



University campuses and types of crime: A case study of the university of KwaZulu-Natal/Howard campus in the city of Durban-South Africa

Sazelo Mkhize, Samuel Fikiri Cinini & Slindile Ngcece

To cite this article: Sazelo Mkhize, Samuel Fikiri Cinini & Slindile Ngcece (2022) University campuses and types of crime: A case study of the university of KwaZulu-Natal/Howard campus in the city of Durban-South Africa, Cogent Social Sciences, 8:1, 2110199, DOI: [10.1080/23311886.2022.2110199](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2110199)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2110199>



© 2022 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.



Published online: 11 Aug 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 3540



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Received: 27 July 2021
Accepted: 02 August 2022

*Corresponding author: Samuel Fikiri Cinini, Department of Criminology and Forensic Studies, School of Applied Human Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal/Howard Campus, Durban, South Africa
E-mail: cininiS@ukzn.ac.za

Reviewing editor:
Heng Choon (Oliver) Chan,
Department of Social and Behavioral
Sciences, City University of
Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Additional information is available at
the end of the article

LAW, CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE | RESEARCH ARTICLE

University campuses and types of crime: A case study of the university of KwaZulu-Natal/Howard campus in the city of Durban-South Africa

Sazelo Mkhize¹, Samuel Fikiri Cinini^{1*} and Slindile Ngcece¹

Abstract: University campuses are consumed by vast numbers of criminal activities, which affect both the student and the staff. This study aimed at ascertaining the types of crimes that happen at University campuses by focusing on the Howard College Campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal Durban South Africa. The research used a qualitative approach to gather data from participants, through in-depth semi-structured interviews. The findings of the study indicated that the types of campus crimes include sexual and verbal assaults and housebreaking to steal laptops, cell phones, clothes, and other accessories. Vehicle theft was also reported

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Sazelo Mkhize is currently a Senior Lecturer in the discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies, within the College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Republic of South Africa. Sazelo holds a Doctorate, Master's, Honour's and bachelor's degree in the discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies. He is a life member of the following associations: Criminology and Victimology Society of Southern Africa, Laser Pulse, as well as Academia.edu. He has received an award for the best emerging scholar by the School of Applied Human Sciences. He has published articles in high-impact and accredited national and international journals as well as presented high-quality papers at reputable conferences. His research specialization is in Police culture, Victimization and victim, crime prevention, community violence, as well as school violence. He is involved in the community with departments such as correctional services, Department of community safety and Liaison, South African Police Services and PSIRA.

Samuel Fikiri Cinini holds a PhD in Criminology and Forensic Studies from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), Durban, South Africa. He is currently a Research fellow of Criminology and Criminal Justice in the School of Applied Human Sciences at UKZN. He has also been a lecturer of Criminology, Criminal Justice, and Criminalistics: crime scene investigation at the same institution. Before this, Dr Cinini worked as a teacher assistant during his postgraduate studies at UKZN in the same department, but also as a mentor within the Academic Monitoring and Support program (AMS) in the College of Humanities. He also worked as a volunteer lecturer of Criminology and Security at Accord University located in Somalia. He has a membership in the World Society of Victimology (WSV), the Criminological Society of Africa (CRIMSA) and Golden Key International Honour Society (GK). His area of research is Policing, Public Safety and Security, Criminal Justice, Xenophobia, Victim rights and migrants. Dr Cinini holds a Doctoral, Master's, Honour's, and bachelor's degree in the discipline of Criminology and Forensic studies.

Slindile Ngcece is currently a PhD candidate in the discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies, within the College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, the Republic of South Africa. She holds a master's, Honours degree in Criminology and Forensic Studies, as well as a bachelor's degree in Criminology and Psychology. She has received recognition for academic excellence and is a member of the Golden Key International Honour Society. She is a member of Education Economics, which is a community organization, and serves as a facilitator and assistant researcher. She has been awarded a National Research Foundation (NRF) Scholarship to pursue her studies. Slindile is a promising scholar with the capability for original thought and whose endorsement is more in her ability to engage in a relentless pursuit of her academic preference. She is still growing in Research and has the right disposition to teaching and research.

and considered a major concern. Forced entry and alcohol and drug abuse were also identified. However, the issue with alcohol and drugs use was that it is hard to detect as students are usually not searched when they enter the campus premises with such substances. The findings did not reveal whether criminal cases are handed over to the police after reporting to the supervisor who then decides what happens next.

Subjects: Criminology and Criminal Justice; Higher Education; Education Policy & Politics

Keywords: Campus safety; types of crime; violence; drug abuse; Durban

1. Introduction

University campuses are consumed by vast numbers of criminal activities, which affect both the student and the staff. Various researchers have often focused on issues of students' safety, fear of crime and ways in which this phenomenon has affected their ability to learn (Barberet & Fisher, 2009; Owusu et al., 2016; Tomsich et al., 2011). A study conducted by du Toit (2015) revealed that the increase in crime rates on campuses creates tremendous challenges for campus protective services. They are often under pressure to provide effective security, keep on track and upgrade their protective systems for a safe environment. This is because when higher institutions fail to provide safety, students get discouraged from attending such institutions and parents become reluctant to send their children to an unsafe environment to learn (du Toit, 2015). Therefore, campus crimes affect the image of institutions, as well as the security officers' jobs; thereby undermining the quality of learning and students' activities on campuses (Sewpersad & Van Jaarsveld, 2012).

Other challenges come with the larger numbers of students who enter universities each year with very few security officers to monitor and provide safety on campus. University campuses then tend to become a public space, accessible to any individuals and it might consequently become difficult to securely monitor activities on campuses. Hardeo (2013), highlights that for many decades university campuses have excluded and failed to recognize security services as a part of the university system. These are law enforcement agencies not registered under the university and are a part of the independent or private security industry. According to Hardeo (2013), there are also perceptions that campus law enforcers are not genuine police officers because of their operational setting. Therefore, opinions on the security measures provided by the universities differ from what is perceived as an effective and safe security control. Moreover, issues arise when a person's attitudes towards security measures conflict with his/her ideology of campus setting and academic proceeding (Hardeo, 2013).

Hardeo (2013), also states that there is a fear of crime on campus and the perceptions of safety and/or crime may be affected by several factors. An individual may view the campus environment as unsafe since it is composed of people from different cultural backgrounds. At times strange outsiders roam the campus without being called to order or subject to interrogation. Events that have occurred on the campus (such as cases of victims of robbery/theft or rape on campus) in the past also make it to be viewed as unsafe. The perception of violence or threat of crime by students, faculty, and other members of the university community may often cause the members of the university community to leave for other institutions where they can be guaranteed better safety. Therefore, campus crime is a major challenge that can determine the level of quality of the university campus protective services. Although, Security officers are aware of criminal activities that occur on college campuses, one significant challenge in line with this assertion is that many serious crimes are not reported to the campus protective services or security officers. This has led to the distorted view that crime on-campus crime is lower than it is, and has also aroused a lack of balance on the provision of adequate security to mitigate the level of crime on campuses. Based on previous studies in a related discipline, university campuses are advised to count on the views and

experiences of the university community instead of depending solely on crime statistics (Hardeo, 2013).

1.1. Conceptual framework

Concepts such as private security, security officer, security services are defined about the PSiRA Act 56 of 2001 .¹

- **“Private security industry”** means the industry comprising security service providers.
- **“Security officer”** means any person -
 - (a) (i) who is employed by another person, including an organ of State, and who receives or is entitled to receive from such other person any remuneration, reward, fee, or benefit, for rendering one or more security services; or
 - (ii) who assists in carrying on or conducting the affairs of another security service provider, and who receives or is entitled to receive from such other security service provider, any remuneration, reward, fee, or benefit, about one or more security services.
- (a) who renders a security service under the control of another security service provider and who receives or is entitled to receive from any other person any remuneration, reward, fee, or benefit for such service; or
- (b) who or whose services are directly or indirectly made available by another security service provider to any other person, and who receives or is entitled to receive from any other person any remuneration, reward, fee, or benefit for rendering one or more security services.
- **“Security service”** means one or more of the following services or activities:
 - (a) protecting or safeguarding a person or property in any manner.
 - (b) advising on the protection or safeguarding of a person or property, on any other type of security service as defined in this section, or on the use of security equipment.
 - (c) providing a reactive or response service in connection with the safeguarding of a person or property in any manner.
 - (d) providing a service aimed at ensuring order and safety on the premises used for sporting, recreational, entertainment or similar purposes.
 - (e) manufacturing, importing, distributing, or advertising of monitoring devices contemplated in section 1 of the Interception and Monitoring Prohibition Act, 1992 (Act No. 127 of 1992).

2. Significance of the study

This study aims at ascertaining the types of crimes that happen at University campuses by focusing on the Howard College Campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal Durban South Africa. The objective of the study is to find possible security measures used by the Risk Management Services and their effectiveness to monitor crime occurrence on Howard Campus.

There are several safety challenges that university campuses face. The University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) has provided some security measures to reduce crime on campus. Despite these measures, there have been many incidents of crime that have not only undermined the effort of university security services but also reflected a negative picture of the university campus. For example, in 2007 an exchange student was sexually assaulted at UKZN Mabel Palmer student residence (Sewpersad & Van Jaarsveld, 2012).

Situations like these instil fear among the members of the university community as well as affect the image of the university campus and South Africa at large. Therefore, raising awareness on the types of crime, safety and security issues is of crucial importance to the university campuses.

When the university is aware of the challenges, this study can be used for raising awareness as well as developments of strategies against crime. This will help the university develop specific strategies to reduce crime on campus. Hardeo (2013), argues that many individuals on campus are unaware of the procedures and/or security services provided at the university.

3. Social control theory

Social control theory developed by Travis Hirschi in 1969 asserts that individuals will engage in offending behaviours when and if their social bonds become weakened. This is the most quoted theory that differs from earlier theoretical studies by addressing “what” restrains individuals from offending rather than “why” certain individuals engage in criminal or delinquent behaviours (Booth et al., 2008). Tshabalala (2001) identifies two forms of control, the “inner” and “outer” control. Inner control refers to social standards and beliefs or values that people maintain. When these standards are violated, they experience feelings of guilt, regrets, and shame. Outer control refers to the presence or absence of social rewards and punishments in response to conformity or disobedience. Therefore, misconduct may be regarded as the individual inability or failure to uphold moral socialization. The social control theory consists of four elements of social bond: (1) attachment, (2) commitment, (3) involvement and (4) beliefs.

4. Routine activities theory

Routine activities theory was coined by Lawrence E. Cohen and Marcus Felson in 1979. The rational choice theory is a sub-field of crime opportunity theory and one of the most cited theoretical constructs in literature. It is postulated as a theory of crime events and is relatively unaffected by social factors, such as unemployment, poverty, or inequality. It seeks to explain criminal activities with space and time, their patterns, and changes in crime trends.

This theory tends to move away from the offender’s motive and looks at how crime occurs. Crime is viewed as a normal incident that depends on various circumstances under which it is committed (Miró, 2014). According to (Yar, 2005), rational choice theory is considered as an “ecological approach to crime causation.” It relies on the localization of a target and the attractiveness of an object. The rational choice theory asserts that the reason for the increase in crime is the affluence of contemporary society which offers more opportunities for crime. In other words, crime is created by the daily patterns or routine activities of persons (such as work, school) which adversely create more opportunities for the offence.

This is true of a university community where most activities are structured and easily predictable. For example, students attend classes, go to the gym, visit home at certain times, which become a routine that the offender may be aware of and may easily study as time unfolds. Furthermore, the theory argues that any individual can commit a crime if an opportunity arises and the target is not protected enough. Possibly, even an individual that has never committed a crime before can be driven to engage in crime when an opportunity is created (Miró, 2014).

However, for crime to occur, three elements must be present and converge in time and space: (a) Presence of a motivated offender, (b) Presence of a suitable target and (c) Lack of a capable guardian. The withdrawal of one element would mean no crime would occur (Miró, 2014). Furthermore, the “spatial-temporal accessibility of targets for potential offenders is crucial in determining the possibility and likelihood of an offence being committed” (Yar, 2005). The routine activities must temporally be in an orderly fashion where one of the elements is either present (but powerless) or absent at a certain place and time. The routines must be defined by a clear sequence or patterns that depict where and when events are coordinated (Yar, 2005).

5. Methodology

This study followed a qualitative research approach to obtain adequate information. Face-to-face interviews were conducted for 20 participants based on voluntary participation. Participants are the guarding section officers of both sex, who were selected using the non-

probability or purposive sampling approach, and seem to be the most visible security unit on campus. They are more exposed to crime situations on campus and are also able to detect and stop crime as they patrol the campus regularly. During data collection, security grades were not taken into consideration despite knowing that big security companies hire guards based on C, B, and A grades. All the participants have experienced security officers who have been working on the campus where this research took place for more than 5 years.

Selected participants from the Risk Management Service (RMS) know the campus environment and may have experienced challenges with various crimes on campus. The thematic analysis approach was used throughout the process because it allowed for the description and interpretation of participants' views. It is defined as an interpretive process, whereby data information is systematically searched to identify patterns within the data to provide an informative description of the phenomenon (Smith & Firth, 2011).

5.1. Ethical considerations

Awareness of ethical issues in criminological research was critically essential as it prevents participants from harm. Thus, the researcher complied with the ethical requirements on voluntary participation, confidentiality, and non-maleficence. Ethical approval of the study was obtained from the University of KwaZulu-Natal Human and Social Science Ethics Committee (HSSREC) [protocols HSS/0430/018 M].

The author studied the types of crime that occur at the Howard College campus and the measures employed to curb them based on the narratives of each participant. Before starting the interview, an information sheet explaining the purpose of the study was presented to each participant, who then signed the information sheet as an agreement to participate in the study. The informed consent form clearly stated that participants have the right to withdraw from the interviews at any given time they feel uncomfortable. Verbal consent to participate and for recording the interview was sought from each participant. Participants' responses were represented by using pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality.

6. Findings

The data collected from face-to-face interviews were analysed using the thematic analysis technique. A framework of analysis reflecting themes that emerged from the study was presented, based on the data, discussion, and analysis of the information gathered from each participant's interview. Participants' views and experiences were transcribed, with common ideas grouped and compared with previous studies.

6.1. Types of crime that occur on campus

Security officers highlighted several types of campus crime. According to Smith and Firth (2011), campus crime not only reflect badly on security officers' jobs but also affect the image of the university. Security officers often get concerned when campus crime appears to escalate because the blame tends to shift to them. For instance, questions such as: "What is their job, if we still get robbed under their watch" may arise. In this study, the security officers interviewed had either experienced or witnessed campus crime. Five interviewed security officers have been victims of campus crime while fifteen have either caught or witnessed a person committing a crime. Other crimes included those that are reported by students to the security officers as they are usually the first to encounter these victims. The truth of these submissions was reflected in the following responses:

Lindiwe said: *"Sometimes, we get held at gunpoint and end up hiding and running. Some of my colleagues were once held at gunpoint, I had not started working here at tower res at that time. And those people wanted to enter the campus by force".*

Zane: “We usually tell students that they must not use their cell phones outside campus because they may get robbed, although it does happen inside the campus. Other incidents are theft and rape ...”

Joseph: “Most times there are people who want to forcefully get inside the campus, and use the fact that they are known on the school campus or by the student, but the fact is that we do not know them. So, we cannot let them in.”

Based on the interviews with some of the participants, the most common types of campus crimes encountered by security officers include forced entry, robbery, theft, and rape. However, according to the responses of 20 security officers interviewed, campus crimes include one or more of these crimes, such as *property theft, vehicle theft, alcohol, and drug use*, which is recorded as the most prevalent on campus. The responses further indicate that the campus is not immune to crime and both students and staff (including security officers) become victims of these crimes. Based on the available data, these crimes have been confirmed to affect the daily lifestyles of the students. This report complies with the routine activities theory which states that for crime to occur three elements must be present: the motivated offender, lack of capable guardian, and an attractive target. According to Yar (2005) and Miró (2014), these elements converge in space and time due to our daily patterns or routines of persons, such as work or school, which adversely creates more opportunities for offending. This was also supported by the responses given by the following security officers:

Zipho said: “... if I remember correctly, there was a student who was robbed. It was around 10 pm when I was coming to work. Near the road, I saw a student crying and I went to her and then the student said she was arm robbed (held at gunpoint), and her laptop was taken ...”

Lewis also said: “What causes crime is people who are opportunists. People who want gadgets like laptops and computers. The equipment of the university attracts these criminals. Students and girls who bring their boyfriends on campus. These boyfriends would come in here and would see things they could steal”.

These statements show that one’s activities can cause someone to be victimised. For example, students attend classes and usually walk alone to the libraries and labs. This is a typical routine of students, which can easily be studied by the perpetrators. The above comments also indicate that although formal guardianship by security officers may be provided on campus, it is opined that they cannot deter all crimes on the university campus. This may be because the offenders study the routines of the victims as well as the security officers assigned to protect the university community.

6.1.1. Alcohol and drug use

Drugs and alcohol use were reported as a major concern by security officers. In a study conducted by Carrico (2016) on on-campus safety, it was reported that about 95% of violent crimes in colleges are caused by the influence of alcohol. About 66% of college students drink alcohol within a month of their stay at university and more than 1,800 deaths of students resulted from alcohol-related causes. In this study, it was revealed that students’ excessive consumption of alcohol causes safety issues on campus. According to Siphon, one of the participants, students bring alcohol inside the campus and hurt each other. James, one of the campus security officers reported the following:

‘Ehh. No Ehh what I can say on my view on crime and how things are happening ever since I started working here. I can say that smoking and drugs are a challenge. And how we deal with them can be a bit challenging because there are people who use them, they always try to hide it from us. ‘—So, it is a bit of a problem ... and sometimes we catch them red-handed. Even when we go inside the rooms at residences, we find alcohol’.

Based on the responses of the participants, the challenge with alcohol use among students is that not only do students bring it on campus, but also it is regarded as a viable cause of crime perpetuations and students' misbehaviour. These findings concur with that of Allen (2016), who reported that alcohol-related crimes may include those in which intoxication plays a part but does not assume a definitional role in the crime committed. This happens when, for instance, students get intoxicated and physically or verbally assault fellow students or vandalize property. Students engage in destructive behaviour because when they are under the influence of drugs and alcohol, their capacity for reasoning becomes altered (Makhaye, 2016). Moreover, when students engage in alcohol they are more susceptible to becoming victims of violent crimes such as sexual assaults (Sewpersad & Van Jaarsveld, 2012).

6.1.2. Property crime

Property crime was another crime that security officers reported to be a major concern on campus as it is mostly reported by students. Data obtained by Barberet and Fisher (2009), on burglary among university students in East Midlands indicated that about 28% of crimes were that of the property with 10% of students experiencing 56% repeat victimisation of theft and burglary. They further stressed that the reason university campus students become victims of theft was that they possess expensive and attractive equipment such as a computer, recent models of mobile phones, and clothing. To concur to the above, Zack, one of the security officers reported: *"Usually computers get stolen, not all the time though. And here at res clothes get stolen at the laundry rooms. So those are the problems we face ..."*. Also, Harley echoed that *'... even though there is not much crime, there are a lot of reports about housebreaking and stolen property such as laptops. In the same vein, Thembelihle who is one of the Guarding Unit members reports that "... And students steal things like USBs, phones and laptops in the lecture rooms from each other."*

Nine participants attested that property crime is the most common crime on the college campus. Items that are frequently stolen, according to the participants, include, laptops, clothes, and cell phones especially when the offenders had broken into students' rooms. Security officers also reported car or vehicle theft as one of the most problematic experiences. This was of great concern because security officers considered car theft as a ghastly loss. After all, these cars cannot be easily replaced or recovered. The participants further elaborated that they usually feel much responsible for this and get blamed. During the interview, twelve participants reported car theft as a major concern that they usually encounter at work. For instance, Julie, one of the security guards was quoted reporting that *"the biggest problem is stealing of cars and students stealing from each other ... Because just three days ago a fortune car was stolen and there was a taxi that usually comes to campus to steal at night ..."*. Similarly, Sharon also echoed that *"the biggest problem we have right now is stealing of cars, especially at the campus gates ..."*

With the above responses, it can be argued that security officers considered vehicle theft as most challenging because of its high value or benefits to criminals, especially when compared to other properties on campus such as a cell phone. The responses reflect the fact that not everyone on campus is there for academic purposes, some might have other plans. Therefore, security officers must always be vigilant. This situation has been made possible because university campuses provide an open environment to all individuals, which allows offenders or perpetrators to enter and leave campus undetected (Sewpersad & Van Jaarsveld, 2012).

6.2. Possible security measures used by RMS

University campuses provide campus protective services to prevent crime by implementing rules, preserving order, and providing support in their mission to deliver education in a protected environment (Carrico, 2016; Hardeo, 2013). One of the ways that Howard College campus has implemented safety measures on campus was by employing visible security officers to protect physical property and campus personnel, and enforce laws or regulations for the students' conduct. Most of the responses of the participants regarding preventing and dealing with crime centred on detecting and reporting any suspicious or criminal activities to supervisors or any

RMS staff. Empirical evidence in support of how security officers handle or prevent crime on campus is captured in the following assertions. Siphso was echoed reporting that

'My job here as someone who is looking after this place is that when I find someone dealing with drugs or alcohol, I have to report to the supervisors . . . our job is to report that person and then others can continue with the case and the paperwork.'

In the same vein, Dean also reported that

'We report cases to the supervisors and the supervisor then take the matter to RMS and then you as security would have to write a statement of everything that happened. So, if the conflict is between students and security, they both write a statement. Then both statements go to RMS and then investigation unit, where they investigate the matter and give punishment where it is due.'

An in-depth interview with all the twenty security officers selected for the study shows that the procedures employed in dealing with campus crime are that the officers must always be vigilant when they come across any challenge (such as break-ins) and report the incident to the supervisors immediately. Security officers also reported that they do not get involved in criminal cases, stating that their job ends after catching and reporting an offender. According to Bazana et al. (2016), security officers have no control or freedom in their job. In case of danger, they are often unable to protect students and must call for backup or call their supervisors as they do not have guns and are unable to approach a criminal or suspicious person without permission. Security officers must pass every decision to their supervisors. These decisions include asking permission to visit the restroom, lunch break, how they should respond to criminal activities and how they should treat a suspect or an offender. Therefore, security officers are restricted and have no control over their work environment. As can be heard from Lewis reporting, "when there is an incident, I am not the one to decide on what I am supposed to do or what is supposed to happen. I take everything and report to the seniors, my supervisor". Similarly, Harley also echoed the same sentiment by reporting the following:

'When you are guarding a place, you have radios as securities and cell phones. So, if I want to go to the toilet, I will have to let my supervisor know that I must do something, and they must call someone to come to the place. So, I must report so that if something happens, I will be able to say that I reported. If there is crime maybe people are coming to rob us, my job as security will be to assess the situation and try to see everything (and what is happening) and report and I do not fight even if I am at gunpoint. I will just have to report everything that happened.'

'—Also, what I say must correspond with what is on the video camera because (everything that happens), they would ask the security what happened. So, I would report to RMS and write a statement.'

From the participants' responses, it is also evident that the university has also used technological measures to deal with crime. When security officers were asked about the procedures of dealing with campus crime, they mentioned the use of cameras, phone radios, cell phones, etc., especially in cases of emergencies and alarms. Hardeo (2013), asserts that technological advancement is another factor that can improve security and service demands. This is in line with the increased use of technology such as the installation of Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras around the country and on campuses. This has greatly helped reduce the prevalence and extent of crime. CCTV cameras have enabled the campus police to identify offenders and help students recover their stolen property. However, Sulkowski and Lazarus (2011), argued that the challenge with technological measures is that they respond after an incident has occurred or check for "clues" after the crime has already taken place rather than prevent crime. Therefore, universities should focus on preventive measures rather than developing intervention strategies. To abide by these preventive measures, universities have also put-up warnings, notices, or rules on boards around

the campus and UKZN websites. These rules include the restriction on procurement and use of weapons by the members of the campus community, as well as strict legal actions against the use of drugs and alcohol on campus. To substantiate this statement Thembelihle who is one of the security officers reported the following:

‘... So, we have laws that we use, like the ones that are posted on the boards on campus with rules and warnings. Although as a security man, I will have to remind you that the rules or laws do not allow you to do something. For example, in this place, no animals like dogs are allowed, so if you arrive with a dog, you may not be allowed into the campus. Or if you arrive with a gun, I will tell you, you are not supposed to bring the guns.’

Although universities have provided that weapons on campus should not be allowed for the protection of staff and students, Sulkowski and Lazarus (2011), argued that weapons restrictions on campuses may put security in danger of being unable to protect themselves during violent attacks. Other measures that security officers use to control crime include residence and campus patrol and maintenance issues. As one of the preventive measures, security officers have reported that they patrol places with no or inadequate security measures so that they can make sure students are safe inside. Also, Lindiwe, one of the security officers said, *“If I see places that would cause danger, I report. Like in some other places where students walk in the absence of light, it may be so hard to ask the management to put light”*.

These responses further support claims by Rademeyer (1995), who found that one of the ways that university campuses can combat crime is to limit alcohol consumption on campuses. The security officers enforce students’ regulations and rules by prohibiting alcohol consumption on campuses. Security officers must detect vandalism and the handling of maintenance issues in the sense that they must report any vandalised asset for possible repair or replacement. On-campus residences, the security officers must also perform door-to-door checks to decrease overcrowding and unpermitted visitors.

6.3. The effectiveness of procedures used to combat crime

The effectiveness of measures against campus crimes is mostly contested on the experiences of students’ vis-a-vis their undue criticisms against campus security officers or security measures. This is evident in one of the studies conducted by Hardeo (2013), entitled “students’ perceptions of security services at UKZN”. The study revealed that security officers were criticized mainly for discrimination against students, lack of professionalism, inability to provide protection and assistance in cases of theft and sexual victimisation, as well as undue absence from known hotspots of campus crime. However, this study provides the security officers and the risk management services with an opportunity for self-reflection; thereby helping them identify some of the challenges that render campus crime measures ineffective. The following responses depict what the security officers reported as reasons for security ineffectiveness to prevent crime on campuses:

Zane said: ‘Procedures here do not work in our favour; we do not have any rights and there is nowhere (I can say) we are happy about the outcome of something we have a problem with. Even, now if there were to be snakes here and I would get back up quickly I would probably live. But that backup would only come maybe after 20 minutes. Even last year at Gate 5, there was a student who was drowning at the swimming pool and the security guard who was working there called for assistance; and at that time the student was not yet dead, but he ended up dying without getting any form of assistance. Because if a person is in the water there is nothing he or/she can hold on to because he’s dying and the security could not help because he would have died—the student died. After all, the assistant got there very late. So, when you call for assistance, it takes a long time for them to get there.’

Interviews with four Security officers unfolded that there are procedures put in place to protect the university community. However, they are sometimes incapable of assisting students when they are under attack due to late emergency responses. The security officers also reported that they have

concerns with late response or feedback from the investigation team on the cases reported by the students. Students would always enquire about the case with the uninformed security unit and not the investigation unit.

An excerpt from Eric revealed the following:

'As a parent, it is hurtful when a student loses his stuff. Then we have to ask them to write a statement to give to RMS and the student always comes to you to ask about the case as if you are the one who is investigating. Sometimes you even feel like moving to that place and work in another place especially when you see that student. Sometimes you even think about all the money the student lost (to buy those things) and maybe it was pension money from grandmother. So, it is disturbing'.

The security officers reported that it is disturbing how students always blame them for being unable to assist. Moreover, from the above response, it is also evident that security guards lack some of the skills for assisting students. For example, security officers who cannot swim are assigned to work at a place that has a swimming pool. Therefore, it would be difficult for the security guards to save the life of the drowning student. To support this statement contends that there is a need for proper training of security officers to deal with student-related issues effectively and specifically. Therefore, crime and other campus challenges can be dealt with effectively if they are given appropriate attention and correct security measures are put in place.

Another issue that the security officers raised was that they are often contradicted in their jobs as security officers, who are supposed to uphold and enforce the university's rules and as parent figures displaying companionship and understanding. Evidence in support of these assertions is captured in the statements of the participants below:

Sipho said: '... If you come with a visitor, the visitor must be out by ten p.m. But they never leave early, and we have to follow such things. But sometimes in other situations, we see that we cannot chase them at that time because where will they go because it is already late. Because we are also parents, and we have children or relatives who study here. Students also tend to tell us about their rights. So sometimes those rights go against the university policy and that frustrates us as workers. Sometimes we must be polite or friendly even when we do not want to because we must maintain a certain level of communication with people. So, we must always be calm. Even when you hit me, I cannot hit you back.'

Lindiwe said: '... Here at work, we become both parents and workers. Where students abuse you and not think at all that you are a parent and when she is abused you take it as that this is my child and would think about how certain things would affect them. So, there are situations where I have to protect them and do not say things that make the student be chased away from school ...'

The above expression, as suggested by six of the interviewed participants, point that the security officers often see students as their children. As such, it becomes mandatory to protect them even if the guards are having a hard time. They further expressed that they sometimes think about the students' well-being and their future; and they always try to advise them as parents, especially students with whom they have built a good relationship.

An analytical interpretation of the above statements shows that security officers sometimes go against the universities' rules to protect students. They reported that they, sometimes, must make decisions that may put their jobs at risk. Furthermore, it can be argued that although the security guards may try to help and protect a student, their actions (such as allowing unpermitted students to sleep over) may also put other students in danger.

If we take a critical look into the participants' points of view, we observe that they opined that the lack of communication among the university workers (such as students' housing management, and investigative team) makes the work of security officers ineffective. They expressed that sometimes they are not informed of the changes or temporary challenges that the school management is facing, which could also adversely affect their work and their cooperation with students and other members of the university community. This finding was corroborated during an interview with Jack:

'If you work the way you suppose to work, the job and procedures you must follow become easy. However, there are situations where you do not understand whether the mistake comes from housing or RMS or both RMS and housing. Where you find that you work at a gate, and you are not told that there are students who have moved to that res. And their cards are not activated and when this person gets robbed you are blamed (as security). In other words, we are not allowed to swipe students when housing does not activate students' cards. And if I let them in, I will be in trouble. Some students lie that they did go to housing, but they were still not assisted'.

Furthermore, six security officers reported that the phenomenon of undue favouritism shown to students over them makes their jobs less effective. The credibility of this statement is affirmed by the statements of James who said that the *"Rules here sometimes work and sometimes they do not. This is because everything that happens here favours students and we do not have the same rights. Students are put first even when they are wrong."* James also claims that the *"Rules and procedures here do not work for us because if they do, the guy who insulted the security would have been dismissed from the res or maybe put outside the campus"*.

Security officers stated that the reason campus security measures do not work sometimes was that no matter what they do, they see no results especially when it comes to students' misbehaviour. They expressed that the school management always puts the interest of students at the fore even when they are the ones at fault.

However, not all participants that were interviewed had concerns with how or the way they work. Contrariwise, four security officers reported that they do not see any difficulty with this situation and are very happy with the way things are. The in-depth interviews with those participants uncovered these expressions.

On the effectiveness of procedures used to combat crime, Zipho was reported that *'If I report to RMS, they respond quickly; we have 2:0 for control room and 2:2 for supervisors. Supervisors usually come to check the situation. Similarly, Harley reported that "Ehh, we have procedures that we follow and there is not much of challenge with them. We always try to make them work"*.

Based on the above responses, it is evident that the participants had contradictory views on the effectiveness of procedures used to combat crime on college campuses. The findings show that the experience differed. Some felt that they work effectively and get assistance when needed while others had concerns and felt challenged in some of the situations they encountered. However, the security officers were not entirely honest about their opinions. This could be attributed to the fact that they might have wanted to appear responsible and might not want to negatively report the situation surrounding their jobs.

7. Conclusion

Despite protective measures put into place, campuses are still not a crime-free zone. As demonstrated in this study, numerous crimes happen both on campus and in students' residences, perpetrators being students, their visiting friends, and other potential offenders in search of a target. The study discovered that several crimes are prevalent on the campus. The shortage of security staff has been reported to have influenced how and when the security officers respond to

campus crimes which negatively affect the effectiveness of the responding units, including, but not limited to the late emergency responses and lack of feedback on reported cases. The findings also suggest that crimes and insecurity on campus occur because of certain students. Mostly because of their misbehaviour and indecent attitude of undermining the security officers concerning outrightly violating the rules of the university to satisfy their inordinate wishes.

However, the study established that students are not the only victims of crime but security officers have also been reportedly robbed and assaulted. The types of crime that occur on campus, according to the findings of the study, include sexual and verbal assaults, and housebreaking to steal laptops, cell phones, clothes, and other accessories. Vehicle theft was also reported and considered a major concern. Forced entry and alcohol and drug abuse were also identified. However, the issue with alcohol and drugs use was, it is hard to detect as students are usually not searched when they enter the campus premises with such substances.

In response to criminal activities, the security officers patrol around campus, control access of unpermitted visitors at the gates and residences, prohibit possession and use of weapons, drugs, and alcohol. However, the study revealed that security officers are often restricted in their work and their response to campus crime. For instance, when they catch an offender or see suspicious persons, they are not allowed to make decisions. They must report the offender to the supervisor, write a statement of the incident and allow the investigation team from RMS to continue with the case. It was also established that in cases of emergency or danger, the security officers used cell phones and phone radios to call for backup. Furthermore, their job entails that they must inform the individuals who are unaware of campus crimes and remind the university community of the rules of the campus. However, the study did not mention whether suspects who are arrested are then transferred to the police station or not, but the study limits its findings in the sense that security guards only report the cases to the supervisor. It is well established that for serious crimes, the RMS always liaison with the South African Police Services so that cases can be opened and handed over to the criminal justice system for prosecution. Nevertheless, guards on only one campus were interviewed or there might be contradicting opinions between students and guards. However, this study suggests that a similar study should be conducted in different tertiary institutions to reach the generality of campus crimes and suggest possible policies to improve the campuses safety system.

Funding

This work did not receive any funding from any individual or institution. The work was done by the sole effort of the authors.

Author details

Sazelo Mkhize¹
ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7950-1948>
Samuel Fikiri Cinini¹
E-mail: cininiS@ukzn.ac.za
ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4889-6398>
Slindile Ngcece¹

¹ Department of Criminology and Forensic Studies, School of Applied Human Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal /Howard Campus, Durban, South Africa.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Citation information

Cite this article as: University campuses and types of crime: A case study of the university of KwaZulu-Natal/ Howard campus in the city of Durban-South Africa, Sazelo Mkhize, Samuel Fikiri Cinini & Slindile Ngcece, *Cogent Social Sciences* (2022), 8: 2110199.

Notes

1. https://www.psira.co.za/dmdocuments/Code%20of%20Conduct/2014_psira_act.pdf

References

- Allen, A. (2016). Campus officers' sanctioning of alcohol-involved crime: Influences on discretionary decision-making. *Police Practice and Research*, 17(3), 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2014.980409>
- Barberet, R., & Fisher, B. S. (2009). Can security beget insecurity? Security and crime prevention awareness and fear of burglary among university students in the East Midlands. *Security Journal*, 22(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.9>
- Bazana, S., Campbell, K., & Kabungaidze, T. (2016). The impact of shift work on the health and wellbeing of campus security guards. *New Voices in Psychology*, 12(2), 70–93. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1812-6371/2783>
- Booth, J. A., Farrell, A., & Varano, S. P. (2008). Social control, serious delinquency, and risky behavior. *Crime and Delinquency*, 54(3), 423–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128707306121>
- Carrico, B. A. (2016). The effects of students' perceptions of campus safety and security on student enrollment. *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 1006. Marshall University.

- du Toit, D. (2015). Working as a security guard on Potchefstroom campus: Issues, challenges and coping strategies. *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(2), 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21528586.2014.999112>
- Hardeo, P. (2013). *Student perceptions of security services at UKZN (Master's dissertation)*. The University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Makhaye, M. S. (2016). *Exploring students' perceptions on the nature and incidence of crime on university on-campus residence (Master's dissertation)*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10413/14835>
- Miró, F. (2014). Routine activity theory. *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118517390.wbetc198>
- Owusu, G., Akoto, J., & Abnory, M. (2016). Is our safety and security guaranteed on University of Cape Coast Campus? Undergraduates students' perceptions. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(4), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n4p75>
- Rademeyer, G. C. (1995). *A criminological investigation into University campus protection in Southern Africa: A comparative study (Doctoral dissertation)*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10530/652>
- Sewpersad, S., & Van Jaarsveld, L. (2012). Campus security and safety: Incorporating new technology to an old paradigm of guarding. *Acta Criminologica: Southern African Journal of Criminology*, 2012(Special Edition 1), 46–55. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC138455>
- Smith, J., & Firth, J. (2011). Qualitative data analysis: The framework approach. *Nurse Researcher*, 18(2), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2011.01.18.2.52.c8284>
- Sulkowski, M. L., & Lazarus, P. J. (2011). Contemporary responses to violent attacks on college campuses. *Journal of School Violence*, 10(4), 338–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2011.602601>
- Tomsich, E. A., Gover, A. R., & Jennings, W. G. (2011). Examining the role of gender in the prevalence of campus victimization, perceptions of fear and risk of crime, and the use of constrained behaviors among college students attending a large Urban University. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(2), 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2010.517772>
- Tshabalala, N. G. (2001). *Protective services and crime control in the University community: A study of the University of Zululand protective unit. (Doctoral dissertation)*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10530/231>
- Yar, M. (2005). The novelty of 'Cybercrime' an assessment in light of routine activity theory. *European Journal of Criminology*, 2(4), 407–427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147737080556056>



© 2022 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions

You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.



Cogent Social Sciences (ISSN: 2331-1886) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.

Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at www.CogentOA.com

