# Research Summaries

## School Security Measures and Their Impact on Students

The National Association of School Psychologists cautions against over-emphasizing extreme physical security measures or universally increasing armed security in schools as such strategies may undermine the learning environment while not necessarily safeguarding students.[1,2] When considering school-wide efforts to promote safety, NASP recommends addressing the continuum of needs and services that lead to improved safety, well-being, and learning for children and youth, instead of the historical practice of primarily increasing school building safety measures, such as armed security guards, metal detectors, and surveillance cameras.[3] The decision to utilize armed security should be made based on the needs of individual schools and communities. NASP believes that armed security in schools should be provided only by school resource officers, police officers specially trained to work in schools. Research on the impact of such security measures on students supports these recommendations.

### Trends in the Use of Security Measures in Schools

- Nearly 70% of students ages 12–18 reported in 2015 the presence of security guards or police officers in their schools; 83% reported the use of security cameras; and more than 12% reported the use of metal detectors.[4]

- In the 2013–14 school year, 75% of public schools reported that they used one or more security cameras to monitor their students (up from 19% in 1999–2000). By grade level, the rates were 89% of high schools, 84% of middle schools, and 67% of primary schools.[5]

- Stringent security measures are increasingly being used in U.S. public schools,[6] even in schools where there are no discernible threats to safety.[7] Schools are also employing strict discipline policies to keep students in line and maintain safety.[8]

### Impact of Security Measures on Violence

- There is no clear evidence that the use of metal detectors, security cameras, or guards in schools is effective in preventing school violence,[9,10,11] and little is known about the potential for unintended consequences that may accompany their adoption.[12]

- There has not been sufficient research to determine if the presence of metal detectors in schools reduces the risk of violent behavior among students.[13]

- Some researchers have expressed concern about the widespread use of guards, cameras, and other security technologies, given that so little is known about their effectiveness.[14,15]

- Research has found security strategies, such as the use of security guards and metal detectors, to be consistently ineffective in protecting students[16] and to be associated with more incidents of school crime and disruption[17] and higher levels of disorder in schools.[18]

- Surveillance cameras in schools may have the effect of simply moving misbehavior to places in schools or outside of schools that lack surveillance. Even more troubling, it is possible that cameras may function as enticement to large-scale violence, such as in the case of the Virginia Tech shooter who mailed video images of himself to news outlets.[19]

- Research suggests that the presence of security guards and metal detectors in schools may actually increase levels of violence in schools by strengthening the influence of youth *street culture* with its emphasis on self-protection.[20]

## Impact on Students' Perceptions of Safety

- The widespread public impression that schools are unsafe—fueled by rare, but highly visible school shootings—is contradicted by empirical evidence.[21,22] In fact, schools are not only safe, but are arguably safer today than they were a decade ago.[23]

- Research evidence suggests that students believe their schools to be safe places and that many of their schools' security strategies are unnecessary.[24]

- Analysis of media reports of the Columbine shooting suggests that perceptions of that tragedy were merged with terrorism as part of a broad framework of fear and national security,[25] stimulating increased use of stringent security measures in U.S. schools.[26]

- Studies have shown that the presence of security guards and metal detectors in schools negatively impacts students' perceptions of safety and even increases fear among some students.[27,28]

- The use of metal detectors is negatively correlated with students' sense of safety at school, even when taking into account the level of violence at the schools.[29]

## Impact on School Climate and Learning

- Studies suggest that restrictive school security measures have the potential to harm school learning environments.[30,31]

- The adoption of rigid and intrusive security measures in schools diminishes the rights of students and increases the likelihood that trivial forms of student misconduct that used to be handled informally by schools will result in arrest and referral to the courts.[32,33]

- Along with the increasing use of security measures,[34] schools are employing strict discipline policies to keep students in line and maintain safety, which undoubtedly negatively influences the social climate of schools.[35]

- Research suggests that the presence of school resource officers has engendered concern that schools are criminalizing student behavior by moving problematic students into the juvenile justice system rather than disciplining them at school.[36]

- Analysis of the use of surveillance cameras in schools suggests that they may work to corrode the educational environment by, among other things, implicitly labeling students as untrustworthy (cameras magnify this impact since their sole purpose is to record misbehaviors and deter through intimidation).[37]

- A study of 38,000 middle and high school students found no evidence that visible security measures beneficially impact academic outcomes, and they may even have detrimental effects in some cases.[38,39]

## ENDNOTES

[1] National Association of School Psychologists. (2013, January 9). *NASP cautions against increasing armed security to improve school safety* (Press Release). Bethesda, MD: Author.

[2] National Association of School Psychologists. (2018, January). *Resolution supporting efforts to prevent gun violence*. Bethesda, MD: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/about-school-psychology/media-room/press-releases/nasp-adopts-resolution-supporting-efforts-to-prevent-gun-violence

[3] Cowan, K. C., Vaillancourt, K., Rossen, E., & Pollitt, K. (2013). *A framework for safe and successful schools* [Brief]. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

[4] Musu-Gillete, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2018). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2017* (NCES 2017-064/NCJ 250650). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018036.pdf

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Bracy, N. L. (2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society, 43,* 365–395.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Tanner-Smith, E. E., Fisher, B. W., Addington, L. A., & Gardella, J. H. (2018). Adding security, but subtracting safety? Exploring schools' use of multiple visible security measures. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 43,* 102–119.

[10] Addington, L. A. (2009). Cops and cameras: Public school security as a policy response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1424–1446.

[11] Borum, R., Cornell, D. G., Modzeleski, W., & Jimerson, S. R. (2010). What can be done about school shootings? A review of the evidence. *Educational Researcher, 39,* 27–37.

[12] Addington, L. A. (2009). Cops and cameras: Public school security as a policy response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1424–1446.

[13] Hankin, A., Hertz, M., & Simon, T. (2011). Impacts of metal detector use in schools: Insights from 15 years of research. *Journal of School Health, 81,* 100–106.

[14] Birkland, T. A., & Lawrence, R. G. (2009). Media framing and policy change after Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1405–1425.

[15] Tanner-Smith, E. E., Fisher, B. W., Addington, L. A., & Gardella, J. H. (2018). Adding security, but subtracting safety? Exploring schools' use of multiple visible security measures. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 43,* 102–119.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Nickerson, A. B., & Martens, M. R. (2008). School violence: Associations with control, security/enforcement, educational/therapeutic approaches, and demographic factors. *School Psychology Review, 37,* 228–243.

[18] Steinka-Fry, K. T., Fisher, B. W., & Tanner-Smith, E. E. (2016). Visible school security measures across diverse middle and high school settings: Typologies and predictors. *Journal of Applied Security Research, 11*, 422–436.

[19] Warnick, B. R. (2007). Surveillance cameras in schools: An ethical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review, 77,* 317–343.

[20] Phaneuf, S. W. (2009). *Security in schools: Its effect on students.* El Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

[21] Borum, R., Cornell, D. G., Modzeleski, W., & Jimerson, S. R. (2010). What can be done about school shootings? A review of the evidence. *Educational Researcher, 39,* 27–37.

[22] Altheide, D. L. (2009). The Columbine shootings and the discourse of fear. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1354–1370.

[23] Musu-Gillete, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2018). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2017* (NCES 2017-064/NCJ 250650). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018036.pdf

[24] Bracy, N. L. (2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society, 43,* 365–395.

[25] Altheide, D. L. (2009). The Columbine shootings and the discourse of fear. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1354–1370.

26 Addington, L. A. (2009). Cops and cameras: Public school security as a policy response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52,* 1424–1446.
27 Bachman, R., Randolph, A., & Brown, B. L. (2011). Predicting perceptions of fear at school and going to and from school for African American and White students: The effects of school security measures. *Youth & Society, 43,* 705–726.
28 Perumean-Chaney, S. E., & Sutton, L. M. (2013). Students and perceived school safety: The impact of school security measures. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 38,* 570–588.
29 Gastic, B. (2011). Metal detectors and feeling safe at school. *Education and Urban Society, 43,* 486–498.
30 Phaneuf, S. W. (2009). *Security in schools: Its effect on students.* El Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
31 Kupchik, A., & Ward, G. (2014). Race, poverty, and exclusionary school security: An empirical analysis of U.S. elementary, middle, and high schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 12,* 332–354.
32 Ibid.
33 Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison? The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology, 12,* 79–101.
34 Musu-Gillete, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2018). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2017* (NCES 2017-064/NCJ 250650). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018036.pdf
35 Bracy, N. L. (2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society, 43,* 365–395.
36 Theriot, M. T. (2009). School resource officers and the criminalization of student behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37,* 280–287.
37 Warnick, B. R. (2007). Surveillance cameras in schools: An ethical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review, 77,* 317–343.
38 Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Fisher, B. W. (2016). Visible school security measures and academic performance, attendance, and post-secondary aspirations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescents, 45,* 195–210.
38 Gardella, J. H., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Fisher, B. W. (2016). Academic consequences of multiple victimization and the role of school security measures. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 58,* 36–46.

Please cite this document as:
National Association of School Psychologists. (2018). *School security measures and their impact on students* [Research summary]. Bethesda, MD: Author.