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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to test perceptions and perceived safety and how it relates to fear of crime regarding university campus violence and safety. Faculty, students, and staff were drawn from a Midwestern university of the United States. This research examined vulnerability to stress, gender, age, and status, and its significance to fear of crime in comparison to the participation in precautionary and avoidance behaviors and campus crime statistics. It was hypothesized that there would be a general fear of crime regardless of overall low levels of campus crime and that both men and women would participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors due to this fear of crime. In addition, it was hypothesized that persons with higher stress vulnerability scores and longer crime related media usage would have higher levels of fear of crime. Results indicated that perceived safety and status both have a significant effect on fear of crime, but sex, age, and stress vulnerability scores do not. Furthermore, results indicated that crime related media usage does not have an effect on fear of crime.
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Introduction

College campuses are subject to different types of criminal activity such as, but not limited to, theft, robbery, physical and sexual assault, and the use of weapons such as firearms. Today, the topic of campus safety is one that can be considered a "hot topic" due to the unfortunate high-profile events that have happened in the United States. For some, campus safety is an important factor when choosing which college institution that they would like to attend or work at. Regarding the general population, there is a plethora of research that investigates fear of crime and perceived risk. However, when discussing a college’s community (students, faculty, and staff), research is much more limited.

This study aimed to establish student, faculty, and staff’s perceptions, precautionary behavior, and avoidance behaviors towards campus violence and safety. Even though campus safety is a continuing concern for students nationwide, there is not much known about student’s or faculty’s feelings and actions regarding campus violence and safety resources. A search of the literature related to perceived victimization and fear of crime finds hundreds of results, however most of the studies focus only on the generalized fear of crime. Very few of these articles research the perceptions of risk when it comes to victimization, and even less focus on the topic regarding a university or college campus setting.

This research study contains multiple different concepts and definitions. The study’s focus is on perception of victimization. Perception is defined in the Merriam-Webster dictionary (2018) as “a result of perceiving, observation, to attain awareness or understanding of”. In addition, this study examined precautionary behavior and
avoidance. Precautionary behavior is defined as “actions taken to prevent something dangerous or unpleasant from happening” and avoidance is defined as the “act or practice of avoiding or withdrawing from something.” Furthermore, this research looked at fear of crime and fear is defined as an “unpleasant and often strong emotion caused by anticipation or awareness of danger.” It is important to note that fear is often a normal and even healthy response relative to crime, however, the fear of crime may also be exaggerated or unwarranted, producing even higher levels of stress and anxiety.

**Routine Activity Theory**

Routine activity theory was first created by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson in 1979. Routine activity theory’s focus is the study of crime as an event. The theory highlights relation to time and space, as well as emphasizes the ecological nature and implications of crime. In short, routine activity theory attempts to identify criminal activities and patterns through changes in crime rate trends at the macro-level (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Cohen and Felson’s theory suggest that criminal victimization occurs when there are three essential elements. These elements include a suitable target, a motivated offender, and an incapable or absent guardian of property or persons. Routine activity theory also suggests that the likelihood of victimization can be linked to five different assumptions including proximity; decreased guardianship, increased exposure, attractiveness, and the properties of crime (Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981). This theory typically attempts to explain the true risk of victimization; however, some researchers have tried to use routine activity theory to explain perceived risk and fear of
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victimization. More specifically, the researchers try to answer if aspects which might predict victimization risk can also predict perceived risk and fear of victimization.

Certain lifestyle activities could increase a person’s exposure to crime and it is suggested that risky lifestyle behaviors that increase true risk of victimizations may also increase fear of victimization (Mesch, 2000a). Since the activities could possibly imply opportunity for crime, they might also increase a person’s fear. In terms of campus violence and crime, risky activities are related to going to parties, clubs, or bars, or going out at night alone (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2003). There have been mixed results through research regarding fear of crime and lifestyle variables. Some research has reported that persons who participate in leisure activities at nighttime are less likely to report their fear of crime (Mesch, 2000a), whereas others have found that participation in nighttime activities had a higher fear of violence because of their increased risk of victimization (Rountree, 1998).

Exposure to crime though lifestyle activities could possibly influence how a person may attempt to prevent being victimized with precautionary behaviors and guardianship. In addition, precautionary behaviors may be related to fear or crime and will use self-protective behaviors to prevent potentially becoming a victim of crime. Tewksbury & Mustaine (2003) suggest that understanding how fear of crime, personal characteristics, and lifestyles relate to one’s use of precautionary measures is an important issue to improve the understanding of this topic. In addition, many factors can influence fear of crime such as media influences, sociodemographic influences, and prior victimization.
Influence factors for fear of crime

Sociodemographic Factors

Many demographic factors have already been found to impact the fear of violence and crime. One of the most consistent predictors tends to be gender. Many times, females will be more likely to have a fear of violence than males (Jennings et al, 2007). However, contrary to females having a higher rate of fear, victimization rates with most types of crimes (not including stalking and sexual assault) are higher for men. This imbalance between the fear levels among women and the victimization level of men becomes a type of paradox. This paradox has caused some researchers to imply that because men are more consistently the victims of violence and women have more of a vulnerability to being victimized, that women should have higher fear of violence. Other researchers have argued that the difference in fear of violence and crime between men and women is explained through the type of crime. For example, in levels of fear involving burglary, there was not a significant difference between men and women (Fox, Nobles, & Piquero, 2009). On the other hand, women report higher fear of sexual assault compared to men, and fear levels are even more significant when comparing sexual assault by a stranger versus an acquaintance. Overall, gender is a consistent factor and predictor for fear of violence and crime.

Race and age are also demographic factors that have been addressed throughout the literature. However, it should be noted that when compared to gender, these two factors are not as consistent of a predictor as gender is. There are some studies that have shown older persons that respond are less likely to report any fear of victimization or feel
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at risk to crime (Ziegler & Mitchell, 2003). In contrast, some studies have shown that younger respondents tend to have a higher level of fear of crime (Lane & Meeker, 2003). This difference may be because, even though younger people are less vulnerable physically to violence and are more likely to have a lifestyle that put them at risk for victimization (Rountree, 1998). In addition, there also seems to be a curvilinear relationship about fear of crime where it is highest amongst younger people in which it then declines in adulthood, only to slightly increase in the elderly. Comparably, race has also been found to be a predictor for fear of violent crime, but these results have yielded to be inconsistent. A handful of studies report that races other than Caucasian have higher levels of fear of safety or risk of crime while other studies have found that race does not affect fear at all.

Prior Victimization

Victims of crime may distinguish crime differently than those who have never been a victim, which may affect their overall fear of crime. Research indicates that past victimization can be a strong predictor of perceived fear of crime or risk of crime (Reid & Konrad, 2004). In some studies, fear of crime varied with the type of victimization. For example, violent victimization caused an increase in fear of crime whereas being a victim of nonviolent burglary did not have a significant effect (Rountree, 1998). In contrast, other studies show that being a victim of a crime in the past yielded higher levels of fear towards crime in terms of sexual assault, robbery, and burglary (Cates, Dian, & Schnepf, 2003). Overall, it has been shown a positive correlation between the degree of victimization experience and the level of fear of crime.
A common factor discussed throughout the present literature is media influence. One of the core theories addressing the effects of media is called cultivation theory and was proposed by George Gerbner in 1973. The theory claims that people who consistently watch television are more likely to be influenced by the media’s messages. Gerber claimed that the messages influence them in such a way that the persons’ perceptions of view of the world will start imitating what they see from TV. As a result, TV is considered to independently contribute to how people see and understand social reality. Cultivation theory also argues that the image the media typically presents is one that does not truly represent reality. For example, images portrayed on television such as the amount of crime and violence can be disproportionate to reality. This leads to viewers having a distorted view of the real world and believing a ‘television perspective’ (Mosharafa, 2015).

Television has become the most widely used news source in the United States and has certain conventions that produce relevant content, especially when it comes to crime (Patterson, 2000). In addition, television is predicted to have the largest influences on today’s society in terms of person’s beliefs and ideologies of violence and crime. Throughout decades, the media has been addressed for providing distorted views of crimes and those who commit crime (Dowler, 2003). Television’s memorable crime coverage which typically focuses and puts an emphasis on violence and homicide could increase viewer’s fear of crime by creating perspectives that crime victimization is likely to happen and outside of our control (Romer, Jamieson & Aday, 2003).
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The availability heuristic suggests that viewer’s recurrent exposure to crime and violent stories on TV increases their availability in memory. Television coverage of crime should increase perceived vulnerability based on the degree of how much stories air, how dramatically they are presented, and if they are relatable or meaningful to the viewer (Romer et al, 2003). Heath and Petraitis (1987) found that people who watch television for longer periods reported a higher perceived risk to crime. Other researchers disagree in that the number of hours affects the perceived risk but argues that it is the amount of news that one watches that leads to a higher fear of crime (Truman, 2005). When discussing access to media and fear of crime, it is also essential to consider demographic factors since fear of crime can also be mediated by socioeconomic status, race, gender, and age.

Campus Violence and Safety

Access to campus crime data was made available to the public in 1990 through the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act, along with its successive legislation, the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998 (Nobles, Fox, Khey, & Lizotte, 2012). The Clery Act is a step in the right direction for providing education for the public regarding crime on campus. Since the creating of the Clery Act, some researchers have reviewed the usefulness of the data. These reviews of data are fascinating and many of the researcher’s arguments are grounded in the use of official statistics to measure crime (Mergerson, 1992; Palmer, 1993). There are apprehensions from a methodological standpoint towards the reliability and accuracy of the created presentation of what is seemingly “campus crime.” For instance, data needed
to satisfy requirements for the Clery Act are collected by law enforcement agencies on campuses, which therefore only reflect crime reported to police.

Generally, college campuses are assumed to be safe and somewhat free from crime, but research indicates that those on college campuses report being fearful of a crime taking place (Fox, Nobles, & Piquero, 2009). During 2016, approximately 28,000 criminal incidents were reported to police and security on college campuses which increased 3% from 2015. Out of the total 28,400 crimes, 12,000 (42.25%) were burglaries, 8,900 (33.34%) were forcible sex offenses, 3,500 (12.32%) were motor vehicle thefts, 2,200 (7.75%) were aggravated assaults, and 1,100 (3.87%) were robberies (Musu, L. et al., 2019).

Despite differing levels of crime on varying campuses and in increased emphasis on improving safety precautions, persons at colleges and universities are not 100% immune from criminal victimization. The campus community’s perceptions of the likelihood of victimization and the strength of on-campus safety resources, combined with their fear of victimization can shape their decision to engage in protective behaviors and avoidance. Past research suggests that perceived likelihood and fear of criminal victimization, confidence in on campus safety measures such as security and police, and past accounts of crime can influence both avoidance and protective behaviors on campus (Higinite, Marshall, & Naumann, 2017).

Past research regarding faculty and staff and their perceptions of campus crime and safety is limited. Most of the current research focuses on college students, disregarding faculty and staff, who although may not reside on or very close to campus,
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still spend a considerable amount of their time working at the university. However, a study done by Fletcher and Bryden (2007) focused on female faculty and staff’s safety practices, beliefs, and attitudes regarding safety issues at a university. The study found that the services used most by the participants were health services and security services. In addition, they found that precautions used included: locking their doors when alone, having a safety route, carrying their keys defensively, checking their backseats, avoiding walking past strangers, avoiding certain areas at night, walking with someone else, and changing up their routine activities. Contradictory to reporting on precautionary behaviors, most faculty and staff reported that they felt safe on campus and that any unease about safety typically happens in the late afternoon or nightfall (Fletcher & Bryden, 2007). The present study addressed this gap in the literature by including both college students and faculty and staff as participants.

The university that was used in this study, Eastern Illinois University, is considered a safe college campus. In 2017, Eastern Illinois University, located in Charleston, IL, with a student population of over 7,400, was ranked as one of the safest college campuses in the entire United States (The 50 Safest College Towns in America, 2017). However, in the last couple of years, the EIU community has experienced an increase with shootings, robbery, and drug related crimes in the blocks surrounding the campus. Table 1 details Eastern Illinois University crime statistics compared to the most recently released National campus crime statistics. Empty spaces indicate that the crime log did not include that type of crime and are marked as non-applicable.
### Table 1
Comparison of crime statistics from the University and national data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Eastern Illinois University, 2017</th>
<th>National Campus Statistics, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Violence</td>
<td>5 (4.1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,824 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,082 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Battery</td>
<td>5 (4.1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2 (1.7%)</td>
<td>2,205 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>2 (1.7%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful use of ID/fraud/deception</td>
<td>8 (6.6%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage to property</td>
<td>6 (4.9%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage to state property</td>
<td>5 (4.1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal trespassing</td>
<td>9 (7.4%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12,015 (42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,106 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,499 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>11 (9.1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>34 (28.1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting/Obstructing</td>
<td>4 (3.3%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis control act</td>
<td>2 (1.7%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor control act</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled substances</td>
<td>1 (.8%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal weapon possession</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug law arrests</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor law arrests</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons law violations referred for disciplinary action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,434 (.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug law violations referred for disciplinary action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>56,125 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor law violations referred for disciplinary action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>173,661 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>15 (12.4%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121 Reported Crimes</td>
<td>28,346 (Crimes against persons/Property)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N/As indicate the crime log did not include this crime type or are non-applicable.
There were a few different hypotheses for this study. It was hypothesized that there would be a general fear of crime regardless of overall low levels of campus crime and that both men and women would participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors due to this fear of crime. In addition, it was hypothesized that persons with higher stress vulnerability scores would have higher levels of fear of crime. As an exploratory hypothesis, exposure time to crime related media was also observed, with a hypothesis that longer crime related media usage would have an effect on fear of crime.

Methods

Participants

Participants were drawn from Eastern Illinois University in the spring of 2019. Of the people that had the opportunity to take the survey, a total of 137 students, faculty and staff participated. Of these 137 participants, 10 had to be discarded because their survey completion rate was less than 80%, leaving 127 valid participant surveys.

The sample included 127 usable surveys in which 88 (69.3%) participants identified as female, 35 (26.8%) identified as male participants, 4 (3.2%) preferred not to answer, and 1 (.79%) identified as other. The average age of the participants was 22, with the youngest participant being 18 and the oldest being 64. Furthermore, 119 (93.7%) of respondents were students, 6 (4.72%) were faculty, and 2 (1.57%) were staff.

Instrumentation

The present study used the valid and reliable survey instrument developed by Merianos, King, and Vidourek (2017). The survey was compiled of the following sections: Perceived Campus Safety Subscale; Perceived Seriousness of Crime Subscale;
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Perceived Helpfulness of Campus Safety Resources/Services Scale; Perceived Campus Safety Resources/Services Improvements Scale; and demographic information.

The Perceived Campus Safety Subscale had 10 items that asked participants to rate how safe they felt on and around campus per a 5-point scale (5 = extremely safe; 1 = not safe at all). The Perceived Seriousness of Crime Subscale which only had 2 items asked participants to rate how serious they feel the level of crime is around and on campus per a 4-point scale (4 = extremely serious; 1 = not serious at all). The Perceived Campus Safety Resources/Services Improvements scale consisted of 12 items which requested participants to “check all that apply” for sources/resources which would help improve campus safety around or on campus. The Perceived Helpfulness of Campus Safety and Resources/Services Subscale which had 13 items asked students to rate how helpful the existing (if any) campus safety resources/services are in creating a feeling of safety around or on campus via a 4-point scale (4 = extremely helpful; 1 = not helpful). Since this subscale assessed campus safety resources that were available by the university, a fifth option of “I have not used this” was included as an option for all 13 items.

A fear of campus crime/victimization scale was implemented which asked participants to rate their fears on a scale of 0 (not afraid at all) to 10 (most afraid) about campus crime including assault, rape, murder, being attacked with a weapon, vehicle theft, robbery/burglary, property vandalism, and books/electronics/class materials stolen. This scale was originally created by Ferraro & LaGrange (1987) but was altered by Hignite, Shantal, & Naumann (2018) to ask specifically about crime on campus (Hignite,
An overall perceived risk index was created using the crime specific variables with a higher score indicating a greater perceived risk of victimization.

A Stress Vulnerability Scale (SYS) developed by Miller and Smith in 1985 was given to discover participant’s vulnerability quotient. The questionnaire tested an individual’s vulnerability to stress. Specifically, the scale rated how much a participant was prone to psychological and physical stress. Participants rated 20 questionnaire questions on a Likert-type scale of 1 (always) to 5 (never) based off how true the statement was to them. For scoring, the total score was added up and then 20 was subtracted from the original total score. A score below 10 indicates superior resistance to stress, while a score over 30 indicates high vulnerability to stress. If a participant received a score above 50, they are severely vulnerable to stress.

The SYS scores were compared to the Perceived Safety subtests to investigate if participant’s that have higher levels of vulnerability to stress are more likely to have a fear of crime, perceive victimization, and participate in avoidance and precautionary behaviors. In addition to the perceived safety subtests and SYS questionnaire, participants also answered a few questions regarding their media usage in terms of length of usage, news reports watched/read, and crime related shows/movies watched. Furthermore, participants answered questions regarding their participation in precautionary or avoidance behaviors. Lastly, there was a qualitative component to the study in which participants were asked to answer the question “If you avoid areas of campus or campus events, which areas or events” and “Overall, how safe do you feel on your college campus?”
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Procedures

This study was approved by Eastern Illinois University’s Institutional Review Board (file number 18-143). The survey was conducted online, using Qualtrics, an online survey program. All data kept within and received by Qualtrics was secured and confidential. Surveys were collected by asking students, faculty, and staff to voluntarily participate in the study by providing them with the URL of the online study. In addition, professors within the psychology department were asked to promote, as well as voluntarily take the survey in their class.

This survey was anonymous; however, participants had the option to put in their name and email at the end of the survey for a chance to win a fifty-dollar gift card. The study contained an informed consent form which participants had to select “I consent” before moving forward with the survey. Participants also had the option to quit and leave the survey at any time. In addition, at the completion of the survey, participants were given a debriefing form which included contact information for Eastern Illinois University’s counseling clinic, as well as other mental health locations within the community if needed.

Analysis methods

This study had three dependent variables (perceived safety scale, stress vulnerability scale, fear of campus crime scale). In addition, there were three grouping variables (male v. female, faculty/staff v. students, and stress vulnerability v. fear of crime). Data was analyzed using a linear multi-regression to test if sex, status, perceived
safety, and stress vulnerability affect crime. Furthermore, a hierarchical multiple regression was ran to explore any possible effect of media usage on the fear of crime.

For the qualitative questions, “Overall, how safe do you feel” and “If you avoid certain people or places on or around campus, where,” the study used a thematic analysis, which consisted in creating thematic units for consistent answers across participants of the study. These data provided further information to interpret the quantitative data.

Results

Internal consistencies were calculated for primary variables to reflect Cronbach’s Alpha values for each scale (Table 2). Alpha values for all scales were acceptable, ranging from .829 to .930

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Safety Scale</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Vulnerability Scale</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime Scale</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1A and 1B were supported. Hypothesis 1A predicted that there would be a general fear of crime regardless of overall low levels of campus crime. The average score for each asked type of crime given by participants was as follows; sexual Assault (4), murder (2), being attacked with a weapon (3), having vehicle stolen (3), being
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robbed/mugged (3), having property damaged/vandalized (3), having books/class materials stolen (3), having electronics stolen (4). None of the questions for fear of crime received a score of 0, indicating there was nothing with no fear from participants. Hypothesis 1B predicted that both men and women would participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors, but woman would participate more. Out of the total number of participants, 59.35% of respondents reported that they do in fact participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors. Of the 59.35% that answered yes, 13.8% of the total respondents were male and 44.7% were female.

Hypothesis 2A was not supported. Hypothesis 2A predicted that participants with higher stress vulnerability scores would also have higher levels of fear of crime across all crimes. A linear multi-regression analysis was conducted with fear of crime as the outcome. The main effects of sex, status, perceived safety, and stress vulnerability scores were introduced as the predictors. At an alpha level of 0.05, the overall model was found to be significant. $R^2 = .36, F(4,111) = 15.701, p < .001$. Status had a significant effect on fear of crime, $\beta = 1.67, p = .008$. In addition, perceived safety had an effect on fear of crime, $\beta = -1.37, p = .001$. Sex did not have a significant effect on fear of crime, $\beta = .604, p = .097$. Stress vulnerability scores also did not have a significant effect, $\beta = .009, p = .467$.

Hypothesis 2B was also not supported. Hypothesis 2B predicted that longer media usage would predict higher levels of fear of crime. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted with fear of crime as the outcome. In the first step, the main effects of sex, status, perceived safety, and age were introduced as predictors. At an alpha
level of 0.05, the relationship between perceived safety and fear of crime was found to be significant. $R^2 = .382$, $F (4, 106) = 16.39$, $p < .001$. Perceived safety had a significant effect on fear of crime, $\beta = -1.521$, $p < .001$.

In the second step, media usage was introduced into the regression model. The results indicated that the media usage variable did not add in predictive value, $R^2$ change $= 0.07$, $F (3, 103) = .371$, $p = .774$. Therefore, media usage did not have any significance on fear of crime.

We also examined correlations between media usage, perceived safety, stress vulnerability, and fear of crime. Perceived safety was negatively correlated with watching/reading real crime related news ($r = -.219$, $p < .015$). Stress vulnerability was also correlated with watching/reading fictional crime related content ($r = .208$, $p < .022$).

**Exploratory Analysis**

In addition to the original analysis, exploratory questions were given during the survey to assess thoughts regarding current campus safety resources and possible improvement for increased safety on and around campus. The question “which of the following do you feel would help to improve safety on or around campus?” was asked to participants. Participants were able to select more than one answer. The top three answers that were chosen by respondents was “campus lighting outside on or around campus” (69.92%), “video monitoring of campus” (68.29%), and “Campus lighting in parking garages or lots” (58.54%) (Table 3).
Table 3.
Respondent percentage answers for improved safety questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which do you feel would improve safety on/around campus?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus lighting outside on or around campus</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video monitoring of campus</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus lighting in parking garages or lots</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus lighting inside buildings</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible presence of campus security officers</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency accessibility to campus security</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled 24/7 access to campus buildings and facilities</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New student orientation that focuses on campus safety methods and services offered</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free campus safety seminar offered to all students, faculty, &amp; staff</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased communication between campus safety services</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if participants or anyone personally close to them had ever been a victim of a crime on or at this campus or within 2 blocks, 27.64% of respondents answered “yes” while 72.36% answered “no” (Table 4). Of those that answered “yes,” 27.3% were female and 29.4% were male. When asked if respondents participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors on campus or within 2 blocks, 59.35% of respondents answered “yes” and 40.65% answered “no.” Of those that answered “yes,” 50% were male, 62.5% were female, and 1 participant identified as other (Table 4).
Table 4

Victim of crime and participation in precautionary/avoidance behavior results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has ever been a victim of crime on or at campus within 2 blocks</th>
<th>Response Rates</th>
<th>Participate in precautionary or avoidance behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
<td>59.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 27.3%</td>
<td>Female: 62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 29.4%</td>
<td>Male: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.36%</td>
<td>40.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages of female and male were calculated out of the total of females and males

Qualitative results

The thematic analysis showed that from the 127 responses, the theme of “I feel safe” and “It’s friendly” was reported 85 times (Table 5). A direct “No” to feeling safe was only reported 6 times and a “both yes and no” type theme was reported 25 times. Respondents that reported “both yes and no” typically reported specific times they did and did not feel safe such as “safe during the day, but not at night.” Of the respondents that reported that they feel like campus and the surrounding 2 blocks are safe and friendly, there was a reoccurring theme of reporting that “things have happened, just not to me.” This may indicate that even though respondents know crime may be happening in the area, they would not necessarily feel worried or unsafe until something happens to them directly. The next largest theme was the mention of external patrol and access to emergency resources which was mentioned 17 times, followed by internal safety precautions which was mentioned 16 times (Table 5). In addition, a common theme of “it’s not safe recently” was also mentioned 16 times and a general concern for safety was mentioned 15 times (Table 5). This can indicate that people are aware of the increase in
crime as of late and or do not rule out that different types of crime can happen in the area despite overall low crime levels.

There were two themes that were only mentioned twice which included feeling safe in comparison to another place with answers such as “safer than where I am from” and race with answers such as “I’m afraid because I am an African American.”

Table 5
Thematic Analysis results for “Overall, how safe do you feel?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of times observed and frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85 (69.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both yes and no</td>
<td>25 (20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s friendly/I feel safe”</td>
<td>85 (69.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s not safe recently”</td>
<td>16 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Concern</td>
<td>15 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Patrol/Emergency Resources and Services</td>
<td>17 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Safety Precautions (for self)</td>
<td>16 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe in comparison to other places</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the “Overall, how safe do you feel on campus?” question, participants were asked if they participated in precautionary or avoidance behaviors. If participants checked “yes” they were then asked which behaviors they participated in and if they checked that they avoid certain areas or events on campus, had the option to input
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which areas. This resulted in 44 responses which showed 3 different themes (Table 6). The most reoccurring theme which was reported 25 times throughout responses was “areas and general safety” (Table 6). Common responses in this theme were “dark areas or sidewalks, “avoid walking at night,” “dimly lit areas,” “lonely areas,” and “parking lots.” The theme of “places” was mentioned 20 times throughout respondent’s answers with responses such as “large sporting events,” “Doudna and Life Sciences buildings,” “the outskirts of campus,” “near intramural fields,” and “Fraternity houses” (Table 6). The last theme noted was “certain people” and was mentioned 5 times throughout the analysis (Table 6). Responses for this theme included “fraternity brothers and Greek life members,” “areas with larger crowds of people,” “random neighbors,” and “student athletes.”

Table 6
Thematic Analysis for “If you avoid areas on campus, which areas?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of times observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Areas &amp; Safety</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Places</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain groups/People</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to explore the potential relationships among perceived safety, sociodemographic characteristics, precautionary behaviors, media usage, stress vulnerability, and fear of crime. Based on previous research and theoretical explanations, it was expected that perceived safety, use of precautionary behaviors, stress
vulnerability scores, media usage, sex, age, and status would relate and predict fear of crime.

As hypothesized, there was some amount of general fear of crime, regardless of overall low levels of campus crime. The average scores for each specific crime that was questioned ranged between 2 and 4, with sexual assault and stolen property being the two most feared types of crime. When viewing Eastern Illinois University’s crime statistics in comparison to the two most feared types of crime, there were only 3 reported sexual assaults and 0 robberies/burglaries for the year of 2017. So, despite the low reported levels of these crimes, a generalized fear of these crimes was still reported. Prior literature finds this consistent stating that even though there is a gender difference, a general fear of crime between both males and females exist (Wilcox et al., Jennings et al, 2007) While it may be typical that crime rates are lower on campus than in other areas around the U.S., studies agree that the campus community may still feel levels of fear of crime (Archer, 2014).

It was hypothesized that both women and men would participate in precautionary/avoidance behaviors due to a fear of crime, but women would participate in these behaviors more. This hypothesis was found supported when the answer “yes” to the question addressing the participation in these behaviors was checked by 59.35% of the respondents, 44.7% of them being female compared to 13.8% of the male respondents. However, the number of overall female respondents (88) was dominant to the number of overall male respondents (34). These findings are consistent with previous research (Rountree, 1998). Past literature indicates that even though men are more likely
to be victimized, except in cases of sexual assault, women engage in more precautionary and avoidance behaviors (Jennings et al., 2007. & Fox, Nobles & Piquero, 2009). However, literature regarding precautionary behavior tends to focus on college women, rather than men.

Hypothesis 2A which predicted that participants with higher stress vulnerability scores would have higher levels of fear of crime was found unsupported. Ultimately, participant’s stress vulnerability scores compared to their levels of fear of crime, did not indicate any type of significance or correlation. This is inconsistent with past literature which finds that vulnerability influences fear of crime and vice versa, that fear of crime effects vulnerability (Shippee, 2012, Macassa et al., 2017, & Franklin, Franklin & Earn, 2008).

The final hypothesis, 2B, predicted that longer crime related media usage would have an influence on fear of crime, but a hierarchical regression showed there was no significance between media usage and fear of crime or perception of safety. However, when a correlation was ran, there was a correlation between fear of crime and accessing media in general. In addition, there was a correlation with watching or reading real crime related news with fear of crime. Watching crime related media also correlated with perceived safety and stress vulnerability.

This is consistent with previous data which finds that crime-show viewing is related to fear of crime. In previous literature, respondents that have reported that they are regular viewers of crime related media are more likely to fear victimization and crime regardless of their age, gender, race, income, status, and perceived safety resource.
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effectiveness (Dowler, 2003., Gerbner & Gross, 1976., Mosharafa, 2015, Patterson, 2000., & Romer et al., 2003). In addition, this literature argues that due to the memorable crime coverage, there is an increase in viewer’s fear of crime due to perspective that victimization is likely to happen and outside of our control, even if this perspective is a distorted view of chances of victimization.

This study aimed to collect and observe data regarding perceptions of victimization and participation in precautionary or avoidance behaviors among students, faculty, and staff at a university before a significant crime event happens. Even though the present study sought to improve upon measures of previous studies and add important findings into the literature, there are still limitations with the measures and methods used. While searching for previous research for this topic, a significant amount can be found specifically regarding college students and their perceptions after a significant event as occurred on campus. However, the amount of research becomes much smaller when also observing the perceptions of faculty and staff, and before a significant crime event such as a mass shooting, happens. Even though this study was able to receive 127 respondents, only 8 (6.3%) of the sample were faculty and staff. Accessing more faculty and staff and including them within this research could possibly become vital for this topic, as the call for faculty and staff to play a larger role (emergency trainings and possibly carrying a weapon) in emergency situations is a quickly growing debate.

In addition to observing more faculty and staff, it may be beneficial to delve into this research further at universities that have higher levels of campus crime. Since Eastern Illinois University and the surrounding community has relatively low levels of crime, it is
possible that there is a certain level of perceived safety in which students, faculty, and staff may not be concerned about their safety until something happens personally to them or to someone very close to them. Furthermore, a significant amount of Eastern Illinois University students are from areas such as Chicago which have far higher levels of crime compared to the town that Eastern Illinois University is located.

Race has been an inconsistent predictor for fear of crime throughout literature. While this survey did not ask a specific question regarding participant’s race, there was a theme found among the thematic analysis in which respondent’s reported they felt less safe due to their race and ethnicity. Since race is an inconsistent predictor, it may be beneficial to observe in further study to test for the possibility of more consistency. Providing a question regarding race in this study may have produced additional significant results, or further added to the inconsistency of past research. However, this study did not have race as a direct focus regarding the predictors for fear of crime.

An additional limitation to the study is the fact that the questionnaires were self-report questionnaires. Using a self-report questionnaire relies on the honesty of respondents. Even though the survey was anonymous and confidential, it is very possible that participants over rated or under rated their use of media, their lifestyle habits for stress vulnerability, their fear of specific crimes, their participation in precautionary behaviors, and their opinions regarding current campus safety resources. Furthermore, even if participants attempted to be honest, they may lack introspection, ability, or understanding to provide an accurate response to some of the questions that were asked. The fact that most of the questions throughout the questionnaire used rating scales could
have provided more nuanced responses since each participant may interpret the scales differently.

Future research could continue to identify not only the levels of victimization and fear of crime regarding college students, but also faculty and staff. Furthermore, while the thematic analysis portion of this study put some effort into identifying particular areas or events in which people feel unsafe during the day or night, additional research can further identify specific campus locations, events, and people that produce increased fear or perception of victimization. In addition, since this study asked participants about their thoughts on helpfulness regarding campus police and campus safety precautions to prevent crime, it may be beneficial to further examine interactions and experiences of respondents and these resources due to the possibility that these experiences can create certain attitudes and beliefs.

In the future, the authors hope to provide this same survey in areas of Brazil where crime rates are significantly higher than rates in the entire United States and compare those findings with findings from the U.S. This may allow researchers to not only compare data between differing levels of crime involving college locations throughout the United States, but also look for comparisons and differences between different countries.

Conclusions

This study contributes to the existing body of literature regarding perceived safety and fear of crime amongst college communities by analyzing sociodemographic factors,
participation in precautionary and avoidance behaviors, crime related media usage, stress vulnerability, and perceived safety as it relates to fear of campus crime. This study addresses not only students, but faculty and staff, who also spend a significant amount of time on campus. With the knowledge from this and previous research, police and other security offices may work to evaluate improvements to campus safety resources in attempts to decrease levels of fear and victimization. In addition, police and college administrators may work together to further create education and prevention programs relating to different types of crime which can be provided to all students, faculty, and staff, including preparations for mass crime. It seems beneficial that policies, procedures, and on campus safety resources should be created to not only address actual victimization rates, but fear of victimization and the possible shadow of crime. Overall, this study provides support that there is a general fear of crime and victimization regardless of low levels of crime and the absences of a mass event among the college community, therefore it remains important for the community to address this issue while considering all previous research.
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Appendix

Consent Form

Welcome to the research study! We are interested in understanding perception of victimization and participating in avoidance or precautionary behaviors regarding campus crime. You will be presented with information relevant to campus crime, media usage, vulnerability to stress, perception, and participating in behavior, and asked to answer some questions about it. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

The study should take you around 30 minutes to complete. If you complete the survey, you will receive either your name put in a drawing for a $50 Walmart gift card, or course extra credit/research credit. Your participation in this research is voluntary and there are no foreseeable risks in the study. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you choose to withdraw from this study, you will not be eligible for the gift card drawing or class credit. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please e-mail Gianna White at gwhite@eiu.edu or her Thesis Advisor, Dr. Mariana Juras at mmjuras@eiu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
Email: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

Demographics

"Which University do you attend as a student of faculty/staff?"
- Eastern Illinois University

"Are you a student faculty or staff?"
- Student
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- Faculty
- Staff

Gender?
- Male
- Female
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

How old are you (2-digit number)?
- Insert age

**Media Usage**

Considering the past month, how many hours a week do you approximately spend...

(1) Accessing media in general?
- Less than 1 hour
- 1-4 hours
- 4-7 hours
- More than 7 hours

(2) Watching or reading real crime related news (newspapers, phone news apps, documentaries, television news, and social media articles, etc.)?
- Less than 1 hour
- 1-4 hours
- 4-7 hours
- More than 7 hours

(3) Watching or reading fictional crime related content (TV shows, movies, books, etc.)?
- Less than 1 hour
- 1-4 hours
- 4-7 hours
- More than 7 hours

**Stress Vulnerability Scale**

HOW VULNERABLE ARE YOU TO STRESS?

Complete the following survey using the scoring below.

(1) Always (2) Almost Always (3) Sometimes (4) Almost Never (5) Never

1. I eat at least one hot, balance meal a day.
2. I get seven to eight hours of sleep at least four nights a week.
3. I give and receive affection regularly.
4. I have at least one relative within 50 miles on whom I can rely.
5. I exercise to the point of perspiration at least twice a week.
6. I smoke less than half a pack of cigarettes a day.
7. I take fewer than five alcoholic drinks a week.
8. I am the appropriate weight for my height.
9. I have an income adequate to meet basic expenses.
10. I get strength from my religious beliefs.
11. I regularly attend clubs or social activities.
12. I have a network of friends and acquaintances.
13. I have one or more friends to confide in about personal matters.
14. I am in good health (including eyesight, hearing, and teeth).
15. I am able to speak about my feeling when angry or worried.
16. I have regular conversations with the people I live with about domestic problems, e.g., chores, money and daily living issues.
17. I do something for fun at least once a week.
18. I am able to organize my time effectively.
19. I drink fewer than three cups of coffee (or tea or cola drinks) a day.
20. I take quiet time for myself during the day.

Total Score Interpretation: Add the score and subtract 20.
0-24: Slightly vulnerable.
50-75: Seriously vulnerable.
Above 75: Extremely vulnerable.

Perceived Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Campus Safety Survey Item Description</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Campus Safety Subscale</td>
<td>10 Items</td>
<td>Overall, how safe do you feel…. 1. On campus in general? 2. On campus during the day? 3. On campus during the night? 4. In surrounding areas around campus (within two blocks)? 5. In parking garages and lots on or around campus (within two blocks?) 6. Walking around on campus during the day? 7. Walking around on campus at night? 8. While using the campus safety</td>
<td>1= Not safe at all 2= Slightly unsafe 3= Neither Safe or Unsafe 4= Slightly Safe 5= Extremely Safe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Perceived Seriousness of Crime Subscale | 2 items | Overall, how serious do you feel…
1. The level of crime is on campus?
2. The level of crime is around campus (within two blocks)? | 1 = Not serious at all
2 = Somewhat serious
3 = Serious
4 = Extremely Serious |
| Perceived Helpfulness of Campus Safety Resources/Services Scale | 13 items | How helpful is each of the following in making you feel safe on campus?
1. Campus security officers in general?
2. Visibly seeing campus security officers on campus?
3. Receiving crime prevention information through seminars, bulletins, emails, and university newspapers?
4. Current environmental conditions on campus (i.e., lighting, sidewalks, etc.)?
5. Current lighting in the garages/parking lots?
6. Using the campus escort service NightWalk program? 7. Accessing campus services such as night walk?
9. At school events (ballgames, etc.)?
10. Trusting other students? | 1 = Not helpful
2 = Somewhat helpful
3 = Helpful
4 = Extremely helpful |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Campus Safety Resources/Services Improvements Scale</th>
<th>12 items</th>
<th>Which of the following do you feel would help to improve safety on or around campus (check all that apply)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Campus lighting inside buildings on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Campus lighting outside on or around campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Campus lighting in parking garages and lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Video monitoring of campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Accessing the annual Campus Safety Report?
9. Receiving emails about crimes on or around campus (within one to two blocks)?
10. Controlled access to on-campus housing?
11. Counseling services?
12. Professors, faculty, or other students present on campus?
13. Knowing contact information in case of an emergency regarding your safety?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible presence of campus security officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Emergency accessibility to campus security officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Controlled 24/7 access to campus buildings &amp; Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New student orientation that focuses on campus safety methods and services being offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased communications between Campus Safety Services about services offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased services offered by Campus Safety Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Free campus safety seminar offered to all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Fear of Crime**
Rate on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = being not afraid at all and 10 = being extremely afraid), how afraid you are of...

1. Being sexually assaulted or raped on campus?
2. Being murdered on campus?
3. Being attacked by someone with a weapon on campus?
4. Having your car stolen on campus?
5. Being robbed or mugged on campus?
6. Having your property damaged by vandals on campus?
7. Having your books other class material stolen on campus?
8. Having your computer or other electronics stolen on campus?
Prior Victimization

Have you or anyone personally close to you ever been a victim of a crime on/at this campus (within 2 blocks)? Yes or No?

Participation in precautionary or avoidance behaviors?

Do you participate in any precautionary or avoidance behaviors on campus (or within 2 blocks)?

Yes or No?

If yes, which behaviors do you participate in?
- Avoid certain areas of campus or certain events (either night or day)
- Request campus escort service
- Carry a self-defense product such as keys, pepper spray, or a weapon
- Take a self-defense or safety class
- Walk on campus with others instead of alone
- Park in a well-lit area
- Check under or in back seat of car before getting in
- Other (Specify)

Qualitative Question

If you avoid areas of campus or campus events, which areas or events?
- Enter specified text into text box

Overall, do you feel safe on campus? Why or why not?
- Enter specified text into text box

Option for Gift Card

If you would like to be considered for the Walmart gift card drawings, please provide your information below. Your information will only be used for the drawings and kept confidential. Please print your name, email, and phone number.

Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study as a research participant in the present study regarding perception of victimization and participating in avoidance or precautionary behaviors related to campus crime. The present study
examines vulnerability to stress and media exposure to measure perception of victimization versus campus safety statistics, as well as participation in precautionary and avoidance behaviors.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to ask the researcher Gianna White (email: gwhite@eiu.edu), or Dr. Mariana Juras (email: mmjuras@eiu.edu). In the event that you feel psychologically distressed by this study and are unable to contact the primary investigator, we encourage you to contact any of the options below.

Lindsay Wilson at the EIU counseling clinic (email: lpwilson@eiu.edu). You may also call 217-581-3413 Monday-Friday or the emergency hotline 1-866-567-2400 after regular business hours. Below is also a list of outside resources in the community.

- Life Links
  o http://www.lifelinksinc.org/

- HOPE Coalition Against Domestic Violence
  o Phone 217-348-5931
  o www.hope-eci.org

- SACIS, Sexual Assault Counseling and Information Services
  o Phone 217-348-5033, toll free 888-345-2846.
  o www.sacis.org

Thanks again for your valuable participation.