pdf)

- Mongan, P., & Walker, R. (2012). The road to hell is paved with good intentions: a historical, theoretical and legal analysis of zero-tolerance weapons policies in American schools. *Preventing School Failure, 56*(4), 232-240.
- Morrison, B. (2003). Regulating safe school communities: Being responsive and restorative. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*, 689-704.
- Morrison, B. (2005). Restorative justice in schools. In E. Elliot & R. M. Gordon (Eds.), *New directions in restorative justice: Issues, practices, evaluation* (pp. 26-52). Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Nash, G. D. (1985). *The American west transformed: The impact of the Second World War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). School Survey on Crime and Safety: 2007–08: Public-use data file codebook. *U.S. Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010334.pdf>
- Newman, K., & Fox, C. (2009). Repeat tragedy: Rampage shootings in American high school and college settings, 2002-2008. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52*(9). 1286–1308. doi: 10.1177/0002764209332546
- Nolan, K. (2011). *Police in the hallways: discipline in an urban high school*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Naymik, M. (2015, March 13). Community policing really matters says retired Cleveland cop once on the frontlines: *Northeast Ohio Media Group*.
- O'Donnell, P. (2016, March 4). Cleveland school ratings are way down - just like statewide (Search ratings here). *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from

[http://www.cleveland.com/metro/index.ssf/2016/03/cleveland\\_school\\_ratings\\_are\\_w.html](http://www.cleveland.com/metro/index.ssf/2016/03/cleveland_school_ratings_are_w.html)

Ohio Department of Education (2012) *Ode emis manual section 2.11: student discipline record (gd)*. Retrieved from

<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/EMIS/EMIS-Documentation/Current-EMIS-Manual/2-11-Student-Discipline-Record-version-1-0.pdf.aspx>

Ohio Department of Education (2013). *Typology of Ohio school districts*. Retrieved from

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/Frequently-Requested-Data/Typology-of-Ohio-School-Districts>

Ohio Department of Education (2014). *Reports home* [data file]. Retrieved from

<http://bireports.education.ohio.gov/PublicDW/asp/Main.aspx?server=edumstrisp02&project=ReportCard&evt=3002&uid=guestILRC&pwd=&persist-mode=%228%22>

Orser, W. E. (1994). *Blockbusting in Baltimore: The Edmondson village story*.

Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Page, C. (1997, January 6). Grass-roots victories in war on crime. *Chicago Tribune*.

Retrieved from [http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1997-01-06/news/9701060121\\_1\\_highly-visible-neighborhood-crime-crimes-many-city-dwellers-lowest-homicide-rate](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1997-01-06/news/9701060121_1_highly-visible-neighborhood-crime-crimes-many-city-dwellers-lowest-homicide-rate)

Peak, B. J. (2015). Militarization of School Police: One Route on the School-to-Prison

Pipeline. *Arkansas Law Review (1968-Present)*, 68(1), 195-229.

- Pelzer, C. J. (2015). Ohio moves toward tougher police training standards. *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Retrieved from [http://www.cleveland.com/open/index.ssf/2015/12/ohio\\_moves\\_toward](http://www.cleveland.com/open/index.ssf/2015/12/ohio_moves_toward)
- Rice, S. (2009). Education for toleration in an era of zero tolerance school policies: A Deweyan analysis. *Educational Studies*, 45(6), 556–571. doi: 10.1080/00131940903338308
- Riner, S. (1999) The school: good grades, good teams and some bad feelings. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://partners.nytimes.com/library/national/042299colo-school-columbine.html>
- Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the social Construction of "broken windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(4), 319-342.
- School Resource Officer Law & Legal Definition. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://definitions.uslegal.com/s/school-resource-officer/>
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: implications for politics and policy. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334–347. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2939044>
- Schreck, C. J., Miller, J. M., & Gibson, C. L. (2003). Trouble in the school yard: a study of the risk factors of victimization at school. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(3), 460-484.
- Shakrani, S., & Michigan State Univ., E. E. (2008). A Big Idea: Smaller High Schools. *Education Policy Center*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

- Sherman, L. W. (2003). Reason for emotion: reinventing justice with theories, innovations, and research - The American society of criminology 2002 Presidential Address. *Criminology*, *41*, 1-37.
- Skiba, R. L., & Peterson, R. L. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan* *80*(5), 372–382.
- Smith, S. M. (2011). Creating safe learning environments for at-risk students in urban schools. *Clearing House*, *84*(4), 123-126. doi:10.1080/00098655.2011.564970
- Smith, D. L., Smith, B.J. (2006). *Perceptions of violence: the views of teachers who left urban schools*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) (n.d.). *Overview*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/>
- Swain, A., & Noblit, G. (2011). Education in a punitive society: An introduction. *Urban Review*, *43*, 465–475. doi:10.1007/s11256-011-0186-x
- Szalavitz, M. (2011). *Study: Whites more likely to abuse drugs than blacks*. Retrieved from <http://healthland.time.com/2011/11/07/study-whites-more-likely-to-abuse-drugs-than-blacks/>
- Taras, H. L., Frankowski, B. L., McGrath, J. W., Mear, C. J. Murray, R. D., & Young, T. L. (2003). Out of school suspension and expulsion. *Pediatrics*, *112*, 1206-1209.
- Teske, S. (2011). A study of zero tolerance policies in schools: A multi-integrated systems approach to improve outcomes for adolescents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, *24*(2). 88–97.



- Theriot, M. T. (2009). School resource officers and the criminalization of student behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 280-287.  
doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.04.008
- Toldson, I. A. (2012). Editor's comment: insecurity at black schools: when metal detectors do more harm than good. *Journal of Negro Education*, 81(4), 303-306.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). *Black or African American alone, percent (V2014) (a)*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/RHI225214/39>
- Weiler, S., & Cray, M. (2011). Police at school: A brief history and current status of school resource officers. *The Clearing House*, 84(4), 160–163. doi: 10.1080/00098655.2011.564986
- Weiss, J. (2007). "Eyes on me regardless": youth responses to high school surveillance. *Educational Foundations*, 21(1/2), 47-69.
- Western, B. (2006). *Punishment and inequality in America*. New York: R. Sage Foundation
- Wiatrowski, M., Griswold, D., & Roberts, M. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 525-541.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Knopf.
- Wilson J. W. (2009). *More than just race: being black and poor in the inner city*. New York: Random House Inc.

- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows: the police and neighborhood safety, *The Atlantic*, retrieved from:  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>
- Yili, X., Fiedler, M. L., & Flaming, K. H. (2005). Discovering the impact of community policing: the broken windows thesis, collective efficacy, and citizens' judgment. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 42(2), 147-186.  
doi:10.1177/0022427804266544
- Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House.