High School Staff and Students' Perceptions of Essential Attributes, Skills, and Job Tasks for an Effective School Resource Officer

Jason S. Farnsworth
B.S.E., University of Central Missouri, 2001
M.A.S.L., Baker University, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

_____
Elizabeth Ann Sanders, Ph.D., Major Advisor

_____
Jim Robins, Ed.D.

_____
Jason Beavers, Ed.D.

Date Defended: September 23, 2015

Abstract

Due to the continuing incidents of school violence, school districts cannot solely focus on educating students, but districts must also create and maintain a safe learning environment for students and staff. One approach to assist in establishing a safe learning environment has been to place school resource officers (SROs) in the schools. A survey was conducted to evaluate high school students' and staff members' perceptions of important attributes, skills, and job tasks that are demonstrated by an effective SRO. The results from this study could assist school districts and police departments to properly screen and appropriately develop the skills of SROs.

Thirteen research questions were used to guide the study and 21 hypotheses were designed for statistical testing. One-sample t tests were conducted to determine factors that students and staff members considered important for an effective SRO, as well as student and staff perceptions of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. Two-sample t tests were conducted to determine if gender influenced student and staff perceptions of important factors for a SRO. One-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to determine if students' grade level, staff members' years of experience, and staff members' age influenced factors they perceived to be important for a SRO.

Test averages indicated that students and staff perceived all factors, identified in this study, as moderately to extremely important, however, results varied between subgroups. Students perceived the overall importance of having a SRO in the building to be very important. Staff members perceived the overall importance of having a SRO in the building to be very to extremely important.

Dedication

To Krista and Cody – You two provide daily reminders of why we are here and what is important. I am so proud to be your dad and I love you both more than I will ever be able to tell you.

To Sara – my best friend, my wife, and the mother of my children. Thank you for your patience, understanding, and for putting up with me throughout this process. I could not have done this without you. I love you.

In memory of my Grandma D and Aunt Prissy – two ladies who always asked about my "schooling."

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

Traditionally, public schools have often been viewed as safe havens for children.

Students attend school with the intent to learn while in a setting they believe to be secure.

However, schools are not immune to violent acts. In Littleton, Colorado, on April 20,

1999, 12 students and one teacher were killed during a school shooting at Columbine

High School (*Timeline of School Shootings*, 2008). On news stations throughout the

world, numerous images were played continuously, 911 phone calls were replayed, and

interviews with Columbine survivors left unimaginable images engrained in the minds of

children and adults. Six years later, an unarmed security officer, a teacher, and five

students were killed on March 21, 2005 at Red Lake High School in Minnesota (*Timeline

of School Shootings*, 2008). More recently, at Sandy Hook Elementary, in Newtown,

Connecticut, 20 students and six adults were killed in a school shooting (*Sandy Hook

Elementary*, n.d.). Incidents such as these have greatly emphasized the need for schools

to reevaluate current safety practices and procedures.

In response to the violent acts taking place in schools, it is not uncommon to have

school resource officers (SROs) being placed in schools and becoming valuable members

of the school staff. Basically, the SRO concept allows school districts and law

enforcement agencies to form a partnership. This partnership places a uniformed officer

in the schools. The SRO, serving as a resource for students and staff members, acts as a

teacher, counselor, and law enforcement officer within the school setting, with the

objective of creating a safer learning environment. Placing law officers in school

buildings is not a new concept. The first SRO in a school dates back to the 1950s in

Flint, Michigan (Girouard, 2001). For over 60 years SRO programs have been

implemented throughout the nation as more officers continue to be placed in schools.

In her article, "Security and the SRO," Susan Black (2009) stated that in January

2009 there were over 17,000 police officers patrolling schools throughout the nation.

SROs can assist school administration and staff in creating and maintaining a safe school

climate. Because SROs are perceived to be valued members of the school staff, with the

ultimate goal of creating a safer learning environment, it is vital that the school and

cooperating police department place the right person in the position of an SRO (Finn,

Shively, McDevitt, Lassiter, & Rich, 2005, p. 43).

Background

Harrisonville High School was selected because of the researcher's affiliation

with the Harrisonville Cass R9 School District. The school district is located in Cass

County, Missouri about thirty miles south of Kansas City. The district is comprised of an

early childhood center, two elementary schools, a middle school, a high school, an

alternative school, and a career center. According to Missouri's Department of

Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), at the time of the study there were 2, 576

students enrolled in the district. Ninety-five percent of the students were white. There

were 37.1% of the district's students that were eligible for free and reduced lunch and the

average daily attendance rate was 85%. Teachers in the district had an average of 11.5

years of experience and 41.1% have earned advanced degrees (Missouri Department of

Elementary and Secondary Education, n.d.).

According to DESE at the time of the study, Harrisonville High School had 892

students enrolled with 95.5% being white. Free and reduced lunch students made up

28.6% of the population. The attendance rate for the high school was 92%. The average

experience for a teacher in the high school was 12 years and 57.1% of the teachers held a

masters degree or higher. There were 23 severe discipline incidents reported during the

2010-2011 school year: alcohol (1), drug (15), violent act (3), weapon (1), and other (3).

These incidents were responsible for 23 out-of-school suspensions; seven of which were

for 10 days and 16 were for longer than 10 days. The high school had an 85.3%

graduation rate for the 2010-2011 school year (Missouri Department of Elementary and

Secondary Education, n.d.).

  The Harrisonville School District employs two full time school resource officers.

The SROs are stationed at the middle school and the high school, but they also serve the

five other schools in the district. Harrisonville School District's Secretary to the

Superintendent, Susan Brooker, stated the district implemented the SRO position in

October 1998 and the program has operated continuously since its implementation.

Brooker also stated the school district pays the city for the use of the officers (personal

communication, February 9, 2015).

Statement of the Problem

  Students attend school to obtain knowledge, which will lead to them becoming

productive citizens. However, in order for optimal learning to take place, students and

staff must feel comfortable in the learning environment. According to the National

Center for Educational Statistics (2012), there were 1,246,000 victims, ages 12-18,

involved in non-fatal crimes while at school during 2011. Because of violent attacks and

illegal acts taking place on school campuses, school districts continue to examine ways to

establish learning environments that are safe for their students and staff.

In order for staff and students to achieve their highest potential, school districts are tasked with establishing and maintaining a safe and positive learning environment. One way to assist in this endeavor is to employ full-time police officers as staff members. Having a uniformed officer at a school can provide immediate assistance should a circumstance arise. However, simply placing a uniformed officer in the building does not necessarily ensure a safer environment (May, Cordner, & Fessel, 2004). All stakeholders (e.g., staff, parents, students, community) must be aware of the role the officer plays within the school setting.

The role of a school resource officer is not limited to dealing only with school crime and violence. Too often, school resource officers are not allowed to reach their potential because they are viewed as only law officials that can be utilized to make an arrest. However, the school resource officer can serve the school in numerous capacities. According to McDaniel (2001), at a national SRO conference, school resource officers were surveyed to better understand the role of an SRO. An analysis of the survey results indicated that SROs spend an average of 20% of their time as teachers/administrators, 30% as counselors, and 50% as law enforcers (2001).

In addition to understanding how SROs spend their time, it is also crucial that school administration and the cooperating police department fully consider what staff and students perceive as essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an SRO. Taking into consideration the perceptions of staff and students and comparing those with the established SRO role will allow school and police administrators to place an officer in the school that is the best fit (socially, emotionally, and professionally) for the position. Placing the right officer in the job will allow for more productive interactions with

students and staff (Missouri School Resource Officer's Association, n.d.), and ultimately, create a safer learning environment.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to gather, analyze, and evaluate what staff members and students perceived as important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer. Demographics were analyzed (gender and grade level for students and age, gender, and years of experience for staff) to see if they had any impact on the attributes, skills, and job tasks perceived as important for an effective SRO. Students' and staff members' perceptions of the overall importance of having a SRO were also evaluated.

Significance of the Study

In an effort to create safe and orderly learning environments, more than 40 states have implemented SRO programs (Missouri School Resource Officer's Association, n.d.). With the SRO program continuing to gain momentum, it is crucial that school districts and law enforcement agencies strive to place the most appropriate officer in the SRO position. Dickerson (2005) found that school leaders need to be cognizant of the fact that not just any police officer will be the right fit for the SRO position. To assist in the proper placement, it is vital to consider what staff and students perceive to be the most important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an SRO. The results of this study add to the body of research regarding SROs and could be used to assist in the placement and professional development of school resource officers.

Delimitations

Delimitations within this study are as follows:

1. Staff members from only one high school were surveyed.

2. Students from only one high school were surveyed.

3. Staff members had one opportunity to complete the survey (during a staff meeting on October 15, 2010).

4. Students had one opportunity to complete the survey (during study lab on October 18, 2010).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. Participants understood the survey questions.

2. Participants were candid in their responses.

3. Data collected in October 2010 remains relevant and representative.

Research Questions

Thirteen research questions guided the research process. The intent of the research was to address the following questions:

1. What do high school students perceive as important attributes for a school resource officer?

2. What do high school students perceive as important skills for a school resource officer?

3. What do high school students perceive as important job tasks for a school resource officer?

4. What do high school staff members perceive as important attributes for a school resource officer?

5. What do high school staff members perceive as important skills for a school resource officer?

6. What do high school staff members perceive as important job tasks for a school resource officer?

7. To what extent do high school students' grade levels influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

8. To what extent does high school students' gender influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

9. To what extent do high school staff members' years of experience influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

10. To what extent do staff members' ages influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

11. To what extent does staff members' gender influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

12. To what extent do students feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

13. To what extent do staff members feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

Definition of Terms

Staff members. Staff members include all employed members of the high school and are divided into two categories: certified or "professional" (e.g., teachers, counselors, and administrators) and classified or "support staff" (e.g., paraprofessionals, maintenance

staff, food services staff, administrative assistants, nurses, and school resource officers).

Certified staff members have earned a minimum of a Bachelor's degree. Classified staff

members may have earned a post-secondary degree/certification (nurses and school

resource officers), may have earned some college credits (paraprofessionals), but do not

have to have completed a degree or certification program (Missouri School Boards',

2013).

      School resource officer. A school resource officer is an officer who works full

time in a school (Missouri School Resource Officer's Association, n.d.) and who serves in

a variety of capacities in being the liaison between schools and the community (Girouard,

2001).

      Attribute. An essential characteristic of a person that sets him/her apart from

others (Lambert, 2000).

      Skill. An ability that is derived through practice and training (Lambert, 2000).

      Job task. An assignment or specific duty (Lambert, 2000).

      Bullying. Hinduja and Patchin (2009) defined bullying as ongoing harassment

that can be physical or verbal and is often associated with adolescents performing these

behaviors at school (p. 185). The Harrisonville School District Board of Education

Policy JFCF defined bullying as one party harassing or intimidating another party

(Missouri School Boards', 2006).

Overview of Methodology

      This quantitative research was conducted utilizing a survey. The population

included the staff and students of Harrisonville High School during the 2010-2011 school

year. The survey was offered to staff and student participants. Purposive sampling was

used for this study and the students and staff from Harrisonville High School were selected because of the researcher's affiliation and interest in the school. Data for this study was collected in October 2010. One-sample t tests, two-sample t tests, and one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to address the 13 research questions.

Organization of the Study

Chapter one included an introduction and the rationale for the study. Also within Chapter one, the research questions were identified, terms were defined, and an overview of the methodology was presented. Chapter two presents a review of literature, which includes a theoretical foundation for the study and includes a history of school violence, laws and practices established to decrease school violence, a history of the SRO program and perceptions of the SRO. Chapter three presents the methodology utilized in conducting the study and includes research design and collection procedures. Chapter three also presents research questions and hypotheses, data analysis of the gathered information and limitations imposed during the study. Chapter four presents the results of the hypotheses tests and references to data tables. In conclusion, Chapter five includes a summary, discussion of findings, conclusions, and implications for further action.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Prior to focusing on educating a student, a school must first ensure that the environment is conducive to learning. Creating and maintaining a safe school environment is an ongoing challenge and a process that must be continuously evaluated and modified. The school resource officer plays a pivotal role in creating a safer school environment by limiting disruptions (Canady, James, & Nease, 2012, p. 7).

The review of literature begins with a brief overview of theoretical foundations, including how safety is a psychological need that can influence student achievement. The review of literature then presents an overview of school violence. This overview includes a discussion of school violence events as well as current statistics on school violence. The school factors/programs section addresses school safety policies and intervention programs currently utilized, including a discussion of the Safe Schools Act of 2000, current debates and legislation involving arming educators, crisis plans, character education, conflict mediation, bullying prevention, the importance of a positive school climate, Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and the transition to the SRO program. Next, the review of literature focuses on the development of a school resource officer program, including a discussion of role definitions and statistics regarding the SRO. Lastly, the literature review provides the perceptions of administration, staff, and students regarding the role of an SRO in the school setting.

Need for Safety

In order for learning and achievement to take place, the school must create and maintain a safe learning environment. Though common sense would dictate that students

would not work as effectively if they do not feel safe, this idea is also supported by psychologist Abraham Maslow, who developed a theory based on the hierarchy of needs. Maslow indicated safety and security as the second most important need (the first need being physiological – the need for air, food, water, etc.) and self-actualization as the fifth and final level (Maslow, 1968, p. 3). In this hierarchy, the needs build on each other, and one need must be fulfilled before the next need can be attained. Following this theory, students must feel safe in their learning environment before they can ever reach the pinnacle of the hierarchy, which includes growth and achievement. Maslow also noted that children typically prefer an orderly environment free from unexpected and dangerous events (Maslow, 1943, p. 376).

Whereas it is crucial for students to feel safe before they can be expected to reach their potential, the same applies to teachers as well. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) stated that a school has a safe and orderly environment when staff and students feel they are safe from psychological and physical threats (p. 88). In order to maximize the potential of both students and staff, it is crucial to provide a safe environment, which may also reduce teacher stress and job burnout. Similarly, Klassen (2010) reported that an increase in job satisfaction can lead to stability in the workforce (p. 349). This stability would potentially impact student learning as teacher turnover has a significantly negative impact on academic achievement (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2012, p. 22).

School Violence

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2011) defined school violence as a form of youth violence, performed by people between the ages of 10 and 24 using physical force, with the intent of causing psychological or physical harm ("What Is

School Violence?" section, para. 1). The CDC (2011) included "bullying, fighting, weapon use, electronic aggression, and gang violence" as examples of violent behavior ("Examples of Violent Behavior" section, para. 1). The CDC also clarified that for a violent episode to be considered school violence it can occur on the way to or from school or a school sponsored event or it may occur on school property ("Examples of Violent Behavior" section, para. 2).

A study by The National Center for Children Exposed to Violence (2006) indicated that incidents of school violence could include a variety of physical and emotional harassment, including but not limited to assault, threats, vandalism, and gangs (para. 1). The same study also suggested that students who fall victim to school crimes might suffer psychological issues including retaliation and suicide (National Center for Children Exposed to Violence, 2006, para. 3).

The following subsections focus on areas of school violence. First, the School Bombings subsection focuses on two documented cases involving bombs in schools. Second, the School Shootings subsection discusses school shootings that have transpired in American schools over the past few decades. Third, the Bullying subsection focuses on an issue currently escalating in schools, bullying—in particular, cyber-bullying.

School Bombings. School violence has not been a trend limited to the past few decades. One of the first documented cases of the twentieth century took place in Bath, Michigan, in 1927 and involved a local farmer who, disgruntled about his tax dollars being used to build a new school, strategically placed explosives throughout the school building over the course of a few months. One morning in May, as the school day began,

the explosives were detonated, killing 40 people (38 students and two teachers) and injuring over 50 others (Orr, 2003, p. 12).

Over 30 years later, in September 1959, another explosion occurred at an elementary school in Houston, Texas, when a father, unhappy about his son's placement in a certain school, went to the building with a suitcase full of dynamite. When the suitcase exploded on the playground, 19 were injured and six people were killed, including the father and his seven-year-old son (Orr, 2003, p. 13).

School Shootings. The events in Michigan and Texas illustrate that violent attacks on schools are not always carried out by students. However, in documented cases from the late 1970s through the present day, students are responsible for the majority of the incidents. Whereas bombs were used in some of the earlier documented situations of school violence, firearms have been used in more recent events. For example, in January 1979, Brenda Spencer, sixteen years old and also the first documented female shooter, used a 22-caliber gun she received as a Christmas present to shoot at an elementary school located across from her house. The incident lasted six hours, resulting in eight children and a police officer wounded and two people dead (Chalmers, 2009, pp. 10-11).

Although during the 1980s the number of incidents in schools was relatively stagnant, during the 1990s, incidents escalated with numerous school shootings. During the 16 months from February 19, 1997, through June 15, 1998, seven major school shooting incidents transpired, resulting in the deaths of 18 people, including 13 students, two staff members, and three parents, and the wounding of 51others (Orr, 2003, pp. 14-15).

The year 1999 produced four major school shooting events, including the April 20 attack on Columbine High School when students Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris killed 13 people (12 students and one teacher) and wounded 23 others, before committing suicide themselves (Thomas, 2006, p. 4). This attack on Columbine resulted in a nation that was "convulsed into fits of self-reflection and finger-pointing" (Larkin, 2007, p. 9). In fact, Klebold and Harris hoped their "act would generate a massive revolt" and their hopes were somewhat realized in that, within a month of the Columbine shootings, three separate school shootings transpired, including four boys charged with planning a similar attack on their own middle school in Michigan (Larkin, 2007, p. 9). As a result, school districts and police departments across the nation began to reevaluate policies and overhaul procedures to ensure an incident like Columbine would not happen in their community.

Although Columbine caused school districts, police departments, and lawmakers throughout the country to try to be more proactive in addressing school violence, Columbine was, unfortunately, not the last school shooting. In one such event, in Red Lake, Minnesota, in March 2005, a 16-year-old shot and killed a teacher, a school resource officer, and five students before committing suicide. In January 2011 in Omaha, Nebraska, a high school student, after being suspended, returned to the school, shooting and killing an assistant principal, wounding the principal, and then leaving the campus and killing himself (Welch, 2011). More recently, on December 14, 2012, at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, 20 students and six adults were shot and killed ("Sandy Hook Elementary Shooting: What Happened?," n.d.).

Though school shootings are not an everyday occurrence, other victimizations take place in the school setting. Using information compiled for the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), Robers, Kemp, Rathbun, Morgan, and Snyder reported that there were 1,364,900 nonfatal victimizations, at school, among students 12-18 years old (2014, p.10). Further data compiled for the National Center for Education Statistics (2013) also indicated that more students suffered victimizations of violent crimes and theft at school than away from school.

Bullying. Another type of school violence that is often linked to the root of numerous school shootings is bullying. In *Bullying Beyond the Schoolyard: Prevention and Responding to Cyberbullying,* Hinduja and Patchin (2009) defined bullying as harassment repeatedly directed by one person toward one or more and is a term usually used to refer to a young person's behavior at or near school (p. 185). At first glance, bullying may not seem as severe as other school violence incidents. However, the amount of bullying that transpires in schools is escalating (Orr, 2003, p. 53), and the victims of bullying often retaliate. These acts of retaliation are the victim's chance to reverse the roles and have power over those who have been controlling them (p. 53).

Furthermore, a report published by the National Center for Education Statistics (2013) indicated that in 2011, 28% of students between 12-18 years-old were bullied at school and that 9% of students between 12-18 years-old were cyber-bullied (Robers et al., 2014, p. 46). John Cloud (2010) stated that since the 1999 Columbine tragedy, laws against bullying have been passed by at least 42 states (p. 60). He also indicated that bullying has become such an issue that President Obama requested a 12% funding increase for anti-bullying programs (p. 62). In addition, a study of ninth through twelfth

grade students, generated in 2013 by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention indicated that 19.6% of the sampled youth reported being bullied on school property (Kann et al., 2013). In comparing the NCES and the CDC studies it would appear that high school youth are more apt to be bullied on school property.

One factor that has made bullying such a pressing issue is that bullying has changed over the past few decades. Whereas bullying used to be visualized as some student in school that coerced other students to forfeit their lunch money, bullying has evolved into a nationwide epidemic in the form of cyberbullying, which Hinduja and Patchin (2009) defined as "intentional and repeated harm inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices" (p. 185). With these advances in technology, students can now bully other students more quickly and repeatedly. For example, within seconds, a student can send an inappropriate text message to another student, make unflattering comments on a *Facebook* page, or send a provocative photo for hundreds of other students to view.

Considering the on-going issues of school violence, it makes sense to examine what lawmakers and public education systems have developed to reduce the number of incidents. The next section of the literature review is twofold: First, the literature section examines what laws and policies have been created in an attempt to decrease the incidents of school violence; next, the literature review focuses on what steps schools have taken and what programs schools have developed to assist in reducing the number of school violence events.

Laws in Response to School Violence

The Gun-Free School Act (GFSA), a major law enacted in October 1994 in an attempt to reduce the number of firearms being brought into public schools, required any school that received money from the federal government to adopt a policy that any student who brought a weapon to school would be expelled for at least one year (Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, n.d.).

To coincide with the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994, school districts throughout the nation have implemented zero-tolerance policies. These policies vary from district to district. The policies, created in an attempt to reduce violence, address a variety of infractions from firearms and weapons to drugs and alcohol.

While the overall intent of these policies is to provide a safe environment for student learning, they draw some opposing concerns. For example, opponents claim that publicizing a school as a gun-free zone may imply the impression that the community has a "gun violence problem" (*Strategy: Gun-Free School Zones*, 2014). Another concern from opponents is that expelling students who are found with guns in the school only removes those students from their educational opportunity, giving them more free time in the community (*Strategy: Gun-Free School Zones*, 2014).

Though studies have been inconclusive as to whether or not zero policies are effective, recent studies show that even with the GFSA and zero-tolerance policies, weapons in schools are still a daily occurrence. For instance, a report published in November 2009, for the U.S. Department of Education, stated that during the 1998-1999 school year, 3,477 students received disciplinary action, including expulsion, for bringing a firearm to school property. That number dropped during the 2002-2003 school year to

2,143, but then increased to 2,695 expulsions during the 2006-2007 school year

(Evaluation, Management and Training Associates & ICF Macro International, 2009).

While the number of expulsions during the 2006-2007 school year was significantly

lower than the number during the 1998-1999 school year, the overall number of

expulsions remained consistent. Similarly, a report on youth violence published by the

CDC (2010) stated that in a 2009 representative national sample of high school students,

grades 9-12, that 17.5% reported bringing a weapon (e.g., gun, knife, or club) to school

on one or more days in the 30 days preceding the survey and that 5.9% carried a gun on

one or more days in that same timeframe. These numbers indicate that weapons in

schools are still an issue and detrimental to a safe learning environment; therefore,

signifying the importance of placing an effective SRO in the school, particularly as the

training an SRO undergoes allows for weapons to be safely confiscated, thus ensuring a

safer environment for students and staff (Canady et al., 2012, p. 24).

In addition to the GFSA and zero-tolerance policies, some states are now

considering arming administrators and teachers in an attempt to create safe learning

environments. In particular, the recent school shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary

School have some lawmakers considering arming educators in schools. Some states have

already passed or have started legislation that could allow for educators to carry firearms

to work. In March 2013 South Dakota enacted a law that allows school employees to

carry guns to work (Eligon, 2013b). However, South Dakota is not the first state to allow

for such provisions. For example, Hawaii and New Hampshire do not prohibit those with

concealed carry permits from having weapons on school property. Also, teachers in Utah

do not have to disclose that they are carrying guns, and schools in Texas can authorize

people to carry guns (Eligon, 2013b). Similarly, Arkansas allows armed security guards on school grounds. In response to the Sandy Hook school shooting, the Clarksville Arkansas School District armed more than 20 school employees, including teachers and administrators. Those employees permitted by law to carry guns have gone through 53 hours of training, allowing them to earn a "guard" status and, thus, under Arkansas law, able to carry concealed weapons (DeMillio, 2013).

Allowing school personnel to carry guns is also gaining momentum in Missouri. In the spring of 2013, outside of West Plains, Missouri, the school board at Fairview School authorized some school employees to participate in a 40-hour training course, which, upon completion, permitted the employees to carry guns on school property (Eligon, 2013a). Also in the spring of 2013, the Missouri Senate voted 26-6 to allow designated school personnel to carry concealed guns on school grounds (*Missouri Senate OKs*, 2013). Missouri Governor Jay Nixon vetoed this bill; however, the Missouri Legislature voted to override the Governor's veto on September 10, 2014 (SB656 – Modifies Provisions Relating to Firearms and Corporate Security Advisors," n.d.). Though Governor Nixon vetoed SB 656, he did sign HCS SB 75, which allows gun safety to be taught to first graders. This act also provides school personnel with active shooter and intruder response training that focuses on how to address staff and students with information about a potential situation and also how to address an intruder/shooter (*Missouri Senate Bill*, 2013).

In contrast, although lawmakers in some states are paving the way for educators to carry guns, the movement has been met with some opposition. For example, one week after the Sandy Hook Elementary shootings, the National Association of School Resource

Officers (NASRO) issued a statement declaring that the only person allowed to carry a gun on school property should be a fully trained officer (NASRO, 2012). To further understand how educators felt about carrying a gun in school, in January 2013 (the month following the Sandy Hook shootings), the School Improvement Network conducted a nationwide survey of 10,661 educators with 72.4% of those surveyed indicating that, if allowed, they would still be unlikely to carry a firearm to school (*Guns and School Safety Survey Results*, 2013). Based on the aforementioned cases, it seems highly unlikely that there will ever be a consensus about educators carrying guns in school.

The next section of the literature review explores factors that can contribute to a safe learning environment. Educational programming that school districts have implemented to assist in preventing school violence will be presented. Crisis plans and active shooter plans will also be presented.

Positive School Climate

The first goal for an educator is to establish and maintain a safe and positive learning environment; only after doing so can the focus then shift to student learning. To accomplish this goal, educators must build positive relationships with the students in order for students to feel more comfortable sharing information with authority figures. Pollack, Modzeleski, and Rooney (2008), indicated that school climate was an influencing factor in whether or not bystanders felt comfortable sharing information with staff members. The report stated that students who did come forward with information regarding potential threats did so because they had positive relationships with adults in the building and knew their report would be acted upon appropriately (Pollack et al., 2008, p. 7). In contrast, students who did not have positive relationships with adults in

the building did not voluntarily come forward because "they anticipated a negative response from the school" (Pollack et al., 2008, p. 7). Specifically, the report cited an incident where there was a weapon on school property and a student was aware but did not inform anyone because he did not want to get interrogated (Pollack et al., 2008, p. 7). This student's concern illustrates the importance of building positive relationships with students in order to create a positive school climate. Similarly, a report published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (n.d.) concurred with the importance of a positive climate and encouraged schools to establish a climate conducive to open communication in order to address potential threats (p. 5). Also, staff members are encouraged to ask students to report all threats of violence. Creating an environment that fosters open communication between students and staff will allow students to feel more comfortable in sharing knowledge with adults in the building, thus, potentially reducing the number of violent incidents in a school.

Character Education. To assist in creating and maintaining a positive school climate, school districts throughout the nation are implementing character education programs. These programs are a way to help students build and develop character traits that will benefit them as adults and further the aims of a democratic society (Cooperating School Districts, 2007, p. 3). While initiated by the school district, the success of the character education program depends on how well it can be ingrained throughout an entire community as stakeholders come together to identify and define character traits. Once identified, those traits are then incorporated into the district's curriculum and various community events and projects.

The philosophy behind character education programs is to instill positive values. One example of a character education program is CHARACTER *plus,* which was developed in 1988 by a group of parents, educators, and business leaders who thought something needed to be done about the deterioration of core values in students. This program, which is currently used by more than 745 schools and 400,000 students, assists in creating a positive school climate in that the program not only addresses the development of core values, but also addresses numerous issues, including "student absenteeism, discipline problems, drug abuse, gang violence, teen pregnancy, and poor academic performance" (Cooperating School Districts, 2007, p. 3).

Conflict Mediation. Another way schools are establishing a positive climate is through empowering students to deal with personal and social issues with the assistance of a mediator. Conflict mediation programs encourage students to resolve conflict in a peaceful manner and "attempt to create win-win situations" (International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d., p. 8). In the *Guide for Preventing and Responding to School Violence*, the International Association of Chiefs of Police suggested that peer mediation can be successful in working through some issues, but does not solve all problems, such as serious or persistent delinquency problems (International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d.). Sampson (2009) stated that, while a number of schools have implemented conflict mediation to address bullying and other issues, the approach, because of inadequate training, is not always successful in addressing and solving the problems (pp. 24-25). For example, Sellman (2011) found that in order for conflict mediation to be successful it must be a "clear and consistent means" that is "modeled by all teachers" (p. 58). Mediation has not been as successful in schools where students distrust the process.

In addition, Theberge and Karan (2004) suggested that some students were not comfortable with the process because they felt the mediators might laugh at them or take sides (p. 284). Although the program allows schools another resource to assist in addressing problematic behavior in schools by having students sit down face to face and work through an issue, research on conflict mediation is currently inconclusive.

Bullying Prevention. One issue that tends to draw a great deal of attention is bullying. Bullying is not a new concept; the first academic study focused on bullying was published in 1887 by a Norwegian social scientist, F. L. Burke (as cited in Billitteri, 2010). However, during the 1990s, bullying changed from the simple act of one student threatening another student for his/her milk money into harming another person via computers and cell phones (i.e., cyberbullying). The increasing popularity of social networking sites has contributed to the increase of cyberbullying (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009, p. 76).

In 2006, the suicide of a Missouri teenager, who allegedly was the victim of cyberbullying, prompted more stringent laws on Internet harassment. Missouri Revised Statute 160.775 (2009) required every district to implement an anti-bullying policy that must treat all students equally, reference consequences for bullying, require all teachers to report any knowledge of bullying, and address staff training regarding bullying (Hazelden Foundation, 2009). At the same time, Missouri is not the only state to implement laws to address bullying. According to Thomas Billitteri (2010), 43 states and the District of Columbia have passed anti-bullying laws because of the ongoing abuse, often leading to teen suicides (p. 4).

Limber (2003) stated that schools are implementing various approaches to address the issue of bullying, including awareness-raising efforts (e.g., assemblies, parent meetings, teacher training), reporting and tracking (e.g., documenting events), school exclusion, therapeutic treatment for bullies (e.g., counseling), mediation and conflict resolution, curricular approaches, and comprehensive approaches. Although all programs have merit, Limber suggested the comprehensive approach is the most effective for changing behaviors and curtailing bullying in schools (p. 23). Components of the comprehensive approach include a focus on prevention and intervention of bullying, an address of the norms and climate of a building, a plan for schools working together as a community, the role of adults taking the lead with student bystanders also playing a pivotal role, a long-term commitment by all, and activities aligned with other programs the school is utilizing.

Crisis Plans

Another resource schools have generated to create and maintain a safe and positive learning environment is the crisis plan, which can cover a myriad of events from severe weather to active shooters. For the most part, the plans are developed by school administration and local community groups, including the police and fire departments (*Practical Information on Crisis Planning,* 2003, p. 10). In order to maintain a safe climate, it is essential that responses to a variety of crises should be considered, practiced, and revised periodically (International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d., p. 20). The Department of Safe and Drug Free Schools notes that crisis plans must be tailored for each individual school and that crisis plans are never finished, but require continuous

modification and development depending on experience, research, and current

vulnerabilities (*Practical Information on Crisis Planning,* 2003, p. 7).

A.L.I.C.E.

Some school districts have started rethinking the traditional approach to

responding to active shooters. In particular, with the assistance of law enforcement (e.g.,

school resource officers) and school administration, some schools are now practicing

active shooter drills by implementing a program called A.L.I.C.E., an acronym that

stands for Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, and Evacuate (*ALICE: How to Respond*,

2014). Developed by a company entitled Response Options, which was founded by Greg

Crane, a law enforcement officer, the program focuses on the importance of students and

staff working with law enforcement during a crisis. After reviewing details from school

shootings and finding that numerous students were simply hiding in place and/or

complying with the active shooter, the program was designed to enhance procedures

currently used by schools during lockdown situations(Response Options Group, 2007, p.

2). While the traditional response taught to deal with an active shooter in public schools

is to lock the door, turn out the lights, and wait for help to arrive, the A.L.I.C.E. program

enhances those lockdown procedures by outlining options, giving students strategies to

consider when responding to an active shooter (*ALICE Components*, 2014). For

example, depending on the scenario, students and staff may evacuate the building and go

to safety or, in the worst-case scenario, they could fight for their lives against the active

shooter. As a part of this process, school resource officers, because of their knowledge of

crisis plans and their relationships with staff and students, are invaluable resources in

teaching staff and students about the A.L.I.C.E. concept.

Though providing students with strategies in the event of an active shooter may seem like a proactive step, there are opponents to this approach. While the supporters of A.L.I.C.E. state that the "counter" component focuses on distracting the shooter (*ALICE Components*, 2014), Kenneth Trump, President of National School Safety and Security Services, argued that the "counter" approach puts staff and students at a greater risk by providing an unrealistic sense of security (Trump, 2013). No matter which philosophy is followed in dealing with an active shooter, current practices indicate that staff and students will receive active shooter training from a law enforcement officer or a SRO.

Numerous programs, laws, and safety approaches have been implemented in schools as a result of dealing with safety issues. Thus far the review of literature has examined a brief history of school violence and what school districts and lawmakers have done in reaction to those events. In a somewhat reactive—but also a potentially proactive—move, the position of a school resource officer is becoming more common in today's schools. The following sections provide information on the SRO position and what literature reveals about the position. Combined, these areas build the case for the purpose of this study, which was to look at staff and student perceptions of attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective SRO with the hopes of using these concepts to place the most effective officer in the SRO position.

School Resource Officer

The concept of placing an officer of the law in a school building has been present for about 60 years (Girouard, 2001). There are a variety of employment agreements with the SRO program. There is a joint agreement in which the school resource officer (SRO) is employed by the local police department and then placed in a designated school. Both

agencies then work together to establish the parameters of the position (Girouard, 2001).

Another approach is to make the SRO a school employee. To gain a better understanding

of the SRO program it is important to understand how it has evolved.

      Historical Development. A law enforcement role that has become a vital

resource for school districts over the past 20 years is the school resource officer (SRO).

The origin of the school resource officer position is often traced back to the 1950s in

Flint, Michigan, when the COPS program took a more active role in the schools

(McDaniel, 2001, p. 4). A police chief in Miami, Florida, is credited with applying the

term "school resource officer" sometime during the early to mid-1960s. Some of the first

school resource officer programs were developed in various Florida school districts

during the 1960s and 1970s (p. 4). Although the 1970s through the early 1990s saw

limited development of the school resource officer program throughout the nation, from

the mid-1990s through present day, the school resource officer program continued to gain

momentum (p. 5). Black (2009) stated that while precise numbers of school resource

officers are elusive, *The New York Times* reported over 17,000 officers patrolling schools.

Also, Black reported that grants from the U.S. Department of Justice's Community

Oriented Policing Services have funded 6,400 school officers.

      The positions of the SRO have been funded by various entities, including: city,

county, and state offices, as well as private businesses (Black, 2009). In other

circumstances, the school district may share costs with the local department. In a

November 2008 report, the Consortium to Prevent School Violence recommended school

districts address sustainability issues and work with local government to make sure the

SRO program would be supported and be allowed to operate efficiently, especially when

short-term grants were used to launch the program (Mayer, 2008). To give the school

resource officer program the highest potential for success, it is crucial to clearly and

concisely define the role of the school resource officer.

      Roles. One of the most detrimental mistakes frequently made in implementing a

school resource officer program is failing to define the roles and responsibilities of the

SRO (Finn et al., 2005, p. 23). Specifically, failing to establish the roles and

responsibilities may lead to persistent problems and/or the overall failure of the program.

Generally, programs that have proved successful develop the SROs' roles and

responsibilities using the following guidelines:

- Identify roles and responsibilities in writing;

- Avoid relying on a personal relationship, easy access, and a handshake between police and school administrators for establishing SRO roles;

- Involve the schools in developing the SRO roles and responsibilities;

- Distribute the list to SROs and to school district and school building administrators and periodically review them;

- Provide a mechanism for resolving disagreements between school administrators and SROs about the officers' responsibilities. (Finn et al., 2005, p. 23)

Being proactive in defining an SRO's roles and responsibilities, prior to placing a school

resource officer in the building, should greatly increase the probability of success and

effectiveness of the program.

      In defining the roles and responsibilities of the SRO, it is also important to note

that the responsibilities of the SRO should supplement the existing staff (Safe Schools

Initiative Division, 2001, p. 2). As an example, The Missouri School Resource Officers

Association (2010) defined job responsibilities for an SRO via the SRO Triad: law

enforcement officer, advisor, and instructor. This triad model represents the areas in

which an SRO will spend his/her time; therefore, the breakdown within each of the triad

areas, designating specific job roles and responsibilities, must be developed, agreed upon,

and written down by the school administration and the police department (Finn et al.,

2005, p. 23). Rosales (2008) stated that being visible should be the SRO's main focus as

this will assist in deterring, preventing, and responding to crime (para. 13). In addition,

Rosales stated that the SRO role may also include advising on legal matters, assisting in

creating a safe school environment, and serving as the liaison between the school and

emergency personnel in the event of a school crisis.

     Black (2009) concurred with Rosales and further defined the role of the SRO,

stating that the SRO may serve in the instructor capacity by being a guest lecturer in a

classroom to discuss law and safety-related topics as well as possibly being a D.A.R.E.

(Drug Abuse Resistance Education) instructor for some districts. Furthermore, Black

stated that the high level of integrity and character that must be constantly displayed to

students adds an additional responsibility as a role model to the SRO triad. The next

subsection presents benefits of the SRO program.

     Benefits. Though the position of a school resource officer is becoming more

commonplace in today's schools, limited evidence is available to indicate whether the

position is effective in reducing school violence (May et al., 2004). Certainly, evidence

available does support the opinion that SROs are effective in creating a safe school

environment (p. 176). In particular, Finn (2006) suggested there are four main benefits,

stating that implementing an SRO program can "reduce the workload of patrol officers or road deputies, improve the image of officers among juveniles, create and maintain better relationships with the schools, and enhance the agency's reputation in the community" (p. 2). In contrast, others have suggested that SRO effectiveness is impeded because neither their roles nor responsibilities are clearly defined and distinguished from the roles of school administrators (Mayer, 2005). As a result, positive relationships among the school resource officer, school personnel, and students are crucial in assuring the effectiveness of a SRO.

Perceptions of the School Resource Officer (Roles and Responsibilities)

Clearly defining the role of the SRO assists in creating a positive and successful partnership between the school and law enforcement. One important aspect in effective placement is to understand how staff and students perceive the role of the SRO. This understanding will assist in cultivating a relationship that is both positive and effective.

Administrators. There are similarities between a law enforcement officer and a school administrator, such as an assistant principal. Both positions require investigative techniques, effective communication, attention to delinquent behavior, and emergency planning and training. However, the main issue at the foundation of the difficulties between SROs and school administrators originates from differences between the cultures of law enforcement and educators (Finn et al., 2005, p. 63). Because of those differences, it is essential that the two entities continuously collaborate in order to successfully coexist. A 2002 study conducted by the North Carolina State Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention revealed that both school administrators and school resource officers indicated that communication was "the key to a good relationship" (p.

5). The same study also stated that on-going communication between school

administration and the SRO "sends a message to the students and staff that the SRO and

administrator work together" (p. 5).

Similarly, research has indicated that school administrators acknowledge the

value of having an SRO in the building. Finn et al. (2005) stated that administrators who

endorse the SRO position cite the following reasons: having another role model in the

building, the added sense of security in dealing with outside threats, including parents,

and having legal resources provided by a SRO (p. 71). Lambert (2000) stated that

administrators want SROs to monitor the school, enforce school rules, and handle legal

issues (p. 145). Though some administrators are a hesitant to employ a full time SRO in

their school (McDaniel, 2001, p. 11), a study conducted by the Center for the Prevention

of School Violence (a division of the North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention) revealed that, out of the surveyed school administrators who

had an SRO on campus for at least part of a school year, the SRO strategy was rated as

being a most effective strategy by almost 62%, with 26% rating the SRO strategy with

the second highest rating (McDaniel, 2001, p. 11) in helping to establish and maintain a

safe school environment. Mayer (2008) suggested that prior to the implementation of an

SRO program, school and law officials must clearly distinguish the roles and

responsibilities for both SROs and school administrators. Clearly defined roles result in a

more effective partnership between the school and local law officials.

Teachers (Staff). Once the roles and expectations have been defined, it is

important that the SRO meet with the school staff to discuss the expected role of the SRO

(North Carolina State Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2002).

Research has indicated the importance of communication between school administration and the school resource officer, as well as the importance of the SRO having a positive working relationship with staff members. Because teachers interact closely with as many as 100-150 students, throughout the course of a day, they create the first line in establishing a safe school and because teachers have more direct contact with students, they may also have more insight into potential threats (International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d.). Therefore, it is significant that the teacher be able to identify issues with a student (e.g., under the influence, domestic issues, safety concerns) and be able to share those with a school resource officer.

The Harrisonville Police Department (2010), in its *Standard Operating Procedures for a School Resource Officers*, stated that the SRO provides training for staff to inform them of current issues, such as alcohol and drug abuse, violence, gangs, and safety and security (para 1) as well as skills relating to diffusing and preventing violence to establish a positive, safe school climate (para 2). In this role, the SRO provides professional development to staff members in order to assist in creating and maintaining a safe school climate. In contrast, a study by Dickerson (2005) found that teachers perceived the role of a SRO as primarily a disciplinarian (p. 89). To further examine influences on teachers' perceptions, a teacher's self-efficacy could be examined.

Self-efficacy is a belief in one's ability to execute behaviors to produce performance results (Bandura, 1977). As teachers gain experience in the profession, it is worth examining if there are factors that influence a teacher's perception of their efficacy. Hoy and Spero (2005) suggested that a teacher's student teaching and first year of experience have a large influence on a teacher's efficacy. Parker (2012) found no

significant difference in levels of teacher efficacy based upon a teacher's experience or age (p. 80). Parker did note that female teachers averaged higher levels of efficacy than male teachers (p. 78). These studies indicate that teacher perceptions may not be influenced by years of experience or age, but by gender.

Students. As with administration and staff, solid relationships formed between the school resource officer and students produce effective results leading to a safer school climate. The SRO can interact with students in a variety of ways, including classroom presentations, supervisions of the student parking lot and hallways, and participation in various school activities. This platform allows the SRO to interact with students and build relationships.

Once the relationships have been established and students feel comfortable, students are more willing to communicate with the SRO. Establishing a rapport with students is crucial so, when a crisis happens, the bond between students and the SRO is already in place, allowing for an issue to be addressed effectively (Rosales, 2011). This rapport also opens the door when students need to discuss or inform the SRO of events that could jeopardize the safety of the school. The data gathered from this study could be used in selecting the right officer for SRO positions in order to make the position as effective as possible. In order to help establish a positive rapport with students, gender perceptions should be taken into consideration.

Gender stereotypes tend to predetermine behaviors often associated with boys and girls. Girls tend to be stereotyped as being more reticent to react to their emotions than their male counterparts. Somech and Elizur (2009) suggest there is an adherence to an honor code in which females are expected to be obedient, while males follow a masculine

honor code, which expects them to be strong and dominant (p. 606). Pollack (2000)

refers to a "Boy Code" in which boys must show power and strength in order to be a

man. Pollack also suggests that boys are constantly trying to prove their masculinity

through aggressive activities (sports), and that society is accepting and encouraging of

these behaviors in boys. Ironically, Pollack also suggests that as boys are becoming more

cognizant of this they are also becoming afraid of being victimized and being labeled as

dangerous just because of their gender (p. 40). These studies suggest that societal views

and expectations tend to reinforce the boy/girl stereotypes.

Summary

The review of literature has provided a chronological history of significant

incidents of school violence. This chapter also focused on policies and programs that

have been enacted to assist in decreasing the amount of violent events in a school. One

program to assist in curbing school violence is the school resource officer program.

Although the literature provides conflicting evidence as to whether or not the SRO

program has been effective, the literature suggests that school administrators value the

role of an SRO. Addressing the effectiveness of the SRO program, the literature also

supports the importance of an SRO being visible and approachable to all stakeholders.

The literature also indicates that, in order for the SRO position to be effective, the role of

an SRO must be clearly defined and continuous communication must take place between

school administration and the SRO. Also, the literature supports the importance of an

SRO building a positive rapport with all stakeholders, especially staff and students. The

literature indicates that an SRO will be more successful if positive relationships are built

and maintained with the school's stakeholders. In order for those relationships to be

created, it is essential that administration be selective in choosing an SRO who will be the right fit for the school. With an understanding of the importance of communication and relationship building, school administration will be better able to effectively select a school resource officer. The literature also presented conflicting evidence addressing whether school violence has increased or decreased. The increase of twenty-first century media access also contributes to this debate. For example, because of the ease of *Facebook* and texting, numerous incidents of threats and bullying go unreported. The importance of clearly identifying the tasks and roles of the school resource officer is evident throughout the literature as an ambiguous understanding of the role of an SRO may contribute to a program being unsuccessful. In order for the SRO position to be most effective, communication between school administration and the SRO must occur and outline the role and job tasks expected prior to implementing the program. Chapter three will address the methodology of this study.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to gather, analyze, and evaluate important

attributes, skills, and job tasks of a school resource officer, as perceived by high school

staff and students. Demographics were analyzed to identify how they influenced

perceptions. Students' gender and grade levels were analyzed. Age, gender, and years of

experience were analyzed for staff members. Students and staff also indicated their

perceptions on the overall importance of having a SRO in the school building. Chapter

three examines the methodology used during this study and focuses on the following:

research design, population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis,

limitations, and a summary.

Research Design

A quantitative survey was conducted for this study. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2005)

stated that quantitative research "is grounded in the assumption that features of the social

environment constitute an objective reality [and the] dominant methodology for studying

these features is to collect numerical data on the observable behavior of samples and

subject them to statistical analysis" (p. 555). The quantitative survey design was chosen

to obtain data from participants who have access to a school resource officer. The

dependent variables were 21 attributes, 17 skills, and 18 job tasks that were evaluated by

staff and students to indicate their perceptions of an effective school resource officer. To

determine perceptions of SRO effectiveness within staff subgroups, the independent

variables of experience in current position, gender, and age were used. The independent

variables used to disaggregate the sample for comparisons between subgroups used for

student perceptions of an effective school resource officer were grade level and gender. Staff and students' perceptions of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building were also analyzed.

Population and Sample

The population for this study included the staff and students of Harrisonville High School during the 2010-2011 school year. The staff sample consisted of 89 staff members at Harrisonville High School. The student sample consisted of 892 students enrolled in grades nine through twelve at Harrisonville High School at the time of the survey.

Sampling Procedures

For this study purposive sampling was used. Purposive sampling is a technique used in which the subjects being investigated are based on the researcher's judgment (*Purposive sampling,* 2012). Harrisonville High School, which is the only high school in the Harrisonville School District, was selected for the study because of the researcher's affiliation with and interest in the school. Staff and students were respectively selected because of their employment and attendance at Harrisonville High School during the 2010-2011 school year.

Instrumentation and Measurement

A survey tool (see Appendix A) developed by Lambert (2000) was utilized for this study. Permission was granted by Lambert to use the survey (see Appendix B). The survey (see Appendices E and H) was divided into three sections. In Section I, which measures perceptions of the important attributes, skills, and abilities for an effective SRO to possess; and in Section II, which measures perceptions of important job tasks for an

effective SRO to perform, participants used a Likert Scale to rate each prompt. The Likert scale consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. Section III collected demographic information from participants.

In Section I of the survey, 21 attributes were listed and participants were asked to indicate the importance of each one using the Likert scale described above. Some of the listed traits/attributes included: enthusiasm, importance of being non-judgmental, reliability, availability when needed, willingness to work with young people, and the importance of being a good role model. Also included in Section I of the survey was a list of 20 skills and abilities pertaining to the role of a SRO, which participants rated using the same Likert scale. The surveyed skills and abilities included: communication, working with school administrators, teaching in the classroom, counseling, conflict resolution, and crisis intervention. Section I also measured perceptions regarding the amount of experience and education a SRO should have, as well as other demographics that included whether the SRO should live in the community, have a strong spiritual foundation, and be respected in the community.

In Section II of the survey, participants were asked to identify the importance of 18 job tasks that are often assigned to school resource officers. Lambert developed the list of 18 tasks by gathering SRO job descriptions and responsibilities, research, and information provided by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, which is a subsection of North Carolina's Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency (Lambert, 2000). Survey participants used the Likert scale Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4

= very important, and 5 = extremely important described above to rate their responses.

Some of the job tasks surveyed included: providing counseling to students regarding law

enforcement issues, consulting with the principal in developing crisis plans, serving as a

resource for teachers, parents, and students, and monitoring halls, parking lots, or other

areas.

 In Section III participants provided demographic information. Lambert's (2000)

survey asked participants to identify the following: position, gender, years of experience

in above position, years of experience working with school security issues, school size,

school location, the part of the state where their school was located, estimated percentage

of students eligible for free/reduced lunch, and to rate, on a scale of one to five, how

important the participant felt it was to have a SRO. The staff and student versions of the

survey used in this study are identical, except for the demographic questions in Section

III.

 With permission from Lambert (see Appendix B) a few modifications within the

demographic section were made to the survey. The addition of marital status (for staff)

and ethnicity, and because only one high school was being surveyed, the deletion of

school size, school location, percentage of students qualified for free/reduced lunch, and

years of experience with school security were made to Lambert's original survey.

Students were asked to provide grade level, gender, and ethnicity. In addition, students

were asked to use the same Likert scale, described above, to rate how important the

student believed it was to have a school resource officer. Staff members were asked to

provide current position (e.g., certified or classified), experience in current position,

gender, age, and marital status. Staff members were also asked to use the Likert scale to rate how important the staff member believed it was to have a school resource officer.

  Validity and reliability. Lambert (2000) took numerous steps during the development of the survey tool to insure validity and reliability. To develop Section I of the survey, Lambert (2000) conducted interviews with school resource officers, school principals, and law enforcement administrators. During the interviews, participants were asked to list necessary characteristics essential for effective resource officers (Lambert, 2000). Feedback was compiled and then organized into categories. Section II of the survey addressed job tasks assigned to a school resource officer which Lambert developed from job descriptions and responsibilities defined by local agencies, research, and the Center for the Prevention of School Violence in Raleigh, North Carolina (2000).

  A preliminary survey was then piloted by the participants who were interviewed and whose responses were used to develop Section I of the survey (Lambert, 2000). The participants included, five SROs, five high school principals, and five law enforcement officials. Included with the survey was an evaluation sheet to solicit feedback regarding the validity of the survey. Suggestions were collected, modifications were made, and the final survey was produced. Lambert (2000) reported that she calculated a Pearson correlation between the pilot and final survey responses for each of the 15 pilot survey respondents. The correlations ranged from .4802 to .9910 ($p < .01$). According to Lambert, these results provided evidence for the reliability of the survey.

Data Collection Procedures

  Data was collected in the fall of 2010. This timing allowed all potential participants to have one school year quarter completed in which to get acclimated to the

school year. This timing also allowed informational materials regarding the survey and

study to be shared during beginning of the year activities (as described below). Though

data was collected prior to IRB approval, a letter addressing why data was collected at

that time was submitted to the IRB committee. The IRB proposal was submitted (see

Appendix C) and the IRB was approved in April 2011 (see Appendix D). Family and

career commitments necessitated the IRB to be renewed per Baker University guidelines.

To begin the data collection process, the researcher met with the building

principal to discuss the possibility of collecting data at the high school. At the same time,

the purpose of the study was identified and the process outlined. The building principal

was informed that all surveys would be completed anonymously and participation would

be voluntary. Permission was granted at the building level and the next step was to meet

with the assistant superintendent. Prior to meeting with the assistant superintendent, the

researcher studied school board documents to ensure the surveys would not violate any

policies. Similar to the meeting with the building principal, the purpose of the study was

identified and the process was outlined for the assistant superintendent. It was decided at

this meeting that staff members choosing to participate in the survey would be allowed

time during a staff meeting. The staff meeting would also allow the researcher to

introduce the student survey to the staff members. The researcher also assured the

assistant superintendent that steps would be taken to inform parents and guardians of the

upcoming student survey.

To inform parents and guardians of the upcoming survey opportunity, an

informational table was set up at District Residency Verification nights on August 5 and

August 10, 2010. To fulfill district requirements, students and their parents/guardians

must attend one of those nights to verify residency, pick up schedules, and update

miscellaneous information regarding the upcoming school year. Next to the high school

section, a table was set up to display informational materials for the upcoming survey.

The informational materials included: a letter explaining the survey and a sample student

survey (see Appendix E), opt-out letters (see Appendix F), and the researcher's contact

information. The researcher was also available during this time to address any questions

from the parents/guardians. Although several parents/guardians had questions about the

study and the survey, no parent/guardian chose to opt-out a student.

The same informational letter and sample survey were posted on the high school's

website from August 5 through August 27, 2010. Parents/guardians were asked to

respond by August 27, 2010, if they wished to opt-out their students, but no requests were

submitted. An informational table was set up again at the high school's open house on

August 17, 2010. The researcher was again available to address any questions.

The final attempt to ensure every parent/guardian was informed of the survey was

made on August 25, 2010. At that time, the researcher utilized the school district's

School Reach phone service to send out a recorded message (see Appendix G) to every

high school student's parent/guardian informing patrons of the study and the opportunity

for students to complete a survey. The message also stated that parents/guardians had the

right to opt-out their students and included the researcher's contact information. By the

end of the deadline date of August 27, 2010, no parents/guardians had chosen to opt-out

their students from the survey.

A hard copy of the survey, with a cover letter, was distributed to Harrisonville

High School's students (see Appendix E) and staff (see Appendix H). Staff members

were given the opportunity to complete the survey during a staff meeting on October 15, 2010, during which time the researcher informed the staff members of the upcoming student survey and that the survey would be available to all students during the study lab period on October 18, 2010. Staff members were asked to distribute the survey to interested students. Staff members were informed that students were not obligated to complete a survey and that the surveys were to be completed anonymously. All surveys were placed in an envelope and picked up at the end of the study lab period. The researcher then addressed any questions about the upcoming survey. Staff surveys were then made available to anyone interested and returned to a designated envelope.

On October 18, 2010, interested students completed the survey, which took about 15 minutes. While no students were penalized for not participating in the survey, in order for the researcher to achieve a higher response rate, students who did complete the survey were issued a two part raffle ticket and entered into a drawing for the chance to win one of four twenty-five dollar gift cards to Walmart.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Data collected from the surveys were entered into an Excel document and then imported into SPSS. Twenty-three hypotheses were conducted to address the 13 research questions. One-sample t tests were conducted to address research questions one through six, twelve, and thirteen. One-sample t tests were selected because the researcher wanted to analyze the attributes, skills, and job tasks that students and staff members perceived as important, as well as their perceptions of the overall importance of a SRO in the building. Two-sample t tests were conducted to address research questions eight and eleven. Two-sample t tests were selected because the researcher wanted to analyze to what extent

student and staff members' gender influenced factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks)

they perceived as important for a SRO. One-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were

conducted to address research questions seven, nine, and ten. An ANOVA was selected

because the researcher wanted to analyze to what extent students' grade level, staff

members' years of experience, and staff members' ages influenced factors (attributes,

skills, and job tasks) they perceived as important for a SRO. The following section

presents the research questions, hypotheses statements, and the analyses.

RQ1. What do high school students perceive as important attributes for a school

resource officer?

H1. High school students perceive the following attributes as important: (a)

enthusiastic; (b) non-judgmental; (c) reliable; (d) available when needed; (e) willing to

work with young people; (f) concerned about young people; (g) a good listener; and (h) a

good role model.

To test H1, 21 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample

mean was tested against a null value of 2. The null value of two was selected because

numbers greater than the null value of two indicated that respondents identified the

attributes as important. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 21 attributes

were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students,

staff, and SROs, the eight listed in H1 were hypothesized by the researcher to be

perceived as important.

RQ2. What do high school students perceive as important skills for a school

resource officer?

H2. High school students perceive the following skills as important: (a) work with school administrators; (b) conflict resolution and mediation; (c) crisis intervention; (d) knowledge of the law; (e) knowledge of police procedures; and (f) knowledge of the physical layout of the school building.

To test H2, 17 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 17 skills were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students, staff, and SROs, the six listed in H2 were hypothesized by the researcher to be perceived as important.

RQ3. What do high school students perceive as important job tasks for a school resource officer?

H3. High school students perceive the following job tasks as important: (a) provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society; (b) provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention; (c) consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event; (d) monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; (e) assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations; (f) assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; (g) takes law enforcement action as required; and (h) assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed.

To test H3, 18 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 18 job tasks were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students, staff, and SROs, the eight listed in H3 were hypothesized by the researcher to be perceived as important.

RQ4. What do high school staff members perceive as important attributes for a school resource officer?

H4. High school staff members perceive the following attributes as important: (a) self-motivated; (b) firm; (c) reliable; (d) available when needed; (e) willing to work with young people; (f) concerned about young people; (g) consistent in actions; (h) a good listener; and (i) a good role model.

To test H4, 21 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 21 attributes were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students, staff, and SROs, the nine listed in H4 were hypothesized by the researcher to be perceived as important.

RQ5. What do high school staff members perceive as important skills for a school resource officer?

H5. High school staff members perceive the following skills as important: (a) ability to communicate; (b) work with school administrators; (c) attend extra-curricular activities; (d) conflict mediation and resolution; (e) crisis intervention; (f) knowledge of the law; (g) knowledge of police procedures; and (h) knowledge of the physical layout of the building.

To test H5, 17 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 17 skills were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students, staff, and SROs, the eight listed in H5 were hypothesized by the researcher to be perceived as important.

RQ6. What do high school staff members perceive as important job tasks for a school resource officer?

H6. High school staff members perceive the following job tasks as important: (a) provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society; (b) consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event; (c) serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students; (d) monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; (e) assist in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations; (f) assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; (g) takes law enforcement action as required; (h) notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function; and (i) assists with crowd control at a school function and assists with securing more officers when needed.

To test H6, 18 one-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each *t* test the sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. Although 18 job tasks were rated on the survey, based on the researcher's experience in dealing with students, staff, and SROs, the nine listed in H6 were hypothesized by the researcher to be perceived as important.

RQ7. To what extent do high school students' grade levels influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H7. High school students' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

To test H7, 21 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, attributes, was grade level. The level of significance was set at .05.

H8. High school students' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

To test H8, 17 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, skills, was grade level. The level of significance was set at .05.

H9. High school students' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

To test H9, 18 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, job tasks, was grade level. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ8. To what extent does high school students' gender influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H10. High school students' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H10, 21 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

H11. High school students' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H11, 17 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

H12. High school students' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H12, 18 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ9. To what extent do high school staff members' years of experience influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H13. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by years of experience.

To test H13, 21 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, attributes, was years of experience. The level of significance was set at .05.

H14. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by years of experience.

To test H14, 17 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, skills, was years of experience. The level of significance was set at .05.

H15. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by years of experience.

To test H15, 18 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, job tasks, was years of experience. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ10. To what extent do high school staff members' ages influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H16. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by age.

To test H16, 21 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, attributes, was years of age. The level of significance was set at .05.

H17. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by age.

To test H17, 17 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variables, skills, was age. The level of significance was set at .05.

H18. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by age.

To test H18, 18 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, job tasks, was years of age. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ11. To what extent does high school staff members' gender influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H19. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H19, 21 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

H20. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H20, 17 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

H21. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H21, 18 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ12. To what extent do students feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

H22. High school students feel it is moderately important to have a SRO in the building.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to address RQ12. The sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ13. To what extent do staff members feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

H23. High school staff members feel it is very important to have a SRO in the building.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to address RQ13. The sample mean was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to consider regarding this study. First, continuing incidents of school and public violence may have changed the public's view since the time data were collected for this study. Second, Section I of the preliminary survey used by Lambert (2000) was developed from responses given by 15 participants and those 15 individuals then piloted the preliminary survey. Third, the data collected and analyzed is representative of one high school within a small district and may not be representative of all high schools in the nation. Lastly, another factor that could be considered a limitation was that just over a week prior to the surveys being administered there was a gunman who fired shots at a group of students, injuring two, at Kelly Elementary School in Carlsbad, California (Leibowitz, 2010). Though this incident was not directly related to the staff and students surveyed, survey responses may have been influenced as a result of this violent act on a school campus.

Summary

Chapter three has described the data collection tools and methods used by the researcher for this study. The researcher used a survey modified from Lambert's (2000) to gather feedback from staff and students regarding their perceptions of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective SRO. The survey was administered to staff and students in October 2010. The response rate was 82% percent from staff members, with 73 out of 89 staff members completing the survey. The response rate for the student population was 76% with 682 out of 892 students completing the survey. The data collected were processed through SPSS. Responses to the surveys were analyzed

using one-sample *t* tests, two-sample *t* tests, and ANOVAs. The results of the analysis of

the responses to the survey are reported and discussed in Chapter four.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this research study was to gather, analyze, and evaluate what staff members and high school students perceived as important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer. This study addressed 13 research questions by conducting 23 hypothesis tests. One-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze the attributes, skills, and job tasks that students and staff members perceived as important. One-sample *t* tests were also conducted to analyze students' and staff members' perception of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. Two-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze if student or staff members' gender influenced factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) perceived as important for a SRO. One-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to analyze if students' grade level, staff members' years of experience, or staff members' age influenced factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) perceived as important for a SRO. Chapter four presents the results of the data analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The population for this research study included the students and staff of Harrisonville High School during the 2010-2011 school year. The survey was offered to 89 staff members. Seventy-three staff members completed the survey, a response rate of 82%. The survey was also offered to 892 students, of which 682 completed the survey. The response rate of the student survey was 76%.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis tests addressed 13 research questions. The research questions, hypotheses, analyses, and the results are presented below.

Research question 1. What do high school students perceive as important attributes for a school resource officer?

H1. High school students perceive the following attributes as important: (a) enthusiastic; (b) non-judgmental; (c) reliable; (d) available when needed; (e) willing to work with young people; (f) concerned about young people; (g) a good listener; and (h) a good role model.

To test H1, 21 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: $1 =$ not at all important, $2 =$ not very important, $3 =$ moderately important, $4 =$ very important, and $5 =$ extremely important. The average rating for the importance of the attributes was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each attribute are presented below.

Enthusiastic (passionate). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute, enthusiastic, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 41.961$, $df = 675$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.646$, $SD = 1.020$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, enthusiastic, to be moderately important to very important. This finding supported H1.

Self-Motivated (self-starter). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute, self-motivated, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 66.315$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.210$, $SD = .869$) was

higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, self-motivated, to be

very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

Flexible (adaptable). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

flexible, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 46.898, *df* = 678, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.866, *SD* = 1.036) was

higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, flexible, to be

moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H1.

Non-judgmental (open-minded). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the

attribute, non-judgmental, indicated a statistically significant difference between the

mean and the null value, *t* = 66.143, *df* = 680, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.417,

SD = .956) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, non-

judgmental, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

Firm (resolute). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute, firm,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* =

54.550, *df* = 677, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.048, *SD* = .977) was higher than the

null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, firm, to be very important to extremely

important. This finding did not support H1.

Reliable (dependable). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

reliable, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 89.601, *df* = 677, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.594, *SD* = .756) was

higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, reliable, to be very

important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

Curious (inquisitive). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

curious, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 33.991, *df* = 676, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.466, *SD* = 1.120) was

higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, curious, to be

moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H1.

Tolerant (accepting). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

tolerant, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 46.417, *df* = 676, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.875, *SD* = 1.048) was

higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, tolerant, to be

moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H1.

Loyal (dedicated/faithful). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

loyal, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value,

t = 68.300, *df* = 680, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.367, *SD* = .904) was higher than

the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, loyal, to be very important to

extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

Empathetic (understanding). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the

attribute, empathetic, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and

the null value, *t* = 73.193, *df* = 680, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.381, *SD* = .851)

was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, empathetic, to be

very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

Honest (truthful). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute, honest,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* =

104.471, *df* = 677, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.687, *SD* = .669) was higher than

the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, honest, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

Available when needed (accessible). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, available when needed, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 87.093$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.496$, $SD = .749$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, available when needed, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

Innovative and creative (inventive). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, innovative and creative, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 40.222$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.622$, $SD = 1.050$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, innovative and creative, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H1.

Sensitive to cultural differences (compassionate). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, sensitive to cultural differences, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 44.142$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.911$, $SD = 1.130$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, sensitive to cultural differences, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H1.

Willing to work with young people (helpful). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, willing to work with young people, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 81.827$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$.

The sample mean (M = 4.489, SD = .795) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, willing to work with young people, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

Friendly and out-going (approachable). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, friendly and out-going, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 62.623, df = 680, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.224, SD = .928) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, friendly and out-going, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

Concerned about young people (caring). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, concerned about young people, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 67.493, df = 681, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.327, SD = .900) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, concerned about young people, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

Consistent in actions (stable). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, consistent in actions, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 69.996, df = 679, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.275, SD = .843) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, consistent in actions, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

A good listener (attentive). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, a good listener, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the

null value, $t = 86.441$, $df = 678$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.502$, $SD = .754$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, a good listener, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

A strong disciplinarian (authoritarian). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, a strong disciplinarian, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 52.696$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.041$, $SD = 1.011$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, a strong disciplinarian, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H1.

A good role model (positive example). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, a good role model, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 85.744$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.588$, $SD = .787$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the attribute, a good role model, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H1.

In summary, 21 one-sample t tests were conducted to analyze students' perceptions of important attributes for an effective SRO. The results showed the average student responses for all of the attributes were between moderately to extremely important. The eight attributes hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between very important and extremely important except for the attribute, enthusiastic, which was rated between moderately and very important.

Research question 2. What do high school students perceive as important skills for a school resource officer?

H2. High school students perceive the following skills as important: (a) work with school administrators; (b) conflict resolution and mediation; (c) crisis intervention; (d) knowledge of the law; (e) knowledge of police procedures; and (f) knowledge of the physical layout of the school building.

To test H2, 17 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. The average rating for the importance of the skills was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each skill are presented below.

Communicate (verbal & written). The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, communicate, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 79.994$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.446$, $SD = .788$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, communicate (verbal & written), to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Work with school administrators. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, work with school administrators, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 74.883$, $df = 676$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.379$, $SD = .829$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, work with school administrators, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

Manage available resources. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, manage available resources, indicated a statistically significant difference between the

mean and the null value, $t = 64.072$, $df = 681$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.148$, $SD = .880$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, manage available resources, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Pay attention to detail. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, pay attention to detail, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 88.030$, $df = 678$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.503$, $SD = .754$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, pay attention to detail, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Teach in the classroom. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, teach in the classroom, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 25.659$, $df = 678$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.185$, $SD = 1.206$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, teach in the classroom, to be moderately important. This finding did not support H2.

Assist special needs students. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, assist special needs students, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 39.695$, $df = 677$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.747$, $SD = 1.145$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, assist special needs students, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H2.

Attend extra-curricular activities. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, attend extra-curricular activities, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 29.986$, $df = 674$, $p = .000$. The sample mean

(M = 3.371, SD = 1.195) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, attend extra-curricular activities, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H2.

Handle criticism. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, handle criticism, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 62.386, df = 678, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.184, SD = .907) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, handle criticism, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Counseling. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, counseling, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 46.575, df = 681, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 3.904, SD = 1.076) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, counseling, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H2.

Conflict resolution & mediation. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, conflict resolution & mediation, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 70.033, df = 680, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.334, SD = .875) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, conflict resolution and mediation, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

Leadership. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, leadership, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, t = 82.764, df = 679, p = .000. The sample mean (M = 4.514, SD = .799) was higher than the null value

of 2. Students perceived the skill, leadership, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Crisis intervention. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, crisis intervention, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 79.302, *df* = 681, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.494, *SD* = .827) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, crisis intervention, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

Knowledge of school discipline policies. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, knowledge of school discipline policies, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 79.148, *df* = 681, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.544, *SD* = .837) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, knowledge of school discipline policies, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Knowledge of the law. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, knowledge of the law, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 96.620, *df* = 681, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.695, *SD* = .725) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, knowledge of the law, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

Knowledge of police procedures. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, knowledge of police procedures, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 85.552, *df* = 680, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.577, *SD* = .786) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill,

knowledge of police procedures, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

Knowledge of other agencies in the community. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, knowledge of other agencies in the community, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 52.744$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.025$, $SD = 1.001$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, knowledge of other community agencies, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H2.

Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill, knowledge of the physical layout of the school building, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 76.383$, $df = 681$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.532$, $SD = .863$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, knowledge of the physical layout of the school building, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H2.

In summary, 17 one-sample t tests were conducted to analyze students' perceptions of important skills for an effective SRO. The results showed the average student responses for all of the skills were between moderately to extremely important. The six skills hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between very important and extremely important.

Research question 3. What do high school students perceive as important job tasks for a school resource officer?

H3. High school students perceive the following job tasks as important: (a) provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement

role in society; (b) provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention; (c) consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event; (d) monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; (e) assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations; (f) assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; (g) takes law enforcement action as required; and (h) assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed.

To test H3, 18 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. The average rating for the importance of the job tasks was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each job task are presented below.

Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 51.120$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.923$, $SD = .974$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, to be moderately important to very important. This finding supported H3.

Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 51.539$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.935$, $SD = .977$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, to be moderately important to very important. This finding supported H3.

Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 69.688$, $df = 678$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.294$, $SD = .857$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H3.

Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 58.979$, $df = 676$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.122$, $SD = .938$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H3.

Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 51.436$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.989$, $SD = 1.010$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the skill, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 55.048$, $df = 675$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.106$, $SD = .996$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H3.

Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, assists in

locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations**,**
indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$
39.000, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.691$, $SD = 1.131$) was higher than
the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, assists in locating school age
children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, to be moderately
important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to
agencies when necessary. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, becomes
familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary,
indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$
43.973, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.707$, $SD = 1.010$) was higher than
the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, becomes familiar with all community
agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary, to be moderately important to
very important. This finding did not support H3.

Regularly checks school facilities when not in use. The result of the one-
sample t test for the job task, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, indicated
a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 42.618$, $df =$
680, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.704$, $SD = 1.037$) was higher than the null value
of 2. Students perceived the job task, regularly checks school facilities when not in use,
to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security
procedures. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, works closely with
other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, indicated a statistically

significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 53.959$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$.

The sample mean ($M = 4.005$, $SD = .967$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students

perceived the job task, works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish

security procedures, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not

support H3.

Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations.

The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, assists in the investigation of bomb

threats and other emergency situations, indicated a statistically significant difference

between the mean and the null value, $t = 65.141$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean

($M = 4.323$, $SD = .930$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job

task, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, to be

very important to extremely important. This finding supported H3.

Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug

problems, and other criminal activities. The result of the one-sample t test for the job

task, assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems,

and other criminal activities, indicated a statistically significant difference between the

mean and the null value, $t = 72.473$, $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.401$,

$SD = .866$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, assists

principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other

criminal activities, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported

H3.

Takes law enforcement action as required. The result of the one-sample t test

for the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, indicated a statistically

significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 76.159$, $df = 669$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.419$, $SD = .824$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H3.

Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 61.422$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.189$, $SD = .931$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H3.

Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 52.044$, $df = 681$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.985$, $SD = .996$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 51.919$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.029$, $SD = 1.017$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H3.

Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 52.005$, $df = 680$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.964$, $SD = .978$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating o the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 42.379$ $df = 679$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.810$, $SD = 1.111$) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived the job task, deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the

assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H3.

In summary, 18 one-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze students' perceptions of important job tasks for an effective SRO. The results show that student responses averaged all of the job tasks between moderately to extremely important. The eight job tasks hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between moderately important and extremely important.

Research question 4. What do high school staff members perceive as important attributes for a school resource officer?

H4. High school staff members perceive the following attributes as important: (a) self-motivated; (b) firm; (c) reliable; (d) available when needed; (e) willing to work with young people; (f) concerned about young people; (g) consistent in actions; (h) a good listener; and (i) a good role model.

To test H4, 21 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: $1 =$ not at all important, $2 =$ not very important, $3 =$ moderately important, $4 =$ very important, and $5 =$ extremely important. The average rating for the importance of the attributes was tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each attribute are presented below.

Enthusiastic (passionate). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute enthusiastic, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 13.046$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.458$, $SD = .948$) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, enthusiastic, to be

moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H4.

Self-motivated (self-starter). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

self-motivated, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the

null value, $t = 25.269$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.232$, $SD = .754$) was

higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, self-motivated, to

be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H4.

Flexible (adaptable). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

flexible, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, $t = 21.794$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.123$, $SD = .832$) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, flexible, to be very

important to extremely important. This finding did not support H4

Non-judgmental (open-minded). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the

attribute, non-judgmental, indicated a statistically significant difference between the

mean and the null value, $t = 24.401$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.342$, SD

$= .820$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, non-

judgmental, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H4

Firm (resolute). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute, firm,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$

27.665, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.479$, $SD = .765$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, firm, to be very important to

extremely important. This finding supported H4.

Reliable (dependable). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

reliable, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 53.387, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.821, *SD* = .451) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, reliable, to be very

important to extremely important. This finding supported H4.

Curious (inquisitive). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

curious, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 17.211, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.904, *SD* = .945) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, curious, to be moderately

important to very important. This finding did not support H4

Tolerant (accepting). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

tolerant, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, *t* = 18.087, *df* = 71, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.847, *SD* = .866) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, tolerant, to be moderately

important to very important. This finding did not support H4

Loyal (dedicated/faithful). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the attribute,

loyal, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value,

t = 21.964, *df* = 71, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.236, *SD* = .863) was higher than

the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, loyal, to be very important to

extremely important. This finding did not support H4

Empathetic (understanding). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the

attribute, empathetic, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and

the null value, *t* = 18.381, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.027, *SD* = .942)

was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, empathetic

(understanding), to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not

support H4

Honest (truthful). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, honest,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$

83.691, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.904$, $SD = .296$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, honest, to be very important to

extremely important. This finding did not support H4

Available when needed (accessible). The result of the one-sample t test for the

attribute, available when needed, indicated a statistically significant difference between

the mean and the null value, $t = 40.471$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.698$,

$SD = .569$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute,

available when needed, to be very important to extremely important. This finding

supported H4.

Innovative and creative (inventive). The result of the one-sample t test for the

attribute, innovative and creative, indicated a statistically significant difference between

the mean and the null value, $t = 12.821$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.561$,

$SD = 1.040$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute,

innovative and creative, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did

not support H4

Sensitive to cultural differences (compassionate). The result of the one-sample

t test for the attribute, sensitive to cultural differences, indicated a statistically significant

difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 22.360$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The

sample mean ($M = 4.166$, $SD = .822$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, sensitive to cultural differences, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H4

Willing to work with young people (helpful). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, willing to work with young people, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 52.957$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.780$, $SD = .448$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, willing to work with young people, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H4.

Friendly and out-going (approachable). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, friendly and out-going, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 17.688$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.944$, $SD = .932$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, friendly and out-going, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H4

Concerned about young people (caring). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, concerned about young people, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 41.764$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.694$, $SD = .547$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, concerned about young people, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H4.

Consistent in actions (stable). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, consistent in actions, indicated a statistically significant difference between the

mean and the null value, $t = 37.872$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.712$, SD

$= .611$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute,

consistent in actions, to be very important to extremely important. This finding

supported H4.

A good listener (attentive). The result of the one-sample t test for the attribute, a

good listener, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the

null value, $t = 30.622$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.388$, $SD = .661$) was

higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, a good listener, to

be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H4.

A strong disciplinarian (authoritarian). The result of the one-sample t test for

the attribute, a strong disciplinarian, indicated a statistically significant difference

between the mean and the null value, $t = 24.341$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean (M

$= 4.328$, $SD = .817$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the

attribute, a strong disciplinarian, to be very important to extremely important. This

finding did not support H4

A good role model (positive example). The result of the one-sample t test for

the attribute, a good role model, indicated a statistically significant difference between

the mean and the null value, $t = 45.133$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.753$,

$SD = .521$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the attribute, a

good role model, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not

support H4

In summary, 21 one-sample t tests were conducted to analyze staff members'

perceptions of important attributes for an effective SRO. The results showed the average

staff responses for all of the attributes were between moderately to extremely important. The nine attributes hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between very important and extremely important.

Research question 5. What do high school staff members perceive as important skills for a school resource officer?

H5. High school staff members perceive the following skills as important: (a) ability to communicate; (b) work with school administrators; (c) attend extra-curricular activities; (d) conflict mediation and resolution; (e) crisis intervention; (f) knowledge of the law; (g) knowledge of police procedures; and (h) knowledge of the physical layout of the building.

To test H5, 17 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. The average rating for the importance of the skills was tested against a null value of 2. . The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each skill are presented below.

Communicate (verbal & written). The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, communicate (verbal & written), indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 35.281$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.493$, $SD = .603$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, communicate (verbal & written), to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H5.

Work with school administrators. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, work with school administrators, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 32.891, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.616, *SD* = .679) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, work with school administrators, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H5.

Manage available resources. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, manage available resources, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 22.197, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.150, *SD* = .827) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, manage available resources, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H5.

Pay attention to detail. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, pay attention to detail, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 34.858 *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.547, *SD* = .624) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, pay attention to detail, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H5.

Teach in the classroom. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, teach in the classroom, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 8.841, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.041, *SD* = 1.006) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, teach in the classroom, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H5.

Assist special needs students. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, assist special needs students, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 12.736, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.493, *SD* = 1.001) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, assist special needs students, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H5.

Attend extra-curricular activities. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, attend extra-curricular activities, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 12.292, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.438, *SD* = .999) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, attend extra-curricular activities, to be moderately important to very important. This finding supported H5.

Handle criticism. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, handle criticism, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 19.910, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.958, *SD* = .840) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, handle criticism, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H5.

Counseling. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, counseling, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 13.291, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 3.575, *SD* = 1.012) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, counseling, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H5.

Conflict resolution & mediation. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, conflict resolution & mediation, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 33.453, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.534, *SD* = .647) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, conflict resolution and mediation, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H5.

Leadership. The result of the one-sample *t* test, for the skill, leadership, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 23.194, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.274, *SD* = .837) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, leadership, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H5.

Crisis intervention. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, crisis intervention, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 53.387, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.821, *SD* = .451) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, crisis intervention, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H5.

Knowledge of school discipline policies. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the skill, knowledge of school discipline policies, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, *t* = 53.387, *df* = 72, *p* = .000. The sample mean (*M* = 4.821, *SD* = .451) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, knowledge of school discipline policies, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H5.

Knowledge of the law. The result of the one-sample t test for the skill,

knowledge of the law, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean

and the null value, $t = 98.478$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.931$, $SD =$

.254) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, knowledge

of the law, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H5.

Knowledge of police procedures. The result of the one-sample t test for the

skill, knowledge of police procedures, indicated a statistically significant difference

between the mean and the null value, $t = 90.143$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean (M

$= 4.917$, $SD = .276$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the

skill, knowledge of police procedures, to be very important to extremely important. This

finding supported H5.

Knowledge of other agencies in the community. The result of the one-sample t

test for the skill, knowledge of other agencies in the community, indicated a statistically

significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 35.105$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$.

The sample mean ($M = 4.479$, $SD = .603$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff

members perceived the skill, knowledge of other community agencies, to be very

important to extremely important. This finding did not support H5.

Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building. The result of the one-

sample t test, for the skill, knowledge of the physical layout of the school building,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$

83.691, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.904$, $SD = .296$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Staff members perceived the skill, knowledge of the physical layout of

the school building, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported

H5.

In summary, 17 one-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze staff members'

perceptions of important skills for an effective SRO. The results showed the average

staff responses for all of the skills were between moderately to extremely important. The

eight skills hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between very

important and extremely important, with the exception of attend extra-curricular

activities, which averaged just over moderately important.

Research question 6. What do high school staff members perceive as important

job tasks for a school resource officer?

H6. High school staff members perceive the following job tasks as important: (a)

provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement

role in society; (b) consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to

prevent or minimize dangerous situations which may occur on campus or during a school

sponsored event; (c) serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students; (d) monitors

halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; (e) assist in the investigation

of bomb threats and other emergency situations; (f) assist principal upon request in the

investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; (g) takes law

enforcement action as required; (h) notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations

occur on school grounds or at a school function; and (i) assists with crowd control at a

school function and assists with securing more officers when needed.

To test H6, 18 one-sample t tests were conducted. Responses were rated using a

Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important,

3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. The average

rating for the importance of the job tasks was tested against a null value of 2. The level

of significance was set at .05. The results of the hypothesis tests for each job task are

presented below.

Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law

enforcement role in society. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task,

provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement

role in society, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the

null value, $t = 15.759$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.739$, $SD = .943$) was

higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, provides guidance

on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, to

be moderately important to very important. This finding supported H6.

Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues

or crime prevention. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, provides

individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t =$

14.437, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.630$, $SD = .964$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, provides individual counseling to

students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, to be moderately

important to very important. This finding did not support H6.

Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or

minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school

sponsored event. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, consults with the

principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 42.617$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.657$, $SD = .532$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 22.524$, $df = 71$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.097$, $SD = .790$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 15.046$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.643$, $SD = .933$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention

presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H6.

Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 30.552$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.534$, $SD = .708$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 15.171$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.712$, $SD = .964$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H6.

Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 21.218$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.904$, $SD = .766$) was higher than the

null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary, to be moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H6.

Regularly checks school facilities when not in use. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 12.916$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 3.493$, $SD = .987$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, to be moderately important to extremely important. This finding did not support H6.

Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 32.089$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.411$, $SD = .641$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H6.

Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations. The result of the one-sample t test for the job task, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 38.843$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.698$, $SD = .593$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job

task, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 45.974$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.767$, $SD = .514$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Takes law enforcement action as required. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 57.442$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.821$, $SD = .419$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 44.353$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.739$, $SD = .527$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, notifies appropriate

law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 23.330$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.315$, $SD = .847$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, to be very important to extremely important. This finding did not support H6.

Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 20.632$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.191$, $SD = .907$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed, to be very important to extremely important. This finding supported H6.

Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed. The result of the one-sample *t* test for the job task, maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when

needed, indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null

value, $t = 25.269$, $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.260$, $SD = .764$) was higher

than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived the job task, maintains detailed and

accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them

available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed, to be very important

to extremely important. This finding did not support H6.

Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned

campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian. The result of the one-sample t test

for the job task, deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating o the

assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian, indicated a statistically

significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 17.615$ $df = 71$, $p = .000$.

The sample mean ($M = 3.986$, $SD = .956$) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff

members perceived the job task, deals specifically with law enforcement matters

originating o the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian, to be

moderately important to very important. This finding did not support H6.

In summary, 18 one-sample t tests were conducted to analyze staff members'

perceptions of important job tasks for an effective SRO. The results showed the average

staff responses for all of the job tasks were between moderately to extremely important.

The nine job tasks hypothesized by the researcher to be important were all rated between

very important and extremely important, with the exception of provides guidance on

ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, which

averaged between moderately and very important.

Research question 7. To what extent do high school students' grade levels influence the factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H7. High school students' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

Twenty-one one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to test H7. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, student perceptions of attributes, was grade level (9, 10, 11, and 12). The level of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in student perceptions of attributes, based on grade level. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table I1. Post hocs were not warranted. These findings did not support H7.

H8. High school students' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

Seventeen one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to test H8. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, student perceptions of important skills, was grade level (9, 10, 11, and 12). The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 16 of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in student perceptions of skills, based on grade level. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table I2. Post hocs were not warranted. The hypothesis test for the skill, conflict resolution and mediation, indicated at least two means were significantly different, $F = 4.007$, $df = 3, 674$, $p = .008$. A Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post hoc was conducted. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of ninth graders ($M = 4.205$, $SD = .952$) were significantly different than 11th graders ($M =$

4.506, *SD* = .724). On average ninth graders perceived the skill, conflict resolution and mediation, less important than eleventh graders perceived the skill. This finding supported H8.

H9. High school students' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by grade level.

Eighteen one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to test H9. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, student perceptions of important job tasks, was grade level (9, 10, 11, and 12). The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 16 of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in student perceptions of job tasks, based on grade level. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table I3. Post hocs were not warranted. The hypothesis test for the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, indicated at least two means were significantly different, *F* = 2.920, *df* = 3, 673, *p* = .033. A Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post hoc was conducted. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of tenth graders (*M* = 4.123, *SD* = .947) were significantly different than twelfth graders (*M* = 3.820, *SD* = 1.087). On average tenth graders perceived the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations, to be more important than twelfth graders. The hypothesis test for the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, indicated at least two means were significantly different, *F* = 3.163, *df* = 3, 669, *p* = .024. A Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post hoc was conducted. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of ninth graders (*M* = 4.212, *SD* = .861) were significantly different than

eleventh graders ($M = 3.932$, $SD = 1.090$). On average ninth graders perceived the job

task, monitoring halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, to be more

important than eleventh graders perceived the job task. This finding supported H9.

Research question 8. To what extent does high school students' gender

influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H10. High school students' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are

affected by gender.

To test H10, 21 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each hypothesis test the

two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The result of

the hypothesis testing is reported below for each attribute.

Enthusiastic (passionate). The results of the test indicated the difference

between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.536$, $df = 666$, $p = .592$. The

sample mean for males ($M = 3.622$, $SD = 1.101$) was not different from the sample mean

for females ($M = 3.665$, $SD = .937$). On average, males' perceptions of the attribute,

enthusiastic, did not differ from females' perceptions of the attribute. These findings did

not support H10.

Self-motivated (self-starter). The results of the test indicated the difference

between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.367$, $df = 670$, $p = .713$. The

sample mean for males ($M = 4.199$, $SD = .871$) was not different from the sample mean

for females ($M = 4.224$, $SD = .874$). On average, males' perceptions of the attribute, self-

motivated, did not differ from females' perceptions of the attribute. These findings did

not support H10.

Flexible (adaptable). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.296$, $df = 669$, $p = .767$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.850$, $SD = 1.038$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.873$, $SD = 1.043$). On average, males' perceptions of the attribute, flexible, did not differ from females' perceptions of the attribute. These findings did not support H10.

Non-judgmental (open-minded). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -3.734$, $df = 671$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.280$, $SD = .997$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.551$, $SD = .885$). On average, males' perceived the attribute, non-judgmental, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Firm (resolute). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.412$, $df = 668$, $p = .016$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.955$, $SD = .993$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.140$, $SD = .947$). On average, males perceived the attribute, firm, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Reliable (dependable). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -3.250$, $df = 668$, $p = .001$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.494$, $SD = .828$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.683$, $SD = .674$). On average, males perceived the attribute, reliable, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Curious (inquisitive). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.647$, $df = 667$, $p = .518$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.446$, $SD = 1.166$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.502$, $SD = 1.060$). On average, males' perceptions of the attribute, curious, did not differ from females' perceptions of the attribute. These findings did not support H10.

Tolerant (accepting). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.617$, $df = 667$, $p = .009$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.768$, $SD = 1.079$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.979$, $SD = 1.007$). On average, males perceived the attribute, tolerant, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Loyal (dedicated/faithful). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -4.060$, $df = 671$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.219$, $SD = 1.010$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.500$, $SD = .770$). On average, males perceived the attribute, loyal, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Empathetic (understanding). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.143$, $df = 671$, $p = .032$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.306$, $SD = .913$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.447$, $SD = .787$). On average, males perceived the attribute, empathetic (understanding), to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Honest (truthful). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -3.152$, $df = 668$, $p = .002$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.601$, $SD = .762$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.764$, $SD = .563$). On average, males perceived the attribute, honest, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Available when needed (accessible). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.187$, $df = 671$, $p = .029$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.429$, $SD = .821$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.556$, $SD = .674$). On average, males perceived the attribute, available when needed, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Innovative and creative (inventive). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.307$, $df = 671$, $p = .759$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.615$, $SD = 1.103$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.639$, $SD = .992$). On average, males' perceptions of the attribute, innovative and creative, did not differ from females' perceptions of the attribute. These findings did not support H10.

Sensitive to cultural differences (compassionate). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.788$, $df = 671$, $p = .005$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.798$, $SD = 1.196$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.038$, $SD = 1.033$). On average, males perceived the attribute, sensitive to cultural differences, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Willing to work with young people (helpful). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -3.261$, $df = 670$, $p = .001$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.393$, $SD = .872$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.589$, $SD = .683$). On average, males perceived the attribute, willing to work with young people, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Friendly and out-going (approachable). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -4.189$, $df = 671$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.069$, $SD = 1.013$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.367$, $SD = .821$). On average, males perceived the attribute, friendly and out-going, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Concerned about young people (caring). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -4.023$, $df = 672$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.189$, $SD = .977$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.463$, $SD = .784$). On average, males perceived the attribute, concerned about young people, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

Consistent in actions (stable). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.913$, $df = 670$, $p = .004$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.184$, $SD = .896$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.370$, $SD = .763$). On average, males perceived the attribute, consistent in

actions, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

A good listener (attentive). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -3.527$, $df = 669$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.402$, $SD = .818$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.604$, $SD = .651$). On average, males perceived the attribute, a good listener, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

A strong disciplinarian (authoritarian). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.567$, $df = 670$, $p = .010$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.937$, $SD = 1.068$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.135$, $SD = .934$). On average, males perceived the attribute, a strong disciplinarian, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

A good role model (positive example). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -4.022$, $df = 670$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.463$, $SD = .900$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.705$, $SD = .645$). On average, males perceived the attribute, a good role model, to be less important than females perceived the attribute. These findings supported H10.

In summary, 21 two-sample t tests were conducted. For each hypothesis test, two sample means were compared. Gender did not influence high school students'

perceptions of the attributes: enthusiastic, self-motivated, flexible, curious, or innovative and creative. Males perceived all of the other attributes to be less important than females.

H11. High school students' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H11, 17 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The result of the hypothesis test for each skill is reported below for each skill.

Communicate (verbal & written). The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.590$, $df = 671$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.339$, $SD = .872$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.556$, $SD = .683$). On average, males perceived the skill, communicate (verbal & written), to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Work with school administrators. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 4.324$, $df = 668$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.250$, $SD = .897$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.521$, $SD = .715$). On average, males perceived the skill, work with school administrators, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Manage available resources. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.711$, $df = 672$, $p = .007$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.057$, $SD = .947$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.240$, $SD = .805$). On average, males perceived the skill, manage available

resources, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Pay attention to detail. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 1.972$, $df = 669$, $p = .049$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.447$, $SD = .803$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.562$, $SD = .700$). On average, males perceived the skill, pay attention to detail, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Teach in the classroom. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.745$, $df = 669$, $p = .081$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.103$, $SD = 1.263$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.265$, $SD = 1.140$). On average, males' perceptions of the skill, teach in the classroom, did not differ from females' perceptions of the skill. These findings did not support H11.

Assist special needs students. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.782$, $df = 668$, $p = .006$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.625$, $SD = 1.117$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.870$, $SD = 1.100$). On average, males perceived the skill, assist special needs students, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Attend extra-curricular activities. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = -.837$, $df = 665$, $p = .403$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.411$, $SD = 1.224$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.333$, $SD = 1.168$). On average, males' perceptions of

the skill, attend extra-curricular activities, did not differ from females' perceptions of the skill. These findings did not support H11.

Handle criticism. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.437$, $df = 669$, $p = .015$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.102$, $SD = .946$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.271$, $SD = .848$). On average, males perceived the skill, handle criticism, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Counseling. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.517$, $df = 672$, $p = .012$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.802$, $SD = 1.155$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.009$, $SD = .975$). On average, males perceived the skill, counseling, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Conflict resolution & mediation. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.886$, $df = 671$, $p = .004$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.240$, $SD = .945$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.432$, $SD = .775$). On average, males perceived the skill, conflict resolution & mediation, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Leadership. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.347$, $df = 670$, $p = .019$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.449$, $SD = .855$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.591$, $SD = .713$). On average, males perceived the skill, leadership, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Crisis intervention. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.370$, $df = 672$, $p = .001$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.390$, $SD = .914$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.601$, $SD = .698$). On average, males perceived the skill, crisis intervention, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Knowledge of school discipline policies. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.598$, $df = 672$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.432$, $SD = .934$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.660$, $SD = .691$). On average, males perceived the skill, knowledge of school discipline policies, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Knowledge of the law. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.510$, $df = 672$, $p = .012$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.628$, $SD = .787$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.765$, $SD = .631$). On average, males perceived the skill, knowledge of the law, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Knowledge of police procedures. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.103$, $df = 671$, $p = .002$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.480$, $SD = .894$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.668$, $SD = .655$). On average, males perceived the skill, knowledge of police procedures, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

Knowledge of other agencies in the community. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.263$, $df = 671$, $p = .207$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.976$, $SD = 1.060$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.073$, $SD = .938$). On average, males' perceptions of the skill, knowledge of other agencies in the community, did not differ from females' perceptions perceived the skill. These findings did not support H11.

Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.210$, $df = 672$, $p = .001$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.423$, $SD = .987$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.636$, $SD = .717$). On average, males perceived the skill, knowledge of the physical layout of the school building, to be less important than females perceived the skill. These findings supported H11.

In summary, 17 two-sample t tests were conducted. For each hypothesis test the two sample means were compared. Gender did not influence high school students' perceptions of the skills: teach in the classroom, attend extra-curricular activities, and knowledgeable of other agencies in the community. Males perceived all of the other skills to be less important than females.

H12. High school students' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H12, 18 two-sample t tests were conducted. For each hypothesis test the two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The result of the hypothesis test is reported below for each job task.

Provides guidance of ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = .939$, $df = 671$, $p = .348$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.889$, $SD = 1.024$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.959$, $SD = .919$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, provides guidance of ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.562$, $df = 671$, $p = .119$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.877$, $SD = 1.022$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.994$, $SD = .930$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 3.403$, $df = 669$, $p = .001$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.192$, $SD = .888$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.414$, $SD = .800$). On average, males perceived the job task, consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may

occur on campus or during a school sponsored event, to be less important than females

perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students. The results of the test

indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.612$, *df*

$= 667$, $p = .009$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.024$, $SD = .955$) was different from

the sample mean for females ($M = 4.212$, $SD = .908$). On average, males perceived the

job task, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students, to be less important than

females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include

but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or

sexual harassment. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two

values was statistically significant, $t = 3.055$, $df = 670$, $p = .002$. The sample mean for

males ($M = 3.874$, $SD = 1.013$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M =$

4.109, $SD = .984$). On average, males perceived the job task, provides community-wide

crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as

drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment, to be less important than

females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal. The

results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically

significant, $t = 2.656$, $df = 667$, $p = .008$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.997$, $SD =$

1.052) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.201$, $SD = .935$). On

average, males perceived the job task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas

assigned by the principal, to be less important than females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.435$, $df = 671$, $p = .152$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.625$, $SD = 1.122$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.750$, $SD = 1.144$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = .789$, $df = 671$, $p = .430$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.672$, $SD = 1.021$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.733$, $SD = .998$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Regularly checks school facilities when not in use. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = .508$, $df = 671$, $p = .611$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.678$, $SD = 1.026$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 3.719$, $SD = 1.053$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.117$, $df = 671$, $p = .035$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.922$, $SD = .998$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.079$, $SD = .931$). On average, males perceived the job task, works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, to be less important than females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 2.542$, $df = 671$, $p = .011$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.232$, $SD = .954$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.414$, $SD = .899$). On average, males perceived the job task, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, to be less important than females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 4.084$, $df = 670$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.268$, $SD = .935$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.535$, $SD = .754$). On average, males perceived the job task, assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities, to be less important than females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Takes law enforcement action as required. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.687$, $df = 660$, $p = .092$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.364$, $SD = .857$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.472$, $SD = .784$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = 4.082$, $df = 671$, $p = .000$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.042$, $SD = .984$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.332$, $SD = .858$). On average, males perceived the job task, notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, to be less important than females perceived the job task. These findings supported H12.

Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.823$, $df = 672$, $p = .069$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.910$, $SD = 1.060$) was not different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.050$, $SD = .930$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed. The results of the test indicated the difference between the two

values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.051$, $df = 671$, $p = .293$. The sample mean

for males ($M = 3.982$, $SD = 1.066$) was not different from the sample mean for females

($M = 4.065$, $SD = .971$). On average, males' perceptions of the job task, assists with

crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed,

did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support

H12.

Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School

Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law

enforcement officials when needed. The results of the test indicated the difference

between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = 1.352$, $df = 671$, $p = .177$.

The sample mean for males ($M = 3.910$, $SD = 1.015$) was not different from the sample

mean for females ($M = 4.011$, $SD = .942$). On average, males' perceptions of the job

task, maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource

Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when

needed, did not differ from females' perceptions of the job task. These findings did not

support H12.

Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned

campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian. The results of the test indicated

the difference between the two values was not statistically significant, $t = .158$, $df = 670$,

$p = .875$. The sample mean for males ($M = 3.801$, $SD = 1.120$) was not different from the

sample mean for females ($M = 3.815$, $SD = 1.099$). On average, males' perceptions of

the job task, deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned

campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian, did not differ from females'
perceptions of the job task. These findings did not support H12.

In summary, 18 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. For each hypothesis test two
sample means were compared. The findings were mixed with 10 job tasks showing no
perceived differences by gender. Females perceived the following 8 job tasks as being
more important than males' perceptions: (a) consults with the principal in developing
plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on
campus or during a school sponsored event; (b) serves as a resource for teachers, parents,
and students; (c) provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may
include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or
sexual harassment; (d) monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the
principal; (e) works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security
procedures; (f) assist in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations;
(g) assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, an
other criminal activities; and (h) notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations
occur on school grounds or at a school function.

Research question 9. To what extent do high school staff members' years of
experience influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H13. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO
are affected by years of experience.

To test H13, 21 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to
group the dependent variable, staff members' perceptions of attributes, was years of
experience in current position (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, 10 years plus). The level

of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no

significant difference in staff perceptions of attributes, based on years of experience.

Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J1. Post hocs were not warranted.

These findings did not support H13.

H14. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are

affected by years of experience.

To test H14, 17 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to

group the dependent variable, staff members' perceptions of skills, was years of

experience in current position (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, 10 years plus). The level

of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no

significant difference in staff perceptions of skills, based on years of experience. Test

statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J2. Post hocs were not warranted.

These findings did not support H14.

H15. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO

are affected by years of experience.

To test H15, 18 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to

group the dependent variable, staff members' perceptions of important job tasks, was

years of experience in current position (1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, 10 years plus).

The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 17 of the hypotheses tests

indicated no significant difference in staff members' perceptions of job tasks, based on

years of experience in current position. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in

Table J3. Post hocs were not warranted. The hypothesis test for the task, monitors halls,

parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, indicated at least two means were

significantly different, $F = 3.029$, $df = 3, 69$, $p = .035$. A Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post hoc was conducted. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of staff members with 4-6 years of experience in their current position ($M = 4.200$, $SD = 1.005$) were significantly different than the perceptions of staff members with 7-9 years of experience in their current position ($M = 4.917$, $SD = .289$). On average the staff members with 4-6 years of experience in their current position perceived the task, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, as less important than staff members with 7-9 years of experience in current position. These findings supported H15.

 Research question 10. To what extent do high school staff members' ages influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

 H16. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by age.

 To test H16, 21 ANOVAs were conducted. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, staff members' perceptions of important attributes was age. Age was divided into four categories: 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51 plus. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 20 of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of attributes based on age. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J4. Post hocs were not warranted. The hypothesis test for the attribute, friendly and out-going, indicated at least two means were significantly different, $F = 4.611$, $df = 3, 67$, $p = .005$. A Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference post hoc was conducted. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of staff members in the 31-40 years old age group ($M = 3.500$, $SD = .913$)

were significantly different than staff members in the 41-50 years old age group ($M = 4.308$, $SD = .751$) and the 51 plus age group ($M = 4.333$, $SD = .856$). On average, staff members in the 31-40 years old age group, perceived the attribute, friendly and out-going, less important than staff members in the 41-50 years old and 51 plus age groups. These findings supported H16.

H17. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by age.

Seventeen ANOVAs were conducted to test H17. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, staff members' perceptions of important skills was age. Age was divided into four categories: 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51 plus. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 16 of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of skills based on age. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J5. Post hocs were not warranted. The hypothesis test for the skill, communicate (verbal & written), indicated at least two means were significantly different, $F = 2.983$, $df = 3$, 68, $p = .037$. The results of the analysis indicated that the perceptions of staff members in the 31-40 years old age group ($M = 4.227$, $SD = .612$) were significantly different than staff members in the 51 plus age group ($M = 4.714$, $SD = .463$). On average, staff members in the 31-40 years old age group, perceived the skill, communicate (verbal & written), to be less important than staff members in the 51 plus age group. These findings supported H17.

H18. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by age.

Eighteen one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to test H18. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, staff perceptions of job tasks was age. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of job tasks based on age. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J6. Post hocs were not warranted. These findings did not support H18.

Research question 11. To what extent do high school staff members' gender influence the factors they perceive as important for a school resource officer?

H19. High school staff members' perceptions of attributes important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H19, 21 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of attributes based on gender. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J7. Post hocs were not warranted. These findings did not support H19.

H20. High school staff members' perceptions of skills important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H20, 17 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for all of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of skills based on gender. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J8. Post hocs were not warranted. These findings did not support H20.

H21. High school staff members' perceptions of job tasks important for an SRO are affected by gender.

To test H21, 18 two-sample *t* tests were conducted. The two sample means were compared. The level of significance was set at .05. The results for 17 of the hypotheses tests indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of job tasks based on gender. Test statistics for these analyses are presented in Table J9. Post hocs were not warranted. The results of the test for the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, indicated the difference between the two values was statistically significant, $t = -2.167$, $df = 71$, $p = .034$. The sample mean for males ($M = 4.962$, $SD = .196$) was different from the sample mean for females ($M = 4.745$, $SD = .486$). On average, males perceived the job task, takes law enforcement action as required, to be more important than females perceived the job task. These finding supported H21.

Research question 12. To what extent do students feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

H22. High school students feel it is moderately important to have a SRO in the building.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H22. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. Students were asked to rate how important they felt it was to have a School Resource Officer. The responses were tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the one sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 54.443$ $df = 715$, $p = .000$. The sample mean ($M = 4.169$,

SD = 1.066) was higher than the null value of 2. Students perceived having a School Resource Officer to be very important to extremely important. These findings did not support H22.

Research question 13. To what extent do staff members feel it is important to have a SRO in the building?

H23. High school staff members feel it is very important to have a SRO in the building.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H23. Responses were rated using a Likert scale that consisted of five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. Staff members were asked to rate how important they felt it was to have a School Resource Officer. The responses were tested against a null value of 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the mean and the null value, $t = 43.797$ $df = 72$, $p = .000$. The sample mean (*M* = 4.684, *SD* = .052) was higher than the null value of 2. Staff members perceived having a School Resource Officer to be very important to extremely important. These findings supported H23.

<div align="center">**Summary**</div>

Chapter four contained the data analysis and hypothesis testing related to high school staff and students' perceptions of attributes, skills, and job tasks important for an effective school resource officer. The results of one-sample *t* tests, two-sample *t* tests, and ANOVAs were presented. Chapter five includes a study summary, major findings,

findings related to the literature, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

Chapter five provides a summary for this study. An overview of the problem, the purpose statement, and methodology are reviewed. Chapter five also presents the major findings, findings related to the literature, implications for action, and recommendations for further research.

Study Summary

The first section of this chapter provides a brief synopsis for this research study. First, the study summary contains an overview of the problem. Secondly, the purpose statement is presented. Thirdly, methodology used for this study is summarized. Lastly, major findings of this research study are presented.

Overview of the Problem. In order for staff and students to reach their full potential, school districts must establish and maintain safe learning environments. With incidents of school violence continuing to occur, one approach to help establish a safe learning environment is to place school resource officers (SROs) in the school buildings. However, merely placing an officer in the school will not ensure a safer environment (May et al., 2004, p. 173). In order to place an officer who will be the right fit for the building and therefore more effective, school administration and police departments should consider the perceptions of staff and students regarding the SRO position and consider these perceptions along with the SRO's knowledge, experience, and personality.

Purpose Statement. The purpose of this research study was to gather, analyze, and evaluate what high school students and staff perceived as important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer. Students' grade level and gender

were analyzed to see if they had any impact on the attributes, skills, and job tasks that students perceived as important for an effective SRO. Staff members' years of experience, age, and gender were analyzed to see if they had any impact on the attributes, skills, and job tasks that staff perceived as important for an effective SRO. This researcher also evaluated students and staff members' perceptions of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. When trying to place an officer who will be the best fit in the SRO position, school districts and police departments, could utilize the data presented in this study to assist in their selection process.

Review of Methodology. A quantitative survey was conducted for this study and was chosen in order to obtain data from students and staff who work in or attend a school that employs a full time resource officer. The population for this research study included the students and staff of Harrisonville High School during the 2010-2011 school year. The dependent variables were 21 attributes, 17 skills, and 18 job tasks that students and staff members used to rate their perceived importance of each variable by using a Likert scale with five ratings: 1 = not at all important, 2 = not very important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important. The independent variables used for comparisons between student subgroups were grade level and gender. The independent variables used for comparisons between staff subgroups were years of experience, age, and gender. One-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze the attributes, skills, and job tasks that students and staff members perceived as important, as well as students' and staff members' perception of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. Two-sample *t* tests were conducted to analyze if student or staff members' gender influenced factors (attributes, skills and job tasks) perceived as important for a

SRO. One-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to analyze if students'

grade level, staff members' years of experience, or staff members' age influenced factors

(attributes, skills, and job tasks) perceived as important for a SRO.

Major Findings

The results of the surveys indicated that all items were perceived as important to

some degree. Some factors (attributes, skills, and job tasks) averaged higher than others,

but all fell within the moderately to extremely important range. The major findings are

presented below.

Student perceptions of important attributes, skills, and job tasks. On average,

students rated each attribute, skill, and job task between moderately and extremely

important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale).

Attributes. Students rated the following attributes between moderately and very

important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): enthusiastic, flexible, curious, tolerant,

innovative and creative, and sensitive to cultural differences. On average, students rated

the following attributes between very and extremely important (between 4 and 5 on the

Likert scale): self-motivated, non-judgmental, firm, reliable, loyal, empathetic, honest,

available when needed, willing to work with young people, friendly and outgoing,

concerned about young people, consistent in actions, a good listener, a strong

disciplinarian, and a good role model.

Skills. On average, students rated the following skills between moderately and

very important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): teach in the classroom, assist

special needs students, attend extra-curricular activities, and counseling. Students, on

average, rated the following skills between very and extremely important (between 4 and

5 on the Likert scale): communicate (verbal & written), work with school administrators, manage available resources, pay attention to detail, handle criticism, conflict mediation & resolution, leadership, crisis intervention, knowledge of school discipline policies, knowledge of the law, knowledge of police procedures, knowledge of other agencies in the community, and knowledge of the physical layout of the building.

Job Tasks. Students rated the following job tasks between moderately and very important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations, assist in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals when necessary, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, participates in court proceedings to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, assists with crowd control at school functions, maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer program, and deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus. On average, students rated the following job tasks between very and extremely important (between 4 and 5 on the Likert scale): consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students; monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and

other criminal activities; takes law enforcement action as needed; notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function.

Though all attributes, skills, and job tasks were rated as important, the following statements reflect factors that rated higher than the others. Student perceptions of important attributes, skills, and tasks indicate that students want a SRO who is reliable, honest, accessible, and a good listener. The results show that students want a SRO who is a leader in the building and a good role model. Job task averages indicate that students view the SRO as a position that deals with supervision, emergencies and criminal activities.

Staff perceptions of important attributes, skills, and job tasks. Staff members, on average, rated each attribute, skill, and job task between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale).

Attributes. On average, staff members rated the following attributes between moderately and very important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): enthusiastic, curious, tolerant, innovative and creative, and friendly and out-going. Staff members, on average, rated the following attributes between very and extremely important (between 4 and 5 on the Likert scale): self-motivated, flexible, non-judgmental, firm, reliable, loyal, empathetic, honest, available when needed, sensitive to cultural differences, willing to work with young people, concerned about young people, consistent in actions, a good listener, a strong disciplinarian, and a good role model.

Skills. Staff members' averages rated the following skills between moderately and very important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): teach in the classroom, assist special needs students, attend extra-curricular activities, handle criticism, and counseling.

Staff members, on average, rated the following skills between very and extremely important (between 4 and 5 on the Likert scale): communicate (verbal & written), work with school administrators, manage available resources, pay attention to detail, conflict mediation & resolution, leadership, crisis intervention, knowledge of school discipline policies, knowledge of the law, knowledge of police procedures, knowledge of other agencies in the community, and knowledge of the physical layout of the building.

Job Tasks. On average, staff members rated the following job tasks between moderately and very important (between 3 and 4 on the Likert scale): provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society, provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations, assist in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations, becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals when necessary, regularly checks school facilities when not in use, and deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus. Staff members, on average, rated the following job tasks between very and extremely important (between 4 and 5 on the Likert scale): consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students; monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; takes law enforcement action as needed; notifies appropriate law enforcement when

violations occur on school grounds or at a school function, participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions, assist with crowd control at school functions, and maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the school resource officer program.

Though all attributes, skills, and job tasks were rated as important, the following statements reflect factors that rated higher than the others. Staff perceptions of important attributes, skills, and tasks indicate that staff members want a SRO who is reliable, honest, accessible, a good listener, and concerned and willing to work with young people. The results show that staff members want a SRO who will work with administration, is a leader in the building, a good role model and knowledgeable in various areas of the law. Job task averages indicate that students view the SRO as a position who deals with supervision, emergencies and criminal activities.

Student perceptions influenced by grade level and gender. Students in each grade level, on average, rated each attribute, skill, and job task between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale). Similarly, students of each gender, on average, rated each attribute, skill, and job task between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale).

Grade Level. The results indicate no significant difference in student perceptions of important attributes based on grade level. Although the difference was not statistically significant, on average, ninth graders perceived the skill, conflict resolution and mediation, less important than eleventh graders perceived the skill. Two job tasks were significantly different based on grade level. On average, tenth graders perceived the job task, provides community-wide crime prevention presentations, more important than

twelfth graders perceived the task. Also, on average, ninth graders perceived the job task, monitoring halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, to be more important than eleventh graders perceived the job task.

Gender. The results indicate that males perceived all of the attributes to be less important than females with the exception of the attributes: enthusiastic, self-motivated, flexible, curious, and innovative and creative, which indicated no significant difference based on gender. Although the difference was not statistically significant, males perceived all of the skills to be less important than females perceived the skills, with the exception of the skills: teach in the classroom, attend extra-curricular activities, and knowledgeable of other agencies in the community, in which there was no significant difference based on gender. The findings regarding job tasks were mixed with 10 tasks showing no perceived difference based on gender. Males did perceive the following 8 tasks as less important than females: consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students; provides community-wide crime prevention presentations, monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal; works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures, assist in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations, assist principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities; and notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function.

Staff perceptions influenced by years of experience, age, and gender. Staff members in all levels of experience, on average, rated each attribute, skill, and job task

between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale).

Similarly, students of each gender, on average, rated each attribute, skill, and job task

between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert scale). On

average, staff members of each age group and each gender, rated each attribute, skill, and

job task between moderately and extremely important (between 3 and 5 on the Likert

scale).

Years of Experience. Staff perceptions of attributes and skills important for a

SRO were not significantly different based on years of experience. The only job task

where averages indicated a significant difference was the task, monitors halls, parking

lots, or other areas assigned by the principal. On average, staff members with 4-6 years

of experience perceived this task to be less important than staff members with 7-9 years

experience perceived the job task.

Age. Staff members' averages indicated a significant difference in one attribute.

Staff members in the 31-40 years old age group, perceived the attribute, friendly and out-

going, to be less important than staff members in the 41-50 years old and 51 plus age

groups. Staff members' averages also indicated a significant difference in one skill.

Staff members in the 31-40 years old age group perceived the skill, communicate (verbal

& written), to be less important than staff members in the 51 plus age group perceived the

skill. Averages indicated no significant difference in staff perceptions of job tasks based

on age.

Gender. The only factor that indicated a significant difference based on gender

was the job task, takes law enforcement action as required. On average, male staff

members perceived this job task to be more important than females perceived the job task.

Although student and staff perceptions were not compared in the data analyses, it is interesting to note that students' grade level and staff members' age and years of experience did not significantly impact their perceptions. It could be generalized that students and staff with less experience in a building may perceive the SRO differently; however, the data did not support that generalization. Another interesting comparison is that students and staff had similar perceptions (moderately to very important) in the areas of providing guidance, teaching in the classroom, and providing crowd control at school events. Considering that the SRO Triad lists being an advisor and an instructor as two of its three areas of focus (Missouri School Resource Officers Association, n.d.), it is interesting that students and staff did not perceive them as important as other factors.

Perceptions of the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. This research study surveyed student and staff perceptions on the overall importance of having a SRO in the building. The results indicated that students perceived having a SRO in the building to be very important to extremely important. Staff member averages indicated staff members perceived having a SRO in the building to be very important to extremely important.

Findings Related to the Literature

This section contains a discussion of the results of this study as they relate to literature presented in chapter two related to perceptions of the SRO position. Limited research has been conducted related to perceptions of students' and staff members'

perceptions of an effective SRO. A brief comparison of the findings from this study

compared with existing literature is presented below.

Findings from Lambert's (2000) study indicated that administrators wanted SROs

to enforce school rules, handle legal issues, and monitor the school (p. 145). Finn et al.

(2005) found that administrators endorsed the SRO position because it added another role

model in the building, provided an added sense of security in dealing with threats, and

provided legal resources (p. 71). The results of this study concur with existing literature.

Staff members' averages indicated that being a good role model, crisis intervention,

knowledge of school discipline policies, knowledge of the law, monitoring halls, parking

lots, or other areas assigned by the principal, and taking law enforcement action when

needed all rated between very important and extremely important.

In contrast, Dickerson's (2005) study found that teachers perceived the role of a

SRO as primarily a disciplinarian (p. 89). Results from this study indicate that staff

members did perceive being a strong disciplinarian as a very to extremely important

attribute for a SRO. However, in addition to being a strong disciplinarian, staff

members' averages for this study indicated numerous roles to be very to extremely

important.

It is also interesting to note that when SROs were surveyed to find out how they

spent their time, McDaniel (2001) reported that SROs spent 20% of their time teaching,

30% of their time counseling, and 50% of their time with law enforcement. Student and

staff members' perceptions presented in this study revealed teaching in the classroom and

providing counseling were only moderately important to very important. There could be

a variety of explanations, such as the school has teachers to provide teaching and

counselors to provide counseling; however, this information does reinforce the literature addressing the importance of clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of a SRO (Mayer, 2005).

Findings of this study revealed that a student's gender can influence their perceptions. Though the findings were mixed in addressing perceived importance of attributes, skills, and job tasks based upon student gender, overall, male students perceived these factors less important than females' perceptions. These results concur with current literature, in which Pollack (2000) suggests that boys must follow a code where they exhibit strength and power and where sensitivity is viewed as a more feminine trait.

The findings of this study also indicated that staff members' years of experience and age had very little influence on their perceptions of the importance of attributes, skills, and job tasks. These findings concur with Parker's (2012) research, which revealed no significant difference in levels of teacher efficacy based upon a teacher's experience or age (p. 80). If a teacher has a strong sense of self-efficacy, the teacher would be confident in their ability to teach and would not feel the need for outside assistance. Given this premise, it is understandable that the staff members in this study perceived the SRO teaching component to be moderately important.

Conclusions

With incidents of school violence continuing to occur, school districts face the challenge of providing safe learning environments where students and staff can reach their full potential. One response has been to place SROs in the building. Though this initiative adds an officer to the building, often the SROs are not allowed to be as effective

in their role because of the lack of clarity with their roles and responsibilities. To better understand the SRO roles and responsibilities, it is important to consider what students and staff members perceive as important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective SRO. Data acquired from this research study could assist school districts and police departments in placing the most effective officer in the SRO position. The following section examines implications for action.

Implications for Action. The results of this research study provide implications for action. Since this study analyzed data from only one high school, generalizations cannot be made solely from the results presented in this study. A more encompassing survey of students' and staff members' perceptions of important attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective SRO is required.

Based on the findings of this research study, there were numerous similarities between students' and staff members' perceived importance of attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective SRO. School districts and police departments would benefit from considering the important attributes and skills when employing a SRO. This is not to suggest that only attributes and skills perceived to be important by students and staff should be considered in hiring a SRO. However, the attributes and skills identified as important could be used to develop benchmarking descriptors, which could be added to the SRO's structured interview process. School districts and police departments would also benefit from considering the important job tasks identified when planning professional development for both SROs and staff members.

School resource officers could benefit from considering this research study's findings on the effect that gender has on student perceptions. Though male and female

participants rated all attributes, skills, and job tasks between moderately and extremely important, it should be noted that males perceived numerous attributes, skills, and job tasks as less important than females perceived them. The SRO should be aware of perception differences based upon gender and be cognizant of this when building a rapport with the students.

Recommendations for Future Research. The first recommendation is to update the survey tool to reflect current trends in school safety. For example, with more schools now having surveillance systems and protected entry to the building, it is possible that student and staff perceptions of job tasks could be different. The second recommendation is to survey a larger and more diverse sample and to breakdown the staff sample by teachers and support staff. A survey of students and staff from high schools of various sizes and geographical locations could then be compared with the results of this study. A third recommendation is to conduct a study to survey the effectiveness of a SRO program. Attributes, skills, and job tasks identified as being effective for successful programs could then be compared with data presented in this proposed study.   A fourth recommendation is to survey parents. The SRO interacts with parents daily and gathering data on parent perceptions could further develop the SRO position. The last recommendation is to survey middle and elementary schools. Different surveys and survey administration would need to be considered and written for younger students, but it could be beneficial to compare middle and elementary schools results with the data presented in this study.

Concluding Remarks. Current issues in school safety, presented in this study, indicate that schools will need to continue looking for ways to maintain safe learning

environments. The SRO program continues to gain momentum with more school districts adding officers to their buildings. While there are established roles and job tasks for the SROs, the literature suggests that they may not always be clearly defined and communicated with students and staff. By considering staff and students perceptions of the SRO, officers and school administrators can approach the placement and professional development of the position more proactively. School administrators interview potential staff members, looking for the most qualified candidate who will be the best fit for the building. It is the hope of this researcher that the data presented in this study will be considered by police departments and school administrators when interviewing officers and trying to find the best fit for the school's students and staff.

References

ALICE Components. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.alicetraining.com/what-we-do/alice.aspx

ALICE: How to respond to an active shooter event. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.alicetraining.com/what-we-do/a-l-i-c-e.aspx

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. doi:10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191

Billitteri, T. J. (2010). Preventing bullying. *CQ Researcher, 20*(43), 4-23.

Black, S. (2009). Security and the SRO. *American School Board Journal,* 196 (6), 30-31.

Canady, M., James, B., & Nease, J. (2012, October). *NASRO.* Retrieved from http://www.nasro.org/content/protect-and-educate-report

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). *Youth Violence.* Retrieved from www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *About school violence.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/youthviolence/schoolviolence/index.html

Chalmers, P. (2009). *Inside the mind of a teen killer*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Cooperating School Districts. (2007). *The characterplus way replication handbook.* St. Louis, MO: Characterplus.

Cloud, J. (2010, October 18). Bullied to death? *Time, 176*, 61-63.

DeMillio, A. (2013, July 30). *Guns in school: Ark. district arming more than 20 teachers, staff*. Retrieved from http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/07/30/197713 20-guns-in-school-ark-district-arming-more-than-20-teachers-staff?lite

Dickerson, S. K. (2005). *Teacher perception of school resource officers* (Doctoral

    dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.bakeru.idm.oclc.org/

    pqdthss/docview/304990474/46CC8B9B795D4F2APQ/1?accountid=26368

Eligon, J. (2013, March 8). A state backs guns in class for teachers. *The New York Times,*

    n.p. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/09/us/south-dakota-gun-

    law-classrooms.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Eligon, J. (2013, April 14). A Missouri school trains its teachers to carry guns, and most

    parents approve. *The New York Times,* n.p. Retrieved from

    http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/15/us/missouri-school-trains-teachers-to-carry-

    guns.html?pagewanted=all

Evaluation, Management and Training Associates & ICF Macro International. (2009).

    Report on the implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act in the states and

    outlying areas school years 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. Washington D.C.: U.S.

    Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

Finn, P. (2006). School resource officer programs finding the funding, reaping the

    benefits. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 75*(8), 1. Retrieved from

    https://leb.fbi.gov/2006-pdfs/leb-august-2006

Finn, P., Shively, M., McDevitt, J., Lassiter, W., & Rich, T. (2005). *Comparison of*

    program activities and lessons learned among 19 school resource officer (sro)

    programs (Rep. No. 209272). Retrieved from

    http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED486266.pdf

Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (2005). *Applying educational research: A*

    practical guide (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Girouard, C. (2001). *School Resource Officer Training Program*. Washington, DC: U.S.

    Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and

    Delinquency Prevention.

Guns and school safety survey results. (2013, January 23). Retrieved from

    http://www.schoolimprovement.com/voices-of-education/guns-and-school-safety-

    survey-results/

Harrisonville Police Department. (2010). *School Resource Officer Program.*

    Harrisonville, MO.

Hazelden Foundation. (2009, July 9). *State and federal bullying information.* Retrieved

    from OLWEUS Bullying Prevention Program:

    http://www.olweus.org/public/laws_missouri.page

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and

    responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of

    teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education,

    21*(4), 343-356. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007

International Association of Chiefs of Police. *Guide for preventing and responding to

    school violence.* (n.d.).

Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S. L., Flint, K. H., Hawkins, J., Harris, W. A., Zaza, S.

    (2013). *Youth risk behavior surveillance - United States 2013* (4th ed., Vol. 62,

    Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, p. 1). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease

    Control and Prevention.

Klassen, R. M. (2010). Teacher stress: The mediating role of collective efficacy beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*(5), 342-350. doi:10.1080/00220670903383069

Lambert, R. (2000). *Perceived importance of certain characteristics, knowledge, skills, and job tasks for the School Resource Officer position: A survey of principals, Law Enforcement Officials, and School Resource Officers.* Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.bakeru.idm.oclc.org/pqdthss/docview/304672183/previewPDF/B600C13F5CAB4138PQ/3?accountid=26368

Larkin, R. W. (2007). *Comprehending Columbine*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Leibowitz, B. (2010, October 08). Kelly Elementary School shooting update: Two students injured, not life-threatening, say Calif. Police. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/2102-504083_162-20019116.html

Limber, S. P. (2003). Efforts to address bullying in U.S. schools. *American Journal of Health Education, 34*(5), 23.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.

May, D. C., Cordner, G., & Fessel, S. (2004). School resource officers as community police officers: Fact or fiction. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum,* 4(6), 173.

Mayer, M. J. (2005). *Fact sheet #5: School Resource Officers*. Retrieved from

    http://www.preventschoolviolence.org/

Mayer, M., J. (2008). *Fact sheet #5: School resource officers (SROs)*. Retrieved from

    http://www.preventschoolviolence.org/

McDaniel, J. (2001). *School Resource Officers: What we know, what we think we know,*

    what we need to know. Raleigh, NC: Center for the Prevention of School

    Violence.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (n.d.). *Educational*

    Resources. Retrieved from http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/SitePages/

    DistrictInfo.aspx?ID=__bk810003001300930013004300930 0

Missouri School Boards' Association. (2006). *Policy JFCF*. Retrieved from

    https://eboard.eboardsolutions.com/ePolicy/policy.aspx?PC=

    JFCF&Sch=84&S=84&RevNo=1.01&C=J&Z=P

Missouri School Boards' Association. (2013). *Policy GCA*. Retrieved from

    https://eboard.eboardsolutions.com/ePolicy/policy.aspx

    ?PC=GCA&Sch=84&S=84&RevNo=1.01&C=G&Z=P

Missouri School Resource Officer's Association. (n.d.). *What is a School Resource*

    Officer? Retrieved from http://www.missourisroa.org/organization

Missouri Senate Bill. (2013, July 12). *Current bill summary: HCS/SB 75*. Retrieved

    from http://www.senate.mo.gov/13info/pdf-bill/tat/SB75.pdf

Missouri Senate OKs guns-in-schools bill. (2013, May 2). Retrieved from

    http://www.kansascity.com/2013/05/02/4214329/missouri-senate-oks-gun-in-

    schools.html

National Association of School Resource Officers. (2012, December 21). *NASRO Responds to NRA*. Retrieved from http://www.nasro.org/content/nasro-responds-nra

National Center for Children Exposed to Violence. (2006). *School violence.* Retrieved from http://www.nccev.org/violence/school/html

National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education & Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2009). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2009.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Justice.

National Center for Educational Statistics. *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2012 - Indicator 2: Incidence of victimization at school and away from school.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2012/ind_02.asp

North Carolina State Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2002). *School Resource Officers and school administrators: "Talking and walking" together to make safer schools.* Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools. (n.d.). *Archived: Guidance concerning state and local responsibilities under the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994.* Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/gfsaguidance.html

Orr, T. (2003). *Violence in our schools: Halls of hope, halls of fear*. New York, NY: F. Watts.

Parker, J. L., Jr. (2012). *Perceptions of teacher efficacy in changing times* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1287052795?accountid=26368

Pollack, W. S. (2000). The Columbine syndrome. *Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 80*(4), 39-42.

Pollack, W. S., Modzeleski, W., & Rooney, G. (2008). *Prior knowledge of potential school-based violence: Information students learn may prevent a targeted attack.* Washington D.C.: United States Secret Service and United States Department of Education.

Practical information on crisis planning: A guide for schools and communities. (2003). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/emergencyplan/crisisplanning.pdf

Purposive sampling. (2012). Retrieved from http://dissertation.laerd.com/purposive-sampling.php#explained

Response Options Group. (2007). *A.L.I.C.E. instructor manual.* Unpublished manuscript.

Robers, S., Kemp, J., Rathbun, A., Morgan, R. E., & Snyder, T. D. (2014). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2013.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2012). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. Retrieved from http://www.caldercenter.org/sites/default/files/Ronfeldt-et-al.pdf

Rosales, J. (March 2008). More than campus cops. *NEA Today Magazine. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/15729.htm*

Safe Schools Initiative Division. (2001). *Briefing paper - School Resource Officers.* Little

    Rock, AR: University of Arkansas - Criminal Justice Institute - Safe Schools

    Initiative Division.

Sampson, R. (2009). *Bullying in school.* U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from

    http://www.popcenter.org/problems/pdfs/Bullying_in_Schools.pdf

Sandy Hook Elementary shooting: What happened? (n.d.). Retrieved from

    http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2012/12/us/sandy-hook-timeline/index.html

SB656 - Modifies provisions relating to firearms and corporate security advisors. (n.d.).

    Current bill summary: HCS/SB 75. Retrieved from

    http://www.senate.mo.gov/14info/BTS_Web/Bill.aspx?

    SessionType=R&BillID=28098814

Sellman, E. (2011). Peer mediation services for conflict resolution in schools: What

    transformations in activity characterise successful implementation? *British*

    Educational Research Journal, 37(1), 45-60. doi:10.1080/01411920903419992

Somech, L. Y., & Elizur, Y. (2009). Adherence to honor code mediates the prediction

    of adolescent boys' conduct problems by callousness and socioeconomic status.

    Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 38(5), 606-618.

    doi:10.1080/15374410903103593

Strategy: Gun-free school zones. (2014). Retrieved from

    http://www.ncpc.org/topics/school-safety/strategies/strategy-gun-free-school-zones

Theberge, S. K., & Karan, O. C. (2004). Six factors inhibiting the use of peer mediation

    in a junior high school. *Professional School Counseling, 7*(4), 283-290.

Thomas, R. M. (2006). *Violence in America's schools: Understanding, prevention, and responses*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Timeline of school shootings. (2008, February 15). Retrieved from http://www.usnews.com/news/national/articles/2008/02/15/timeline-of-school-shootings?page=3

Trump, K. (2013, October 29). *ALICE training and run-hide-fight: Are students and educators risking injury?* Retrieved from http://www.schoolsecurity.org /2013/10/alice-training-and-run-hide-fight-are-students-and-educators-risking-injury/

Welch, C. (2011). *Slain assistant principal sent student home because of trespass charge.* Retrieved from http://cnn.com/2011/CRIME/01/06/ nebraska.school.shooting/index.html

Appendices

Appendix A: Lambert Survey

School Resource Officer Selection and Job Expectation Staff Survey

Section I – The following is a list of traits, attributes, skills or abilities that may or may not be important for a School Resource Officer. Please identify how important you believe these qualities are for the officer working within the school environment. You may feel that most, or all of the qualities listed are important. However, **on this survey we are asking you to help determine which qualities are the __most__ important, which are the __least__ important, and which fall somewhere in between.** In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the items. You may wish to skim through the entire list before you begin marking your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the statement.

> **1 = Not at all important**
> **2 = Not very important**
> **3 = Moderately important**
> **4 = Very important**
> **5 = Extremely important**

A School Resource Officer should be:

- enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
- self-motivated	1	2	3	4	5
- flexible	1	2	3	4	5
- non-judgmental	1	2	3	4	5
- firm	1	2	3	4	5
- reliable	1	2	3	4	5
- curious	1	2	3	4	5
- tolerant	1	2	3	4	5
- loyal	1	2	3	4	5
- empathetic	1	2	3	4	5
- honest	1	2	3	4	5
- available when needed	1	2	3	4	5
- innovative and creative	1	2	3	4	5
- sensitive to cultural differences	1	2	3	4	5
- willing to work with young people	1	2	3	4	5
- friendly and out-going	1	2	3	4	5
- concerned about young people	1	2	3	4	5
- consistent in actions	1	2	3	4	5
- a good listener	1	2	3	4	5
- a strong disciplinarian	1	2	3	4	5
- a good role model	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale: **1 = Not at all important**
                        2 = Not very important
                        3 = Moderately important
                        4 = Very important
                        5 = Extremely important

A School Resource Officer should be able to:

- communicate (verbal & written)	1	2	3	4	5
- work with school administrators	1	2	3	4	5
- manage available resources	1	2	3	4	5
- pay attention to detail	1	2	3	4	5
- teach in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
- assist special needs students	1	2	3	4	5
- attend extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
- handle criticism	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should have skills in:

- counseling	1	2	3	4	5
- conflict resolution & mediation	1	2	3	4	5
- leadership	1	2	3	4	5
- crisis intervention	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should be knowledgeable of:

- school discipline policies	1	2	3	4	5
- the law	1	2	3	4	5
- police procedures	1	2	3	4	5
- other agencies in the community	1	2	3	4	5
- the physical layout of the school building	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should have:

- at least 3 years of law enforcement experience	1	2	3	4	5
- some post-secondary education	1	2	3	4	5
- some previous experience working with young people	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should:

- live in the community	1	2	3	4	5
- be of the same ethnic background as the majority of the student population	1	2	3	4	5
- have a strong spiritual foundation	1	2	3	4	5
- be respected in the community	1	2	3	4	5
- be resourceful in implementing programs and ideas	1	2	3	4	5

Section II – The following are tasks assigned to School Resource Officers. Please identify how important you believe it is for the officer to perform each task. You may feel that most, or all of the tasks are important. **However, on this survey we are asking you to help us determine which tasks are <u>most</u> important, which are <u>least</u> important, and which fall somewhere in between.** In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the tasks. You may want to skim through the entire list before you begin making your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the task using the rating scale below.

Rating Scale: 1 = **Not at all important**
2 = **Not very important**
3 = **Moderately important**
4 = **Very important**
5 = **Extremely important**

1. Provides guidance on ethical issues in a
   school setting and explains the law
   enforcement role in society.   1   2   3   4   5
2. Provides individual counseling to students
   related to law enforcement issues or crime
   prevention.   1   2   3   4   5
3. Consults with the principal in developing
   plans and strategies to prevent or
   minimize dangerous situations, which may
   occur on campus or during a school
   sponsored event.   1   2   3   4   5
4. Serves as a resource for teachers, parents,
   and students.   1   2   3   4   5
5. Provides community-wide crime
   prevention presentations that may include
   but are not limited to topics such as drugs
   and the law, alcohol and the law, or
   sexual harassment.   1   2   3   4   5
6. Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas
   assigned by the principal.   1   2   3   4   5
7. Assists in locating school age children
   not enrolled in school and reports
   attendance violations.   1   2   3   4   5
8. Becomes familiar with all community
   agencies and makes referrals to agencies
   when necessary.   1   2   3   4   5
9. Regularly checks school facilities when
   not in use.   1   2   3   4   5
10. Works closely with other law enforcement
    agencies to establish security procedures.   1   2   3   4   5

Rating Scale: 1 = **Not at all important**
2 = **Not very important**
3 = **Moderately important**
4 = **Very important**
5 = **Extremely important**

11. Assists in the investigation of bomb
threats and other emergency situations.   1   2   3   4   5
12. Assists principal upon request in the
investigation of thefts, fights, drug
problems, and other criminal activities.   1   2   3   4   5
13. Takes law enforcement action as required.   1   2   3   4   5
14. Notifies appropriate law enforcement
when violations occur on school grounds
or at a school function.   1   2   3   4   5
15. Participates in court proceedings
pertaining to law violations on school
grounds or at school functions.   1   2   3   4   5
16. Assists with crowd control at school
functions and assists with securing more
officers when needed.   1   2   3   4   5
17. Maintains detailed and accurate records
of the operation of the School Resource
Officer Program, making them available to
principals and law enforcement officials
when needed.   1   2   3   4   5
18. Deals specifically with law enforcement
matters originating on the assigned campus
and does not act as a school disciplinarian.   1   2   3   4   5

Section III – Please check beside the option that best describes your current status.

1. Position: _____ Principal
_____ Law Enforcement Administrator
_____ School Resource Officer

2. Sex: _____ Male   _____ Female

3. Years of experience in above position: _____ 1 – 3 years
_____ 4 – 6 years
_____ 7 – 9 years
_____ 10 or more years

4. Years of experience working with school security issues:
     _____ 1 – 3 years
     _____ 4 – 6 years
     _____ 7 – 9 years
     _____ 10 or more years

5. School size: _____ 100 – 300 students
     _____ 301 – 600 students
     _____ 601 – 1000 students
     _____ 1001 – 1300 students
     _____ 1301 – 1600 students
     _____ 1601 – 2000 students
     _____ More than 2000 students

6. School location:
     _____ Rural area or small town of fewer than 20,000 inhabitants
     _____ Small town (20 – 50,000 inhabitants; at least 20 miles from a larger city)
     _____ Suburban (small or midsize community within 20 miles of a larger city)
     _____ Urban (a city of 50,000+ inhabitants)

7. In which part of the state is your school located:
     _____ Eastern   _____ Piedmont   _____ Western

8. Estimate the percentage of your student body that is eligible for free/reduced lunch:
     _____ 0 – 20%
     _____ 21 – 40%
     _____41 – 60%
     _____ 61 – 80%
     _____ 81 – 100%

9. On a scale of one to five, how important do you feel it is to have a School Resource Officer?
     _____ 1 = Not at all important
     _____ 2 = Not very important
     _____ 3 = Moderately important
     _____ 4 = Very important
     _____ 5 = Extremely important

Appendix B: Notice of Permission to Use the Lambert Survey
(copied from email correspondence)

Jason,

I would be glad to have you use the survey from my dissertation. Please use anything that would be useful to you. Good luck with your work.

Sincerely,

Regina Lambert

07/22/09 12:23 PM

Dear Dr. Lambert,

My name is Jason Farnsworth and I am currently pursuing an EdD from Baker University (Kansas City, Missouri area). I have finished the coursework and I am now ready to embark on the dissertation journey. While still in the early stages of planning and discussion, my topic will be along the lines of the perceptions of high school staff and students regarding attributes, skills, and job tasks of effective school resource officers.

In researching this topic, I have come across your dissertation, which I believe will be quite relevant and resourceful as I work through this study. I am inquiring to obtain permission to use the survey you utilized in your dissertation. While still in the early stages of planning, I cannot say if the survey would be used in its entirety or if certain sections would be used, but I do believe the survey holds a substantial amount of value to the study I would like to complete.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and I look forward to future correspondence.

Sincerely,

Jason Farnsworth

Appendix C: IRB Proposal

IRB Request

Date   January 21, 2011

IRB Protocol Number_____
           (IRB use only)

I. Research Investigator(s) (students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) _____

   Name   Signature

1. Elizabeth Sanders _____ Major Advisor

2. Peg Waterman _____ Research Analyst

Jason Farnsworth's   Phone: (XXX) XXX-XXXX
contact information:

           Email: XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

           Mailing address: XXXXXXXXXXX

Expected Category of Review: __ Exempt <u>X</u> Expedited __ Full __ Renewal

II: Protocol Title

High School Staff and Students' Perceptions of Essential Attributes, Skills, and Job Tasks for an Effective School Resource Officer

III: Summary
The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience, and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

In light of recent school violence incidents, school resource officers are becoming more commonplace in the school setting. However, the job description of school resource officers is often vague and their role in the school setting is often left undefined. This study will analyze high school staff and students' perceived importance of attributes, skills and job tasks the school resource officer must possess/perform to be considered effective. Information from this study will assist school districts and police departments in the selection and retention of quality school resource officers.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

The research is a survey design. There are no manipulations or conditions to describe. The survey was offered to students during study lab time. Students did not lose any academic class time for the purpose of the survey. The survey was offered to staff members during a staff meeting on a staff work day.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

The staff and student surveys (see Appendix E and Appendix H) are modifications of one originally created by Regina Lambert. Dr. Lambert granted consent to utilize her survey tool (see Appendix B). The survey uses a Likert scale for participants to rate the importance of various attributes, skills, and job tasks that may be considered important for an effective school resource officer.

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

There was no risk to the subjects of this study.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

The survey did not cause stress. The surveys were completed anonymously.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

No, the participants were not deceived or misled in any way. No debriefing was required.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

Participants did not consider the survey questions personal or sensitive. Student participants were asked to share their grade level, gender, and ethnicity. Staff participants were asked to share their current position, experience in current position, gender, age, marital status, and ethnicity.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

Participants were not presented with any offensive, threatening, or degrading materials.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The survey took participants an estimated 10 - 20 minutes to complete.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The subjects of this study were staff and students from Harrisonville High School who voluntarily chose to complete the survey. Staff participants were given the opportunity to complete the staff survey at a staff meeting held during a work day in October 2010. A letter explaining the purpose of the survey was attached to the staff surveys (see Appendix H). Surveys were available for interested staff members; time was given to complete the surveys; and completed surveys were returned to a designated location.

Prior to giving students the opportunity to participate in the survey, an informational table was set up during Residency Verification nights on August 5 and 10, 2010. An informational table was also set up during Harrisonville High School's Open House on August 17, 2010. Materials presented included the student survey letter, the student survey, and an opt-out letter (see Appendix F). This information was also available for viewing on the district's website from August 5-27, 2010.

Students were given the opportunity to complete the student survey during their Study Lab/Supervision period on October 18, 2010. Study Lab/Supervision teachers made student surveys available for interested students to complete. A letter explaining the purpose of the survey was attached to the student surveys (see Appendix E). Time was given at the beginning of the Study Lab/Supervision period for interested participants to complete the survey. Once completed, participants returned the survey to their teacher, who then placed surveys in a designated envelope.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

All participation was strictly voluntary. The survey was provided to any interested participant. Time within the established school day was given to any interested participant to complete the survey. Participants were reminded that survey completion was voluntary.

No inducements were offered to staff members who participated. Students who participated were entered into a drawing to possibly win one of four twenty-five dollar Walmart gift cards.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Passive consent was utilized for the purpose of this study. Numerous steps were taken to inform potential student participants and their parents/guardians about their right to opt out of the survey. These steps included:

- Informational table set up at two district residency verification nights (August 5 and August 10, 2010). Parent/Guardian informational/opt out letter was available (see Appendix F). Copies of the survey were also available for viewing.
- Parent/Guardian opt out letter and sample of the student survey was available on the Harrisonville High School website from August 5 – August 27, 2010.
- Informational table set up at the Harrisonville High School Open House on August 17, 2010.
- A phone call (School Reach) was sent out to all parents/guardians on August 25, 2010 (see Appendix G).

Will any aspect of the data be made part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No. All responses were completely anonymous.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No. All responses were completely anonymous. No information will be part of any permanent record.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data?

Data was collected anonymously. Data will be presented as a whole. Subgroup data will be analyzed, but will not be presented in any way that would identify any participant. Subgroup information for student participants includes: grade level, gender, and ethnicity, but specific participant responses will not be identified or shared. Subgroup information for staff participants includes: current position, experience in current position, gender, age, marital status, and ethnicity, but specific participant responses will not be identified or shared. In order to maintain confidentiality, if any subgroup numbers are deemed too small and risk identifying participants, those subgroups will not be broken down.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

Benefits include gaining a better understanding of what role an SRO should play in meeting the needs of the school, the staff, and the students – ultimately providing a safer school environment.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No data from files or archival data will be used in this research study

Appendix D: IRB Approval

October 13, 2011

Dear Mr. Farnsworth:

On April 6, 2011, the Baker University IRB reviewed your research project application (E-0112-0121-0406-G) and approved this project under Expedited Review . As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

The Baker University IRB requires that your consent form must include the date of approval and expiration date (one year from the approval date). Please be aware of the following:

1. At designated intervals (usually annually) until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the IRB.
2. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify the OIR about any new investigators not named in original application.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the IRB Chair or representative immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or myself when this project is terminated. As noted above, you must also provide OIR with an

annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from the IRB one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Doolittle, EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Appendix E: Student Survey with Cover Letter

July 26, 2010

Dear Student,

I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University and I am currently working on a clinical research study in regards to staff and students' perceptions of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer.

In order to obtain valid data, I would appreciate your candid responses on the attached survey. All responses will remain anonymous. In order to keep the feedback anonymous, **please do not write your name on the survey.** The survey should take no longer than 10 – 15 minutes to complete. As a thank you for your time, upon completing the survey you will be entered in a drawing to win one of four $25 gift certificates to Wal-Mart. You will notice a ticket attached to your survey. Once you complete the survey, detach the portion that states "Keep this Coupon" and leave the other portion attached to the survey. Return the survey to the envelope provided by your teacher. Once all of the surveys have been returned, the tickets will be detached and placed in a box for the drawing. The drawing will be held on October 21 at 11 am in the Student Services Office and the winning numbers will be read during the end of the day announcements. If you have one of the winning tickets, bring your portion of the ticket to the Student Services Office to claim your prize.

Please understand this is not a job evaluation survey of our current school resource officer, but instead a survey of student perceptions of the attributes, skills, and job tasks important to the overall role of the school resource officer position.

I understand how valuable your time is and your responses on this survey are greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Jason Farnsworth

School Resource Officer Selection and Job Expectation Staff Survey

Section I – The following is a list of traits, attributes, skills or abilities that may or may not be important for a School Resource Officer. Please identify how important you believe these qualities are for the officer working within the school environment. You may feel that most, or all of the qualities listed are important. However, on this survey we are asking you to help determine which qualities are the <u>most</u> important, which are the <u>least</u> important, and which fall somewhere in between. In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the items. You may wish to skim through the entire list before you begin marking your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the statement.

Rating Scale:	**1 = Not at all important**	**2 = Not very important**
	3 = Moderately important	**4 = Very important**
	5 = Extremely important	

A School Resource Officer should be:

- enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
- self-motivated	1	2	3	4	5
- flexible	1	2	3	4	5
- non-judgmental	1	2	3	4	5
- firm	1	2	3	4	5
- reliable	1	2	3	4	5
- curious	1	2	3	4	5
- tolerant	1	2	3	4	5
- loyal	1	2	3	4	5
- empathetic (understanding)	1	2	3	4	5
- honest	1	2	3	4	5
- available when needed	1	2	3	4	5
- innovative and creative	1	2	3	4	5
- sensitive to cultural differences	1	2	3	4	5
- willing to work with young people	1	2	3	4	5
- friendly and out-going	1	2	3	4	5
- concerned about young people	1	2	3	4	5
- consistent in actions	1	2	3	4	5
- a good role model	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

- a good listener   1   2   3   4   5

- a strong disciplinarian   1   2   3   4   5

A School Resource Officer should be able to:

- communicate (verbal & written)   1   2   3   4   5

- work with school administrators   1   2   3   4   5

- manage available resources   1   2   3   4   5

- pay attention to detail   1   2   3   4   5

- teach in the classroom   1   2   3   4   5

- assist special needs students   1   2   3   4   5

- attend extra-curricular activities   1   2   3   4   5

- handle criticism   1   2   3   4   5

A School Resource Officer should have skills in:

- counseling   1   2   3   4   5

- conflict resolution & mediation   1   2   3   4   5

- leadership   1   2   3   4   5

- crisis intervention   1   2   3   4   5

A School Resource Officer should be knowledgeable of:

- school discipline policies   1   2   3   4   5

- the law   1   2   3   4   5

- police procedures   1   2   3   4   5

- other agencies in the community   1   2   3   4   5

- the physical layout of the school building   1   2   3   4   5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

A School Resource Officer should have:

- at least 3 years of law

  enforcement experience   1   2   3   4   5

- some post-secondary education   1   2   3   4   5

- some previous experience working with

  young people   1   2   3   4   5

A School Resource Officer should:

- live in the community   1   2   3   4   5

- be of the same ethnic background

  as the majority of the student

  population   1   2   3   4   5

- have a strong spiritual foundation   1   2   3   4   5

- be respected in the community   1   2   3   4   5

- be resourceful in implementing

  programs and ideas   1   2   3   4   5

Section II – The following are tasks assigned to School Resource Officers. Please identify how important you believe it is for the officer to perform each task. You may feel that most, or all of the tasks are important. However, on this survey we are asking you to help us determine which tasks are <u>most</u> important, which are <u>least</u> important, and which fall somewhere in between. In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the tasks. You may want to skim through the entire list before you begin making your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the task using the rating scale below.

Rating Scale:	**1 = Not at all important**	**2 = Not very important**
	3 = Moderately important	**4 = Very important**
	5 = Extremely important	

1. Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

2. Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

3. Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

4. Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

5. Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

6. Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal.　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

7. Assists in locating school age children
   not enrolled in school and reports
   attendance violations.   1   2   3   4   5

8. Becomes familiar with all community
   agencies and makes referrals to agencies
   when necessary.   1   2   3   4   5

9. Regularly checks school facilities when
   not in use.   1   2   3   4   5

10. Works closely with other law enforcement
    agencies to establish security procedures. 1   2   3   4   5

11. Assists in the investigation of bomb
    threats and other emergency situations. 1   2   3   4   5

12. Assists principal upon request in the
    investigation of thefts, fights, drug
    problems, and other criminal activities. 1   2   3   4   5

13. Takes law enforcement action as required. 1   2   3   4   5

14. Notifies appropriate law enforcement
    when violations occur on school grounds
    or at a school function.   1   2   3   4   5

15. Participates in court proceedings
    pertaining to law violations on school
    grounds or at school functions.   1   2   3   4   5

16. Assists with crowd control at school
    functions and assists with securing more
    officers when needed.   1   2   3   4   5

17. Maintains detailed and accurate records
of the operation of the School Resource
Officer Program, making them available to
principals and law enforcement officials
when needed.   1   2   3   4   5

18. Deals specifically with law enforcement
matters originating on the assigned campus
and does not act as a school disciplinarian.   1   2   3   4   5

Section III – Please check beside the option that best describes your current status.

1. Grade Level: _____ 9th   _____ 10th

                       _____ 11th   _____ 12th

2. Gender: _____ Female   _____ Male

3. Ethnicity: _____ Minority (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian)

                       _____ Non-Minority (White)

4. On a scale of one to five, how important do you feel it is to have a School
   Resource Officer?

                       _____ 1 = Not at all important
                       _____ 2 = Not very important
                       _____ 3 = Moderately important
                       _____ 4 = Very important
                       _____ 5 = Extremely important

Appendix F: Parent/Guardian Opt-Out Letter

July 26, 2010

Dear Parent/Guardian,

My name is Jason Farnsworth and I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University. I am currently working on a clinical research study in regards to staff and students' perceptions of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer.

In order to obtain valid data, students will have the opportunity to complete a survey that will measure students' perceptions of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer. The survey will take 10 – 15 minutes to complete. To ensure students will not lose any instructional minutes in order to complete the survey, it will be distributed during their Advisory/Supervision period. The surveys will be distributed during the week of October 18, 2010.

Student participation is voluntary and any student choosing not to participate will not be penalized. Students will be asked not to put their names on the survey and all responses will remain anonymous. Students who complete and return the survey will be entered in a drawing to win one of four $25 gift certificates to Wal-Mart.

As a parent/guardian, you have the right to opt your student out of the survey. Please take a few minutes to review the survey. A copy of the survey will also be available for viewing on the high school's website. If at any time between now and August 27, 2010, you wish to opt your student out of the survey, please complete the bottom portion of this letter and return it to the Student Services Office. Thank you for your time and consideration and feel free to contact me at 380-3273 ext. 6301 with any questions.

Respectfully,

Jason Farnsworth
Assistant Principal – Harrisonville High School

_____ I do not want my student to participate in the School Resource Officer Survey.

Student's Name (printed)

_____

Parent/Guardian's Name (printed)

_____

Parent/Guardian's Signature

_____

Date _____

Appendix G: School Reach Message Regarding SRO Survey

Good Evening,

This is Jason Farnsworth, assistant principal at Harrisonville High School. During the week of October 18, 2010 students will have the opportunity to participate in a survey regarding the position of a school resource officer. The survey will measure the perceived importance of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer.

Copies of the survey were available for viewing at both Residency Verification nights as well as the Open House. The survey is also currently available for viewing on the Harrisonville High School website.

Student participation in this survey is strictly voluntary and any student choosing not to participate will not be penalized. As a parent/guardian, you have the right to opt your student out of the survey. If you would like to opt your student out of the survey, please contact me by the end of the day Friday, August 27, 2010 at 380-3273 ext. 6225.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, feel free to contact me at the same number.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Have a good day.

Appendix H: Staff Member Survey with Cover Letter

July 26, 2010

Dear Staff Member,

I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University and I am currently working on a clinical research study in regards to staff and students' perceptions of essential attributes, skills, and job tasks for an effective school resource officer.

In order to obtain valid data, I would appreciate your candid responses on the attached survey. All responses will remain anonymous. In order to keep the feedback anonymous, **please do not write your name on the survey.** The survey should take no longer than 10 – 15 minutes to complete. Once completed, please return the survey to the envelope provided by the facilitator.

Please understand this is not a job evaluation survey of our current school resource officer, but instead a survey of staff perceptions of the attributes, skills, and job tasks important to the overall role of the school resource officer position.

I understand how valuable your time is and your responses to this survey are greatly appreciated.

Thank you.
Jason Farnsworth

School Resource Officer Selection and Job Expectation Staff Survey

Section I – The following is a list of traits, attributes, skills or abilities that may or may not be important for a School Resource Officer. Please identify how important you believe these qualities are for the officer working within the school environment. You may feel that most, or all of the qualities listed are important. However, on this survey we are asking you to help determine which qualities are the <u>most</u> important, which are the <u>least</u> important, and which fall somewhere in between. In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the items. You may wish to skim through the entire list before you begin marking your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the statement.

Rating Scale:	**1 = Not at all important**	**2 = Not very important**
	3 = Moderately important	**4 = Very important**
	5 = Extremely important	

A School Resource Officer should be:

-	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
-	self-motivated	1	2	3	4	5
-	flexible	1	2	3	4	5
-	non-judgmental	1	2	3	4	5
-	firm	1	2	3	4	5
-	reliable	1	2	3	4	5
-	curious	1	2	3	4	5
-	tolerant	1	2	3	4	5
-	loyal	1	2	3	4	5
-	empathetic (understanding)	1	2	3	4	5
-	honest	1	2	3	4	5
-	available when needed	1	2	3	4	5
-	innovative and creative	1	2	3	4	5
-	sensitive to cultural differences	1	2	3	4	5
-	willing to work with young people	1	2	3	4	5
-	friendly and out-going	1	2	3	4	5
-	concerned about young people	1	2	3	4	5
-	consistent in actions	1	2	3	4	5
-	a good role model	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

- a good listener	1	2	3	4	5
- a strong disciplinarian	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should be able to:

- communicate (verbal & written)	1	2	3	4	5
- work with school administrators	1	2	3	4	5
- manage available resources	1	2	3	4	5
- pay attention to detail	1	2	3	4	5
- teach in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
- assist special needs students	1	2	3	4	5
- attend extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
- handle criticism	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should have skills in:

- counseling	1	2	3	4	5
- conflict resolution & mediation	1	2	3	4	5
- leadership	1	2	3	4	5
- crisis intervention	1	2	3	4	5

A School Resource Officer should be knowledgeable of:

- school discipline policies	1	2	3	4	5
- the law	1	2	3	4	5
- police procedures	1	2	3	4	5
- other agencies in the community	1	2	3	4	5
- the physical layout of the school building	1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

A School Resource Officer should have:

- at least 3 years of law

  enforcement experience   1   2   3   4   5

- some post-secondary education   1   2   3   4   5

- some previous experience working with

  young people   1   2   3   4   5

A School Resource Officer should:

- live in the community   1   2   3   4   5

- be of the same ethnic background

  as the majority of the student

  population   1   2   3   4   5

- have a strong spiritual foundation   1   2   3   4   5

- be respected in the community   1   2   3   4   5

- be resourceful in implementing

  programs and ideas   1   2   3   4   5

Section II – The following are tasks assigned to School Resource Officers. Please identify how important you believe it is for the officer to perform each task. You may feel that most, or all of the tasks are important. However, on this survey we are asking you to help us determine which tasks are <u>most</u> important, which are <u>least</u> important, and which fall somewhere in between. In other words, please try to make a judgment as to the <u>relative</u> importance of the tasks. You may want to skim through the entire list before you begin making your responses. Circle the number that corresponds to how you feel about the task using the rating scale below.

Rating Scale:	**1 = Not at all important** **2 = Not very important**
	3 = Moderately important **4 = Very important**
	5 = Extremely important

1. Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society.   1   2   3   4   5

2. Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention.   1   2   3   4   5

3. Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event.   1   2   3   4   5

4. Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students.   1   2   3   4   5

5. Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment.   1   2   3   4   5

6. Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal.   1   2   3   4   5

Rating Scale:	1 = Not at all important	2 = Not very important
	3 = Moderately important	4 = Very important
	5 = Extremely important	

7. Assists in locating school age children
   not enrolled in school and reports
   attendance violations.   1   2   3   4   5

8. Becomes familiar with all community
   agencies and makes referrals to agencies
   when necessary.   1   2   3   4   5

9. Regularly checks school facilities when
   not in use.   1   2   3   4   5

10. Works closely with other law enforcement
    agencies to establish security procedures. 1   2   3   4   5

11. Assists in the investigation of bomb
    threats and other emergency situations. 1   2   3   4   5

12. Assists principal upon request in the
    investigation of thefts, fights, drug
    problems, and other criminal activities. 1   2   3   4   5

13. Takes law enforcement action as required. 1   2   3   4   5

14. Notifies appropriate law enforcement
    when violations occur on school grounds
    or at a school function.   1   2   3   4   5

15. Participates in court proceedings
    pertaining to law violations on school
    grounds or at school functions. 1   2   3   4   5

16. Assists with crowd control at school
    functions and assists with securing more
    officers when needed.   1   2   3   4   5

17. Maintains detailed and accurate records
of the operation of the School Resource
Officer Program, making them available to
principals and law enforcement officials
when needed.   1   2   3   4   5

18. Deals specifically with law enforcement
matters originating on the assigned campus
and does not act as a school disciplinarian. 1   2   3   4   5

Section III – Please check beside the option that best describes your current status.

1. Position: _____ Certified (teacher, counselor, administrator)

   _____ Classified (administrative assistant, kitchen staff, maintenance,
   nurse, paraprofessional, school resource officer)

2. Experience in current position: _____ 1-3 years   _____ 4-6 years

   _____ 7-9 years   _____ 10 years-plus

3. Gender: _____Female   _____Male

4. Age: _____ 21-30 years old   _____ 31-40 years old

   _____ 41-50 years old   _____ 51-60 years old

   _____ 61-plus

5. Marital Status: _____ married   _____ single

6. Ethnicity: _____ Minority (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian)

   _____ Non-Minority (White)

7. On a scale of one to five, how important do you feel it is to have a School Resource Officer?

   _____ 1 = Not at all important

   _____ 2 = Not very important

   _____ 3 = Moderately important

   _____ 4 = Very important

   _____ 5 = Extremely important

Appendix I: Hypothesis Test Results for Students

Table I1. *Students' perceptions of attributes based on grade level*

Attribute	F	df1	df2	p
Enthusiastic	.621	3	669	.602
Self-Motivated	.477	3	673	.699
Flexible	1.697	3	672	.166
Non-judgmental	.829	3	674	.478
Firm	.956	3	671	.413
Reliable	1.101	3	672	.348
Curious	.627	3	670	.598
Tolerant	2.371	3	670	.069
Loyal	.291	3	674	.832
Empathetic	1.234	3	674	.296
Honest	.306	3	671	.821
Available when needed	.311	3	674	.817
Innovative and creative	.694	3	674	.556
Sensitive to cultural differences	.941	3	674	.420
Willing to work with young people	.202	3	673	.895
Friendly and out-going	.851	3	674	.466
Concerned about young people	.777	3	675	.507
Consistent in actions	.857	3	673	.463
A good listener	1.291	3	672	.276
A strong disciplinarian	.965	3	673	.409
A good role model	.357	3	673	.784

Table I2. *Students' perceptions of skills based on grade level*

Skill	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*p*
Communicate (verbal & written)	.375	3	674	.771
Work with school administrators	.639	3	670	.590
Manage available resources	.734	3	675	.532
Pay attention to detail	.124	3	672	.946
Teach in the classroom	2.371	3	672	.069
Assist special needs students	1.422	3	671	.235
Attend extra-curricular activities	.319	3	668	.812
Handle criticism	.239	3	672	.869
Counseling	.755	3	675	.519
Conflict resolution & mediation	4.007	3	674	.008
Leadership	.835	3	673	.475
Crisis intervention	.998	3	675	.393
Knowledge of school discipline policies	1.467	3	675	.222
Knowledge of the law	1.336	3	675	.262
Knowledge of police procedures	.959	3	674	.412
Knowledge of other agencies in the community	.642	3	674	.588
Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building	.186	3	675	.906

Table I3. *Students' perceptions of job tasks based on grade level*

Job Task	F	df1	df2	p
Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society	1.372	3	674	.250
Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention	.775	3	674	.508
Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event	.295	3	672	.829
Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students	.216	3	670	.885
Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment	2.920	3	673	.033
Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal	3.163	3	669	.024
Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations	2.605	3	674	.051
Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary	.542	3	674	.653
Regularly checks school facilities when not in use	.473	3	674	.701

Table I3. *Students' perceptions of job tasks based on grade level (continued)*

Job Task	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*P*
Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures	.389	3	674	.761
Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations	.565	3	674	.638
Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities	.688	3	673	.560
Takes law enforcement action as required	.740	3	663	.529
Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function	.221	3	674	.882
Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions	.704	3	675	.550
Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed	.360	3	674	.782
Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed	.655	3	674	.580
Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian	.315	3	673	.815

Appendix J: Hypothesis Test Results for Staff Members

Table J1. *Staff members' perceptions of attributes based on years of experience*

Attribute	F	df1	df2	p
Enthusiastic	.593	3	68	.622
Self-Motivated	.495	3	69	.687
Flexible	2.536	3	69	.064
Non-judgmental	.126	3	69	.944
Firm	.854	3	69	.469
Reliable	.733	3	69	.536
Curious	1.483	3	69	.227
Tolerant	.680	3	68	.567
Loyal	2.064	3	68	.113
Empathetic	.030	3	69	.993
Honest	1.741	3	69	.167
Available when needed	.445	3	69	.722
Innovative and creative	.677	3	69	.569
Sensitive to cultural differences	1.694	3	68	.176
Willing to work with young people	.385	3	69	.764
Friendly and out-going	2.229	3	68	.093
Concerned about young people	1.221	3	68	.309
Consistent in actions	1.185	3	69	.322
A good listener	.436	3	68	.728
A strong disciplinarian	2.394	3	69	.076
A good role model	.402	3	69	.752

Table J2. *Staff members' perceptions of skills based on years of experience*

Skill	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*p*
Communicate (verbal & written)	.122	3	69	.947
Work with school administrators	1.858	3	69	.145
Manage available resources	2.319	3	69	.083
Pay attention to detail	.596	3	69	.619
Teach in the classroom	.756	3	69	.522
Assist special needs students	.418	3	69	.741
Attend extra-curricular activities	.513	3	69	.674
Handle criticism	.146	3	69	.932
Counseling	.341	3	69	.795
Conflict resolution & mediation	.262	3	69	.853
Leadership	.948	3	69	.422
Crisis intervention	.243	3	69	.866
Knowledge of school discipline policies	.340	3	69	.797
Knowledge of the law	.396	3	69	.756
Knowledge of police procedures	.769	3	69	.515
Knowledge of other agencies in the community	1.539	3	69	.212
Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building	1.265	3	69	.293

Table J3. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on years of experience*

Job Task	F	df1	df2	p
Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society	.114	3	69	.952
Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention	.589	3	69	.624
Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event	.581	3	69	.630
Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students	1.458	3	68	.234
Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment	2.215	3	69	.094
Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal	3.029	3	69	.035
Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations	1.823	3	69	.151
Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary	.960	3	69	.417
Regularly checks school facilities when not in use	.401	3	69	.752

Table J3. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on years of experience (continued)*

Job Task	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*P*
Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures	.578	3	69	.632
Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations	.315	3	69	.814
Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities	1.140	3	69	.339
Takes law enforcement action as required	1.037	3	69	.382
Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function	.935	3	69	.429
Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions	.116	3	69	.951
Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed	1.883	3	69	.141
Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed	.528	3	69	.664
Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian	1.330	3	68	.272

Table J4. *Staff members' perceptions of attributes based on age*

Attribute	F	df1	df2	p
Enthusiastic	1.409	3	67	.248
Self-Motivated	624	3	68	.602
Flexible	1.847	3	68	.147
Non-judgmental	.994	3	68	.401
Firm	1.031	3	68	.384
Reliable	.389	3	68	.761
Curious	1.701	3	68	.175
Tolerant	.492	3	67	.689
Loyal	.904	3	67	.444
Empathetic	.476	3	68	.700
Honest	1.373	3	68	.258
Available when needed	1.335	3	68	.270
Innovative and creative	.558	3	68	.644
Sensitive to cultural differences	.431	3	67	.731
Willing to work with young people	.569	3	68	.637
Friendly and out-going	4.611	3	67	.005
Concerned about young people	.354	3	67	.786
Consistent in actions	.895	3	68	.449
A good listener	1.083	3	67	.362
A strong disciplinarian	.804	3	68	.496
A good role model	.957	3	68	.418

Table J5. *Staff members' perceptions of skills based on age*

Skill	F	df1	df2	p
Communicate (verbal & written)	2.983	3	68	.037
Work with school administrators	2.240	3	68	.092
Manage available resources	.417	3	68	.741
Pay attention to detail	1.990	3	68	.124
Teach in the classroom	1.547	3	68	.210
Assist special needs students	1.772	3	68	.161
Attend extra-curricular activities	.524	3	68	.668
Handle criticism	2.041	3	68	.116
Counseling	2.742	3	68	.050
Conflict resolution & mediation	.727	3	68	.539
Leadership	.963	3	68	.416
Crisis intervention	.263	3	68	.852
Knowledge of school discipline policies	1.071	3	68	.367
Knowledge of the law	.452	3	68	.717
Knowledge of police procedures	.489	3	68	.691
Knowledge of other agencies in the community	.429	3	68	.733
Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building	.108	3	68	.955

Table J6. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on age*

Job Task	F	df1	df2	p
Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society	.444	3	68	.952
Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention	.156	3	68	.624
Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event	.752	3	68	.630
Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students	.331	3	67	.234
Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment	1.652	3	68	.094
Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal	.438	3	68	.035
Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations	.635	3	68	.151
Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary	.561	3	68	.417
Regularly checks school facilities when not in use	.789	3	68	.752

Table J6. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on age (continued)*

Job Task	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*P*
Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures	1.758	3	68	.632
Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations	.696	3	68	.814
Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities	.195	3	68	.339
Takes law enforcement action as required	.294	3	68	.382
Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function	.129	3	68	.429
Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions	.221	3	68	.951
Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed	1.062	3	68	.141
Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed	.283	3	68	.664
Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian	2.012	3	67	.272

Table J7. *Staff members' perceptions of attributes based on gender*

Attribute	t	df	p
Enthusiastic	-1.322	70	.191
Self-Motivated	-.304	71	.762
Flexible	.060	71	.952
Non-judgmental	.864	71	.391
Firm	.465	71	.643
Reliable	.199	71	.843
Curious	-.902	71	.370
Tolerant	1.143	70	.257
Loyal	-.526	70	.601
Empathetic	-.591	71	.557
Honest	-.404	71	.687
Available when needed	.070	71	.944
Innovative and creative	-1.516	71	.134
Sensitive to cultural differences	.396	70	.694
Willing to work with young people	-.378	71	.706
Friendly and out-going	1.202	70	.233
Concerned about young people	.920	70	.361
Consistent in actions	.605	71	.547
A good listener	-.327	70	.744
A strong disciplinarian	1.368	71	.176
A good role model	1.218	71	.227

Table J8. *Staff members' perceptions of skills based on gender*

Skill	t	df	p
Communicate (verbal & written)	-.072	71	.943
Work with school administrators	-.707	71	.482
Manage available resources	-.318	71	.752
Pay attention to detail	-1.079	71	.284
Teach in the classroom	1.487	71	.142
Assist special needs students	1.945	71	.056
Attend extra-curricular activities	-.389	71	.698
Handle criticism	-.309	71	.758
Counseling	.955	71	.343
Conflict resolution & mediation	.334	71	.739
Leadership	-.545	71	.588
Crisis intervention	-1.434	71	.156
Knowledge of school discipline policies	.199	71	.843
Knowledge of the law	-1.735	71	.087
Knowledge of police procedures	-1.924	71	.058
Knowledge of other agencies in the community	-1.027	71	.308
Knowledge of the physical layout of the school building	-.404	71	.687

Table J9. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on gender*

Job Task	t	df	p
Provides guidance on ethical issues in a school setting and explains the law enforcement role in society	.836	71	.406
Provides individual counseling to students related to law enforcement issues or crime prevention	-.915	71	.363
Consults with the principal in developing plans and strategies to prevent or minimize dangerous situations, which may occur on campus or during a school sponsored event	-.872	71	.386
Serves as a resource for teachers, parents, and students	-1.723	70	.089
Provides community-wide crime prevention presentations that may include but are not limited to topics such as drugs and the law, alcohol and the law, or sexual harassment	-1.117	71	.268
Monitors halls, parking lots, or other areas assigned by the principal	-.038	71	.970
Assists in locating school age children not enrolled in school and reports attendance violations	-.121	71	.904
Becomes familiar with all community agencies and makes referrals to agencies when necessary	-.156	71	.876
Regularly checks school facilities when not in use	-.784	71	.435

Table J9. *Staff members' perceptions of job tasks based on gender (continued)*

Job Task	t	df	p
Works closely with other law enforcement agencies to establish security procedures	-.119	71	.906
Assists in the investigation of bomb threats and other emergency situations	-1.171	71	.246
Assists principal upon request in the investigation of thefts, fights, drug problems, and other criminal activities	-1.463	71	.148
Takes law enforcement action as required	-2.167	71	.034
Notifies appropriate law enforcement when violations occur on school grounds or at a school function	-1.287	71	.202
Participates in court proceedings pertaining to law violations on school grounds or at school functions	.055	71	.956
Assists with crowd control at school functions and assists with securing more officers when needed	.802	71	.425
Maintains detailed and accurate records of the operation of the School Resource Officer Program, making them available to principals and law enforcement officials when needed	-1.034	71	.304
Deals specifically with law enforcement matters originating on the assigned campus and does not act as a school disciplinarian	.418	70	.677