2019

School Resource Officers and Student Arrest Inclination

Bill B. Young
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Billy B. Young

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Gregory Campbell, Committee Chairperson,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Robert Spivey, Committee Member,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Joseph Pascarella, University Reviewer,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

School Resource Officers and Student Arrest Inclination

by

Billy B. Young

MCJ, Boston University, 2013

MAEd, Union University, 2009

BUS, University of Tennessee at Martin, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

November 2018

Abstract

The problem examined in this study was the harming of students arrested in schools and related human and fiscal costs. The purpose was to identify arrest decision-making processes of school resource officers (SROs) and non-SROs and examine how arrest inclinations may lead to the concept of a school-to-prison pipeline. Black's theory of arrest and the factors of amount of evidence, suspect demeanor, wishes of the victim, seriousness of the offense, and the relationship between victim and suspect was the theoretical framework for this study. Six research questions were tested to examine relationships between SROs, non-SROs, and the arrest of students. Additionally, years of experience, prior service as an SRO, length of service in an SRO assignment, section of the state, and the type of community the officer served were considered. This correlational study included a total of 134 law enforcement officers as participants. Bivariate and multiple regression tests, along with directional and symmetric measures, were conducted, revealing correlations between SROs and the likelihood of arresting juveniles. Additionally, prior service and years of service in a school assignment were shown to have significant levels of correlation. Positive social change implications of this study include informing stakeholders about SROs potentially being a moderating factor in the school-to-prison pipeline. The findings can also be used to guide policymakers in decisions regarding law enforcements operation and practices, which may mitigate the potential harm to students if SROs are removed because of perceived harm or contribution to what has been called a school-to-prison pipeline.

School Resource Officers and Student Arrest Inclination

by

Billy B. Young

MCJ, Boston University, 2013

MAEd, Union University, 2009

BUS, University of Tennessee at Martin, 2005

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

November 2018

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to the men and women who risk their lives each day. This dissertation is also dedicated to the memory of our departed comrades in Jackson-Madison County, Tennessee, who have shared my life and career with me and have gone on to their reward. May the memory and sacrifices of Sargent Andy Bailey and Deputy Doug Nanney never be forgotten, for they gave their lives in the line of duty to defend our freedom and our *Constitution of the United States of America*. Unless one has stood as an honor guard over a hero's casket draped in the American flag, one cannot possibly appreciate the meaning of our flag or the sacrifice that the one it covers made.

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Dr. Christy Young, who is Abigail Adams to my John. She raised two daughters alone while I was away in Iraq, Haiti, and Afghanistan, having fun and being shot at. She is my true hero and North Star. I could never have achieved any of my success without her by my side. My family must be included in this dedication, for their encouragement to complete my doctoral program.

Finally, and most importantly, I dedicate this dissertation to the glory of God, who doeth all things well. Without His blessing, I could never have been born in the greatest country on earth, with the greatest opportunities that any citizen in the history of civilization could have hoped to access. Thank you, God, for being my creator and making me an American.

Acknowledgments

So many individuals deserve credit for walking beside me in this journey. My wife, Dr. Christy Young, was the main source of my strength. I must also acknowledge my dissertation chair, Dr. Gregory Campbell, and my methods member, Dr. Lance Spivey, for their continuous encouragement and support. I never had to reach very far for help without one of them responding and giving me wise counsel.

I would also like to thank Dr. Kerrin Wolf for allowing me to use his data collection instrument and sharing his insights with me regarding his SRO research in the State of Delaware. Dr. Wolf also connected me with several other researchers who provided me with valuable insight during my review of the literature. I also wish to thank Sheriff John Mehr and Lieutenant Allen Castleman for supporting me in this endeavor.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The presence of law enforcement officers in schools is not a recent development; however, the increase in the number of officers assigned has risen significantly in the last two decades. According to McKenna, Martinez-Prather, and Bowman (2016), the Police–School Liaison Program that the Flint Police Department in Michigan instituted in the late 1950s was the first school resource officer (SRO) program. The growth of SRO programs expanded in the aftermath of the 1999 mass murders in Littleton, Colorado (Theriot, 2016; Wolf, 2014) and the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School mass murders (Theriot & Orme, 2016; Wolf, 2014). More recently, an active shooting was prevented in late January 2018 after a student was overheard making statements about shooting other students at the Uniontown High School in Pennsylvania (Uniontown H.S., 2018). In contrast, on February 14, 2018, a former student armed with a semiautomatic rifle killed 17 victims at Stoneman Douglas High School in Broward County, Florida (Active shooter, 2018).

The response to these recent events has been to increase school security by using SROs or arming teachers. Since the school shooting in Parkland, Florida in February 2018, 10 states have acted to increase security in schools (Russ & Kearney, 2018). For example, in Livingston Parish, Louisiana, a half-cent sales tax increase will be voted on in November 2018 to fund 50 SROs to cover the 46 schools in Livingston Parish (Fambrough, 2018). In Maryland, Governor Larry Hogan signed Senate Bill 1226 into law on April 10, 2018, requiring armed resource officers to be present in the public

schools in the state (Collins, 2018). Thus, much of the growth in SRO programs is related to current events that triggered interest in school security. But the law enforcement officers permanently assigned to schools or responding to incidents in schools can lead to confrontation between law enforcement and students. Because of the recent shootings in schools, it is important to examine SROs and student arrests for overall student safety.

This quantitative correlational study includes information concerning the likelihood of law enforcement officers assigned to schools as SROs compared to non-SROs taking juveniles into custody or arresting juveniles. This involves the interaction between SROs and students and the decision-making processes that result in arrest. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of students and the SROs and non-SROs who arrested them and how arrest inclinations may lead to a school-to-prison pipeline. Understanding how the removal of SROs affects the number of student arrests is important to student safety. If SROs are less likely than non-SROs to make an arrest, their presence might be a moderating factor in the school-to-prison pipeline. For example, May, Barranco, Stokes, Robertson, and Haynes (2015) suggested that SROs do not increase the size of the school-to-prison pipeline and have lower rates of juvenile arrests than do non-SROs; therefore, removing them may unnecessarily affect student safety.

Chapter 1 includes an overview of the study and background material about the presence and purpose of law enforcement officers in schools. Next is a statement of the problem, including the reasons that students suffer following school arrests. The purpose of the study, the research questions and hypotheses, the limitations of the study, and the

implications for social change follow. The chapter ends with a definition of the terms, the theoretical foundation, the nature of the study, the significance of the study, and a summary.

Background of the Study

Schools should be safe places in which students can socialize and learn. However, because of high-profile school shootings, the presence of SRO law enforcement officers in schools to protect students has increased throughout the United States (McKenna et al., 2016). The constant presence of law enforcement officers can result in higher numbers of students arrested because of closer surveillance, particularly on the detection of drugs and weapons (May et al., 2015; Nance, 2016). Therefore, it is imperative that school administrators and educational researchers understand which type of officer is more likely to arrest a student and why.

Although scholars have explored topics on SROs, researchers have not extensively examined SROs' decision-making processes that result in arrests. Based on my literature review, Wolf (2012, 2014) and Hall (2015) were the only researchers who evaluated the thought processes of SROs when taking juveniles into custody. Wolf found that SROs' decisions to arrest were determined by (a) the quality of the evidence, (b) the seriousness of a charge, (c) the demeanor of suspects, (d) the relationship between suspect and victims, and (e) the wishes of victims or complainants. Hall examined the issue of SRO arrest decision-making, comparing SROs with 10 years or more experience to SROs with less than 10 years' experience, finding that fewer years of service increased

arrest inclination. In addition to the limited literature in the field of SRO arrest decision-making, little consideration has been given to the influence of population density in locations (e.g., rural, suburban, or urban populations). Therefore, this study was also conducted to consider the differences between urban and rural settings and SROs' arrest inclinations.

Schools have developed zero-tolerance policies that SROs reinforce to ensure that students are educated as well as taught life skills that will prevent future conflict with others and society (Nance, 2016). But interactions with SROs have led to conflict that resulted in the arrest of students. Wolf (2013) reported that during the 2010–2011 school year, the arrests of 739 students occurred in schools or buses, comprising 16% of the total number of juvenile cases handled in Delaware. Of this number, 76% were for fighting or disorderly conduct (Wolf, 2013). According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2017), in 2010, 1.6 million juvenile arrests occurred, provoking protests against SROs. Though the number of juvenile cases declined to 889,400 in 2015 (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2018), the arrest of students, especially minority students, at an early age funnels them into the juvenile justice system, increasing the likelihood that they will drop out of school and commit future criminal acts (May et al., 2015; Nance, 2016). The number of arrests and incidents of violent behavior in schools should be an area of concern because schools are mirrors of society (Dewey, 1900).

The value of SROs is also debated regarding victimization risks to students through acts of violence. Parker, Glenn, and Turner (2014) found that, although violent

crimes by juveniles had fallen, the number of arrests for offenses such as disorderly conduct had increased significantly. However, the findings did not reveal how many of those totals were because of SRO referrals, schools, administrators, parents, or teachers. The number of arrests is important to examine because SROs might harm students by their early introduction into the juvenile justice system via a school-to-prison pipeline (Martinez-Prather, McKenna, & Bowman, 2016; McKenna et al., 2016; Wolf, 2014). However, May et al. (2015) has reported that schools and not SROs were the main contributor to the juvenile justice system. Therefore, it is important to have a way to balance learning with maintaining order.

As mentioned earlier, a literature review revealed that few researchers have investigated SROs' thought processes in deciding to take a juvenile into custody, and no researchers have contrasted arrest decision-making inclinations with non-SRO law enforcement officers. Therefore, a demonstrated gap exists in the literature, which I addressed in this study. The need to assess the value of having SROs as opposed to removing SROs from schools is a subject that needs further investigation to inform policymakers.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that this study was the harm that is caused to students who are arrested in schools. Researchers have described the nature of the alleged harm to students who are arrested at an early age (Nance, 2016) and how the SRO's presence might contribute to those harms (Monterastelli, 2017). I evaluated the correlational relationships

regarding the arrest decision making of SROs and non-SROs, how to measure the arrest inclinations of both groups, and whether this tendency leads to a school-to-prison pipeline. The specific problem and overarching research question was "Does a relationship exist among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision-making involving middle school and high school students?"

The presence of law enforcement SROs has generated mixed reviews in studies concerning their effectiveness and benefit to students. The presence of uniformed SROs has resulted in some student beliefs that their school environment is more dangerous, whereas other students have reported the opposite belief (Theriot, 2016). For example, Stinson and Watkins (2014) found that students and school personnel viewed SROs in a favorable light. However, this favorability has also been linked to increased communication between students, administrators, teachers, and SROs (Devlin & Gottfredson, 2016). Despite personal beliefs, because the presence of SROs may be a threat to students (Devlin & Gottfredson, 2016), it is important to explore the topic and related problems.

Another recurring theme in SRO research is that non-SRO law enforcement officers or security guard's actions are conflated with those of SROs. For example, an incident involved the dropping or throwing of a slice of cake onto a floor that escalated to a student's arrest (Nance, 2016), but this involved a school security guard rather than an SRO (Simmons, 2007). Another example involves the arrest of a 5-year-old (Nance, 2016), which did not involve an SRO but a dispatched patrol officer (Herbert, 2007;

Tobin, 2005). Additionally, administrators tried for more than 20 minutes to contact a parent, who refused to come to the school and address the child's behavior (Tobin, 2005). This theme of conflating SROs with non-SROs shows the need for this study to measure differences in arrest inclination between SROs and non-SROs.

Overall, the security and protection of students must be weighed against the unintended consequences of students being arrested and of their potential future harm. Students might enter the juvenile or adult criminal justice system via arrest because of incidents that occur in schools in the presence of SROs and during their investigations of reported crime. Although there are studies on the consequences of students arrested because of the presence of SROs in schools, little to any research has been done on the decision-making processes of SROs in making arrests as compared to non-SROs making arrests (Wolf, 2012, 2014). The current study is intended to fill the void in the literature regarding SROs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to discover whether and to what extent a relationship exists among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision-making outcomes in Tennessee, involving middle school and high school students. The general problem is the harm caused to students through arrest, particularly at an early age (Monterastelli, 2017; Nance, 2016). Comparing the arrest decision-making processes of two groups of law enforcement officers, divided by two attributes (SROs vs. non-SROs), on the dependent variable of the arrest likelihood of middle school and high school age

students allows inferences about the level and likelihood of harm to juveniles. In addition to the independent variable of law enforcement officers, other predictors included years of total law enforcement experience, years of assignment as an SRO, prior SRO experience, section of the state (eastern, middle, or western) and the type of community the officer serves (urban, suburban, or rural). This sample of the SRO and non-SRO population might then be generalizable to larger groups of SRO and non-SRO law enforcement officers.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

For this study, the research questions were the following:

Research Question 1: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students?

$H_0$1: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

H_a1: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

Research Question 2: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience?

$H_0$2: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement

experience.

H_a2: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience.

Research Question 3: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment?

$H_0 3$: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

$H_a 3$: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 4: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment?

$H_0 4$: No significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

$H_a 4$: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 5: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest

inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural)?

$H_0$5: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

H_a5: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

Research Question 6: Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (e.g., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee)?

$H_0$6: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (i.e., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee).

H_a6: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (eastern, middle, or western Tennessee).

Theoretical Foundation

The tension between SRO order maintenance in schools and the concept of justice for individual students is ongoing between utilitarian and deontological philosophies. This leads to the questions of “How does society do justice to the students who wish to

attend school and learn, while also keeping at-risk students in school and engaged in the educational mission and controlling adverse behavior?" and "How does the SRO fit into the disciplinary matrix as an agent of positive social change as compared to a non-SRO law enforcement officer?"

In Black's (1971, as cited in Wolf, 2012, 2014) general theory of arrest, decision-making processes of law enforcement officers are placed in a theoretical context. In the theory, Black examined aspects of police behavior, including discretionary aspects of enforcement relating to stratification, morphology, culture, organization and social control. Black's theory is fundamental to understanding the arrest decision-making processes of law enforcement officers and to understanding the inclination of regular patrol officers to make arrests as compared to SROs. According to Black (1971, as cited in Wolf, 2012, 2014), five factors are present that relate to arrest decision-making, including (a) the amount of evidence, (b) the seriousness of the offense, (c) the wishes of the victims, (d) the suspect's demeanor, and (e) the relationship between victim and suspect. In Black's theory, police discretion filters how the arrest decision-making process occurs.

Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory has also contributed to this study. Sutherland argued that interactions influence behavior that is favorable and unfavorable to criminal and delinquent acts. According to Sutherland, an excess of definitions in either direction increases the likelihood of deviant acts. The interactions of influence were said to vary in intensity, duration, priority, and frequency (Kim, Lee, &

Leban, 2017; Sutherland, 1947). The theory of differential association in the school and neighborhood setting might aid in answering the question regarding whether school policies and law enforcement contribute to a school-to-prison pipeline or students meeting the juvenile justice system were already on a negative path.

In a similar context, opportunity and social disorganization theory contribute to the argument that students who bring socialization issues from home into the school add to the school-to-prison pipeline. Weisburd, Groff, and Yang (2014) offered evidence for social disorganization theory and opportunity theory to show a cause of criminal and deviant behavior. Concepts such as shared norms or traits found in high density and similar areas might help to explain why a great percentage of crimes occurs in small geographical areas such as schools, which then result in the arrests of students.

With routine theory, Newton (2015) studied crime and deviant behavior in the context of *nodes* and *paths*. According to Newton, nodes are areas of activity, while paths are routes between nodes (p. 2). During the daily routines of offenders and victims, the active transport between nodes and paths brings the two groups together. This increases the likelihood in high-density locations such as schools for rapid detection and arrest of students for delinquent and criminal offenses.

Another aspect that contributes to the arrest of juveniles includes cultural theories. Theriot and Orme (2016) offered support for Zapolski, Garcia, Jarjoura, Lau, & Aalsma, (2016) when describing how student mistrust about SROs might originate in their current culture, enforcing a code against reporting criminal activity to police. Negative

socialization might create a framework to describe the impact of such a phenomenon (Zapolski et al., 2016). Once the negative socialization occurs, minority youth might be deprived of coping behaviors when faced with adversity, leading to potential violent confrontations, especially in schools where an arrest might result. I will investigate each of these theories further in Chapter 2.

Nature of the Study

The nature of the quantitative, correlational design was to discover whether and to what extent a relationship exists between full-time SROs and non-SROs who have been certified in the Peace Officer Standards and Training (State of Tennessee, n.d.b.) and arrest decision-making outcomes exist in Tennessee, involving middle school and high school students. An analysis of the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable (arrest inclination) was conducted to reveal whether relationships between the two groups were present, aiding in filling a current knowledge gap. Quantitative research involves numerically examining the relationship between variables to test hypotheses or research questions. The ontological and epistemological concerns of this study stemmed from a belief that researchers need to empirically examine problems. Therefore, quantitative methods are best suited for the alignment between philosophical, ontological, and epistemological perspectives.

The correlational design was appropriate to collect and analyze numerical data from naturally occurring variable relationships and to measure a naturally occurring effect without external manipulation (Burkholder, Cox, & Crawford, 2016). I used a

correlational design to measure the significance of the relationship between the two attributes of the primary independent variable (law enforcement officers composed of SROs and non-SROs) on a dependent variable (student arrest inclination). No external manipulation of any variables took place; instead, the natural inclination of routine stimuli measured the day-to-day, decision-making processes of law enforcement officers when considering the arrest of a middle school or high school student.

The correlational design was chosen due to support of logical positivism or empiricism (Burkholder et al., 2016). Empiricism is rooted in the belief that scientific knowledge is observable and quantifiable. The ideal model of empiricism is that of a true experimental design to control all variables, thus observing and recording any cause and effect (Burkholder et al., 2016). A correlational design is developed from what Reynolds (2007, as cited in Burkholder et al., 2016) labeled as "relational statements" (p. 28). The naturally occurring variables that interact with greater or lesser strength allow the drawing of inferences. The weakness of the correlational design is the lack of controls for spurious effects, thus, not truly proving causation (Burkholder et al., 2016).

In addition to a correlational design, I considered a quantitative, causal comparative research design. This design can be used to compare two preexisting groups (Schenker & Rumrill, 2004), which would have applied to SROs vs. non-SROs and the measure of their attitudes toward the likelihood of taking students into custody. A causal comparative research design applies to the field of education (Airasian & Gay, 2005), which fits the roles of SROs. However, I rejected this design because it did not align with

the research questions under investigation. Additionally, I did not consider causation in this study.

The target population of the study consisted of full-time, Peace Officer Standards and Training-certified, sworn, law enforcement officers in Tennessee. Tennessee is divided into three geographical sections: eastern, middle, and western. Tennessee is also home to a mixture of urban and rural communities throughout all three regions. SROs and non-SROs serve all three regions; therefore, all sections of the state sampled should allow for greater generalizability of results at a statewide level. The number of sworn law enforcement officers in Tennessee was 17,376 members, as reported in the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (2016) *National Sources of Law Enforcement Employment Data*. A convenience sample of sworn law enforcement officers was drawn to produce an effect size large enough to show medium effects. Additionally, I used G Power 3.1.9.2 to decide the needed sample size. The steps used to carry out the power analysis involved (a) selecting the data analysis test, in this case a linear multiple regression: (b) choosing a fixed model R2 increase, within the F test family; (c) using an alpha level of .05, a power level of .8, and an effect size of .15. I discovered that a sample size of 98 participants was needed to show a medium-sized effect. This estimate is based on the predictors of total years of law enforcement service, years in an SRO assignment, prior service as an SRO, the urban-versus-rural nature of a participant's assignment, and the region of the state in which the participant serves. These levels were justified because they are accepted standard levels for alpha, effect size, and power. Further justification of the sample size

needed is provided in Chapter 3. Additionally, the hypotheses were tested using linear and logistical regression analysis. Statistical analysis consisted of a two-tailed test with a .05 alpha level.

The sampling and data collection method used was a convenience sample that consisted of a self-administered Internet survey, incorporating descriptive demographic data, and the *School Resource Officer Survey* that Wolf (2012) designed and used. The name of the survey did not appear when the survey was deployed. This change was made to capture a greater sample of non-SROs, who might have believed the survey did not have applicability to them. The survey instrument used was validated in prior SRO research (Wolf, 2012).

Definition of Terms

The terms listed below are operational terms and definitions that have been used in the scope of this study.

Arrest: An arrest is the use of legal authority to deprive a person of his or her freedom of movement. Arrests are executed with an arrest warrant or without a warrant if probable cause and exigent circumstances are present at the time of the arrest (Black's Law Dictionary, 2012; Hall, 2015; Hashmall, 2009).

Arrest decision-making: Arrest decision-making is defined as the exercise of authority and discretion integrating legal and extralegal factors, including the amount of evidence, the seriousness of an offense, the victim wishes, and the suspect's demeanor (Wolf, 2012, 2014).

Circumstances: Circumstances include independent variable correlates, numerical and categorical, used in the survey to gather data to describe influences affecting the dependent variable (arrests decisions). These circumstances include the SRO's perceptions of the juvenile justice system impact, and outside influences (e.g., the wishes of teachers, administrators, and victims regarding the impact of arrest decisions on stabilizing the school environment; Wolf, 2012, 2014).

Criminalization of school discipline: The criminalization of school discipline is the change in thinking from classroom management to criminal referral to law enforcement entities during or after school incidents to keep order in schools (Irwin, Davidson, and Hall-Sanchez, 2013: Merkwae, 2015; Hall, 2015).

Factors: Factors are independent variable correlates, numerical and categorical, used in the survey to gather data to show influences that affect the dependent variable (arrest decision making). These encompass legal considerations (i.e., laws, rules, and regulations), student attitudes and behaviors, student academic achievement, student beliefs of deterrence, tenure as an officer on the street, and tenure as an SRO (Wolf, 2012, 2014).

Individualized education program: An individual education plan is a legally binding document that sets up conditions under which special education students are to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. As part of the act, a due process hearing is conducted after incidents that occur to decide whether the student's behavior is a manifestation of the student's condition

(Rotter, 2014).

Minor school behavior or minor discipline infraction: Minor school behavior or minor discipline infractions are student behaviors or misconduct that can be categorized as one or more of the following: (a) status offenses (offenses not considered illegal for adults); (b) nonviolent, nondrug, and nonweapon related; (c) not a threat to overall school safety; (d) not usually considered a criminal act outside of school; (e) often determined subjectively; and (f) non-zero-tolerance behaviors (Gonsoulin, Zablocki, & Leone, 2012; Hall, 2015).

National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO): NASRO is the first professional association founded in 1991 to give training to school law enforcement officers to promote safer schools. NASRO recommends using a three-prong model called the triad school policing. The triad model includes the concepts of education, counseling/mentoring, and enforcement (Canaday, James, & Nease, 2012; Hall, 2015; NASRO, n.d.).

Nonschool Resource Officers (non-SROs): Non-SROs are full-time sworn law enforcement officers who do not work in schools. Nevertheless, these officers might respond to calls for service in schools.

Peace Officer Standards and Training: The Tennessee Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission develops and enforces standards and training for Tennessee law enforcement officers (State of Tennessee, n.d.b.).

Rural: Rural areas are the areas found outside of cities and towns, having smaller

populations and undeveloped land. Tennessee is primarily a rural state (State of Tennessee, n.d.c.).

School criminalization: School criminalization is the prosecution of acts that formerly fell in the purview of school discipline. These observed acts might be seen by law enforcement officers during their daily duties, which then might result in students being referred to the juvenile justice system (Hall, 2015; Parker et al., 2014).

School grounds: School grounds are the school safety zone that includes the interior of the school building, exterior grounds of the school building (e.g., parking lots, recreational areas, school buses, or the way to and from school; Nance, 2016; U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

School personnel: School personnel include teachers, principals, administrators, counselors, social workers, psychologists, nurses, librarians, and other support staff employed by a school or who perform services for the school on a contractual basis.

School resource officers (SROs): SROs are career law enforcement officers, with sworn authority who are deployed in community-oriented policing and are assigned by the employing police department to a local educational agency to work in collaboration with schools and community organizations to (a) educate students in crime and illegal drug use prevention and safety; (b) to develop or expand community justice initiatives for students; and (c) to train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime and illegal drug use awareness (Community Oriented Policing Services, n.d.; Hall, 2015; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.c.).

School resource officer program: An SRO program is a local police department, sheriff's agency, or school system that employs SROs to work closely with school administrators to create a safer environment (Community Oriented Policing Services, n.d.; Hall, 2015).

School-to-prison pipeline: The school-to-prison pipeline is the confluence of the K–12 public education system and law enforcement, and the way that referring students directly to law enforcement for committing offenses at school and their suspension or expulsion creates conditions that increase the probability of students dropping out of school or eventually becoming incarcerated (Merkwae, 2016; Monahan, VanDerhei, Bechtold, & Cauffman, 2014; Nance, 2016).

Special education students: Special education students are students who fall under the umbrella of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (Rotter, 2014).

Special education facilities: Special education facilities are school facilities and classrooms that are designed to comply with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (Rotter, 2014).

Suburban: Suburban areas are lower density areas that separate residential and commercial areas from one another. They are either part of a city or part of an urban area, or they exist as a separate residential community within commuting distance of a city (State of Tennessee, n.d.d.).

Urban: Urban areas are locations with high population density (State of

Tennessee, n.d.e.).

Zero tolerance: Zero tolerance refers to a uniform approach to discipline that does not allow flexibility in deciding on sanctions for certain offenses (Nance, 2016).

Zero-tolerance policies: Zero-tolerance policies are those disciplinary measures implemented by the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994, upon which other actions are modeled (Nance, 2016).

Assumptions

Although the data collection instrument that Wolf (2012, 2014) used captured perceptions about arrest decision-making among SROs, the instrument was not used previously on non-SRO law enforcement officers. Officers in schools are law enforcement officers first; therefore, the assumption was that similar training and socialization of officers creates a homogenous population overall from whom SROs are drawn.

The second major assumption is that the law enforcement officers sampled in the Tennessee function under generically similar policies and procedures, molded by judicial decisions, training standards, and state and federal law. Different communities have different personalities and law enforcement agencies are no different; however, state and federal regulations and statutes provide a guide that makes valid comparisons possible. Without being able to evaluate each agency's policies, it is necessary to draw the assumption claimed.

Scope and Delimitations of the Study

I used a convenience sample of SROs selected according to their accessibility obtained with the assistance of the Tennessee School Resource Officers Association (TNSRO), the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, the Tennessee Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, along with agencies who responded to invitations to disseminate the survey link to their personnel. Additionally, the law enforcement personnel who were sampled were drawn from municipal and county law enforcement agencies because only those agencies have SROs or personnel who might have served in a similar role in such an agency. This sample of the law enforcement officer population of Tennessee limited the total population of law enforcement officers to only those whom this this researcher had previously examined using the theoretical framework of this study.

Accessibility limitations might have affected the generalizability, causing the sample of law enforcement officers not to be as representative of the entire population. Individual officers across Tennessee were invited to take part in this study; therefore, training officers and other executives within their respective organizations were asked to disseminate the survey link to officers to complete the survey. Ideally, the identities of all SROs serving in Tennessee would be obtained so that a random selection of participants would occur. Likewise, a method to reach all non-SROs in Tennessee would enhance validity through random selection.

Limitations

Though a correlational design was selected to collect and analyze numerical data from naturally occurring variable relationships to measure a naturally occurring effect without external manipulation (Burkholder et al., 2016), the weakness of the correlational design is the lack of controls for spurious effects. Therefore, the correlational design might not truly show causation (Burkholder et al., 2016). Nevertheless, one advantage of this study was that it partly replicated a prior study, building on the research of Wolf (2012).

Another limitation of this study was the necessity of collecting data online as opposed to on paper and pencil surveys. The lack of Internet availability in rural areas that receive law enforcement service might have limited the external validity of the findings. The solution to this limitation was to collect as large a sample size as possible. This effort was made with the aid of the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, embedded within the Tennessee Department of Commerce's Peace Officer Standards and Training Office, the Tennessee Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Tennessee Sheriffs Association. Additionally, the study's deployment was aided by the TNSRO Association, and individual agency personnel contacted via social media to distribute the survey link.

One area of ethical consideration in this study was the proximity to the topic under study. Having served as an SRO for several years, and as an SRO supervisor, I may have introduced conscious or unconscious biases and perspectives. To overcome these

issues, I sought to present the findings in as an objective and unbiased manner as possible.

Significance of the Study

This study was guided by the issue of student arrests and the likelihood of arrests by SROs compared to non-SROs. The comparison of arrest likelihood of students by the two groups might have provided or discounted alignment with the concept of a school-to-prison pipeline, being "the policies and practices that push school children, especially the most at-risk children, out of the classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems" (McKenna et al., 2016, p. 440). Similarly, there are concerns regarding the impact that the arrests of students create in the students' lives. Concerns extend to whether the presence of SROs is a contributing factor to the arrests.

This study is relevant to the public policy and administration field because of the necessity of limiting youth involvement in the juvenile justice system wherever possible. Different stakeholders who have been affected by this research include school administrators, law enforcement executives, and elected officials. Strategies using evidence-based research such as this study aid in mitigating or at least not increasing juvenile arrests. An area of significance now overlooked will have a baseline of research that can provide policymakers with the development of guidance regarding law enforcement operations and practices.

Currently, children look to school for the socialization that used to occur in homes and neighborhoods across the United States. Additionally, keeping students in school and

out of facilities is cost effective compared to the expense of warehousing. The incarceration cost of one juvenile for 1 year nationally averages $148,767 with a high ceiling of $300,000 annually (Nance, 2016, p. 954). The costs to Tennessee are as high as $230,000 annually per bed on certain placements (State of Tennessee, 2017). Rural areas of Tennessee are the most significantly affected because of costs that range as high as 27 times what state probation incurs (State of Tennessee, 2017). The implementation of policy to remove SROs from schools might increase the costs that already burden the juvenile justice system. Therefore, these issues show the need for greater research into this issue.

Added benefits to stakeholders include those to the criminal justice professional who can transform knowledge into policy and directives or is a recipient of training. SRO training gaps might exist if no discernible relationship in arrest inclination between the two groups of officers appears. Parents and guardians of students are also beneficiaries as are law enforcement professionals. The direct effects upon parents and guardians include the necessity to attend juvenile court proceedings or court-mandated programs. Additionally, parents and guardians face financial hardships because of fines, court costs, and lost wages because of absence from work to attend disciplinary hearings at school and court.

Summary

This chapter's contents included the topic of SROs and the claims that they contribute to a school-to-prison pipeline. The findings of prior researchers described

some of the harm that comes to students through an early involvement with the juvenile justice system and the correlation with early dropping out and future incarceration probability. I evaluated the relationships of SROs and non-SROs where arrest decision making of students is concerned to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the two subgroups of the overall population of law enforcement officers. A brief outline the theoretical foundation, Black's (1971) arrest theory, and its relationship to the arrest decision-making process was also provided in this chapter. The implications for positive social change include mitigating greater harm to students when implementing policy changes not driven by data or research but by emotional reaction. The gap in the literature will be addressed in Chapter 2. Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature relating to SROs, SRO decision-making, an in-depth examination of the school-to-prison pipeline, and the theoretical framework for this study, which is Black's (1971) theory of arrest. Chapter 3 includes the quantitative method and framework of the study, a discussion of the alignment of the method with the research problem, and an in-depth description of the theoretical framework. Chapters 4 and 5 include the findings of the study and a discussion of how the findings fit into the current knowledge that has been accumulated in SRO and non-SRO decision-making, and of student arrests.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

This study was conducted to examine the harm to students arrested in schools, as this review of the current literature suggests that SROs are a contributing agent to this problem. Researchers have explained the nature of the harm to students arrested at an early age (Nance, 2016) and how SRO presence might contribute to those harms (Monterastelli, 2017). The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to discover whether and to what extent a relationship exists between SROs and non-SROs regarding arrest decision-making involving middle school and high school students. I examined the relationships of SROs and non-SROs and arrest inclinations that may lead to a school-to-prison pipeline. Comparing the arrest decision-making processes of the independent variable of law enforcement officers whose two attributes are SROs and non-SROs on the dependent variable of the arrest likelihood of middle school and high school age students allowed inferences about the level and likelihood of harm to juveniles.

A review of the literature concerning SROs and SRO arrest inclination was limited. Scholars have explored the topic of SROs, but researchers have not extensively examined the SROs' decision-making processes that result in arrests. Based on my review, Wolf (2012, 2014) and Hall (2015) produced the only studies on the thought processes of SROs when taking juveniles into custody. Additionally, many of the articles on SROs conflated their conduct in schools with non-SROs and hired security personnel (see Nance, 2016). This conflation creates confusion on who arrests or uses force the

most against students. This study was designed to fill the gap that currently exists in this area of SRO research.

In Chapter 2, I synthesize the information discovered during the literature review that addresses SROs, policing styles, the taking into custody of students, and factors that influence the arrest decision-making process. This review of the literature revealed that a gap exists in the study of arrest decision-making processes between SROs and non-SROs. In Chapter 2, information is presented about the modern-day history of the SRO program, the topic of school discipline, the concept of a school-to-prison pipeline, and how SROs are contributing agents to that problem. This review also includes the components of Black's (1971) theory of arrest and the way that those elements formed the framework for the study.

Research Strategy

The literature review consisted of primary sources such as books, peer-reviewed journal articles, dissertations, professional websites, state and federal government publications, and media outlets. The review of the literature was conducted using the ProQuest, Sage, and Google Scholar databases, all of which were found through Walden University's library. Extensive keywords for finding peer-reviewed literature that related to SROs included *school resource officers, SRO, school violence, school-to-prison pipeline, school police, zero-tolerance, and arrest of students,* and *special education*. Variations on terms (e.g., *policing style, school arrests, school liaison officers,* and *school crime*) were also used to find articles that fell outside the original keyword

parameters. Most of the articles used in this review fell within the last 5 years, apart from seminal works such as Dewey (1900), Sutherland (1947), and Black (1971) as well as Wolf (2012). However, this resource was necessary because it included the data collection instrument that was used in this study. The lack of literature relating to SROs required me to use articles that fell outside the 5-year window of current peer-reviewed literature.

Theoretical Foundations

The tension between SRO order maintenance in schools and justice for students is ongoing. The questions are "How does society do justice to students who wish to attend school and learn, while keeping at-risk students in school and engaged in the educational mission and controlling adverse behavior?" and "How does the SRO fit as an agent of positive social change compared to a non-SRO law enforcement officer?"

Black's General Theory of Arrest

Although little research has been conducted to understand or compare the decision-making processes of SROs and non-SROs, several theories exist for studying law enforcement arrest decision-making and student behavior. For this study, it was important to understand both the motives behind arrest inclination of officers and the theories. The theoretical framework that began examining SRO arrest decision-making was Black's (1971) general theory of arrest. According to Black (as cited in Wolf, 2012, 2014), five factors are present that relate to arrest decision-making, including the amount of evidence, the seriousness of the offense, the wishes of victims, the suspect's demeanor,

and the relationship between the victim and the suspect. As part of the theory, police discretion serves as a filter in how the arrest decision-making process occurs.

Black's (1971) general theory of arrest was used in Wolf's (2014) SRO research as a theoretical framework. Wolf developed a set of survey questions that were related to the scenarios that ended in arrest outcomes, interviewing all SROs in Delaware (49 total SROs). Wolf found partial confirmation of Black's (1971) theory after data analysis, including the importance to SROs of the quality of the evidence, the seriousness of a charge, and the wishes of victims or their complainants. However, this finding might show that, by exercising a considerable amount of discretion, SROs might be inclined to arrest students because of their knowledge of the student and their circumstances.

The rationale for the choice of Black's (1971) theory is the utility, which exists in SRO research that was developed from the findings of Wolf (2012, 2013, 2014). The findings in this study that are generalizable might strengthen those of Wolf, adding to the layer of current SRO knowledge. Additionally, Wolf's earlier research into SRO arrest decision-making was limited to Delaware. By carrying out a similar study in a southern state and including non-SROs, broader inferences can be made on a national level. A detailed examination of each facet of Black's theory follows.

Amount of evidence. One of the arrest decision-making factors in Black's (1971) theory is the amount of evidence involved in a case. Wolf (2012) described this element of the decision-making process as being a "legal factor" compared to "extralegal/legal factors" or solely "legal factors" (p. 76). Wolf found that the quality of evidence ranked

highest among the factors involved in the decision to make an arrest. Another legal factor that ranked just below evidence was the legal factor of laws and regulations. Wolf also reported that SROs used much discretion in not making an arrest, even when evidence to support a probable cause arrest was present.

Seriousness of the offense. The nature or the seriousness of an offense is another element of Black's (1971) theory of arrest. Wolf (2012) described this variable as falling into the category of an extralegal or legal category. Depending on the type of offense, different states have mandatory reporting laws that require law enforcement involvement, thus exposing students to potential legal jeopardy.

As a refutation against charges that SROs excessively police students in schools, prior research into the phenomenon of SROs and the charging of students has shown that SROs downgrade the level of offenses that juveniles commit. Johnson (2016b) described SROs as having a "social work" view of their tasks, and that they tend to charge juveniles at a less serious level than non-SROs. Johnson also described the overall numbers of arrests that SROs make as similar to the number that non-SROs make despite the closer proximity that SROs have to the juveniles. Based on Johnson's findings, SROs provide a moderating influence on the prosecution of juveniles in the juvenile justice system and reduce the culpability in the school-to-prison pipeline that other SRO researchers have ascribed to them.

The wishes of the victim. The wishes of the victim are an area that needs context in terms of prior SRO research and juvenile delinquency in schools. Wolf (2012)

described this extralegal or legal factor in terms of the wishes of a student who was the victim of an offense, though many victims of youth violence are not students but are instead teachers, staff, and faculty. Wolf referenced the wishes of victims as students whose parents or guardians sought to petition an offender or suspect into the juvenile court system. This introduction into the juvenile justice system is subject to less discretion for law enforcement officers because the probable cause requirement to sign a petition is similar to the requirement that a victim signs when seeking an arrest warrant against an adult. Thus, although an SRO might recommend or not recommend the pursuit of a juvenile petition, the victim is the one who decides.

Suspect demeanor. Researchers who have investigated the responses of law enforcement officers when confronted with disrespectful suspects have found that their results support Black's (1971) theory. For example, Johnson (2016a) cited examples supporting Black's (1971, 1980) and Reiss' (1971) hypotheses relating to demeanor. However, Klinger (1994, 1996) found little evidence to support the assertion that a relationship existed between suspect demeanor and the use of force, noting that prior research has defined demeanor broadly to include criminal acts (as cited in Johnson, 2016a). Additionally, Johnson found that according to the current mood or emotional priming of an officer, the arrest of an offender was more likely to occur. When a law enforcement officer is already in an irritated state, meeting a hostile citizen is likely to have a resulting unpleasant exchange, which can lead to an arrest.

Culture and socialization also play a role in the interactions that youth have with

law enforcement. For example, Zapolski et al. (2016) examined juvenile behavior from a cultural and socialization perspective, suggesting that mistrust, moral disengagement, and aggression are potential causes of violent behavior. When juveniles are socialized with these factors, they are may try to confirm their bias or perceived challenges to their aggressiveness, leading to conflict with authority figures. Additionally, SROs might be placed in high crime locations that make these conflicts with youth more likely. Yorke and Dallos (2015) reinforced Zapolski et al.'s conclusions among male offenders, describing concepts such as disempowerment, being trapped within socially constructed frameworks, and disengagement.

A different aspect to the cultural and socialization perspective is the reaction from authority to cultural differences. Disproportionate minority discipline has been claimed to stem from this lack of understanding of cultural differences (Monterastelli, 2017). However, Whichard and Felson (2016) suggested that defiant or resistant suspects are "either desperate or disoriented" (p. 564), which provides the stimulus that results in the response of arrest or nonarrest.

Relationship between victim and suspect. The relationship between the victim and suspect, where juvenile arrests are concerned, is more complex than simple student-on-student delinquency. A web of social interactions between adult educators, SROs, staff, and administrators occur thousands of times each day with the student populations they serve and instruct. Teachers and administrators formerly intervened in violent confrontations between students; however, now the adults are often the victims of the

violence themselves (Musu-Gillette, Zhang, Wang, Zhang, & Oudekerk, 2017). Wolf (2012) described the relationship between victim and suspect as one element of Black's (1971) theory of arrest. One of Wolf's survey questions related to the wishes of teachers who wanted the SRO to make an arrest of a student, for which there was statistical significance supporting for Black's theory. Nevertheless, the wishes of teachers or administrators to have a student arrested ranked next to last in the factors that Wolf cited as affecting the decision to make an arrest of a student. This extralegal factor ranked only ahead of a student's academic achievement in significance, which was below the wishes of a student victim's family or guardian.

Other investigators have found support for this aspect of Black's (1971) theory while investigating the topic from different theoretical frameworks. Drawve, Thomas, and Walker (2013), in their examination of opportunity theory and arrests, reported that victims between ages 15–55 who reported incidents of assault to law enforcement were more likely to have their cases cleared by an arrest. Additionally, assault incidents that occurred in a school resulted in a greater likelihood of an arrest. Although the relational aspect of the arrest is important, this finding also supports other elements of Black's theory where the amount of evidence, the seriousness of the offense, and the wishes of victims are concerned. In the case of aggravated assaults, the interpersonal relationship of the victim to the offender was a significant predictor of apprehension, supporting Drawve et al.'s findings and integrating routine activity theory but also supporting Black's theory of arrest.

Socialization Theories

Differential association theory. One explanation that supports the argument that much of the damage to students comes from their socialization is Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory. Sutherland argued that interactions influence behavior favorable and unfavorable to criminal and delinquent acts; a significant amount of either favorable or unfavorable behavior increased the likelihood of deviant acts. The interactions of influence have been suggested to vary in intensity, duration, priority, and frequency (Jihoon, Yeungjeom, & Leban, 2016; Sutherland, 1947). The theory of differential association in the school and neighborhood setting might aid in determining whether school policies and law enforcement contribute to a school-to-prison pipeline or students who met the juvenile justice system were already on a negative path. In a similar context, based on opportunity and social disorganization theory, shared norms or traits found in high density and similar areas might explain why so many crimes occur in small geographical areas such as schools. The claim could be made that SROs do not overly increase contact with the juvenile justice system, but that students who are inclined to commit deviant acts are brought into closer contact with law enforcement and are more quickly identified and apprehended.

Opportunity theory. Location and the intersection of victims and suspects, as dimensions of opportunity theory and routine activity theory, are two factors that must be examined. Proposing routine theory, Newton (2015) studied crime and deviant behavior in the context of nodes and paths. According to Newton, nodes are areas of activity,

whereas paths are routes between the nodes (p. 2). During the daily routines of offenders and victims, the active transport between nodes and paths bring the two groups together.

Opportunity theory has relevance in the school setting. In the case of a school, this convergence between nodes and paths occurs each day, creating what Newton (2015) described as “awareness spaces” (p. 2). By setting up such conditions and introducing law enforcement officers who are available to witness or respond to deviant or delinquent acts, the possibility of apprehension quickly increases. Opportunity theory also suggests that students bring socialization issues from home to school, contributing to the school-to-prison pipeline. In a correlational analysis, overlapping areas of criminal activity with the travel patterns of victims were consistently present, helping explain why so many crimes occur in small geographical locations such as schools. However, although opportunity theory might explain the school setting as a crime-generating location where unplanned but favorable opportunity for crimes are present, other researchers see the presence of law enforcement as a negative security feature that creates a climate of mistrust and fear (Wolf, 2014). This negative security is the cause of the attention that weighs utilitarianism against the focus of the individual offender.

Cultural theories. Other theories that aid in explaining illogical or antisocial behavior of juveniles are worth examining. Theriot and Orme (2016) supported Zapolski et al. (2016) when describing how student mistrust about SROs might originate in their current culture, enforcing a code against reporting criminal activity to police. Although fairness might contribute to enhancing legitimacy, students might have already become

socialized to resent authority before their first day of kindergarten. This leads to the question of how an authority figure outside of the home can obtain legitimacy when authority figures such as a mother do not have authority or legitimacy inside of the home. Therefore, negative socialization creates a framework to describe the impact of such a phenomenon (Zapolski et al., 2016). Once the negative socialization occurs, minority youth might be deprived of coping behaviors when faced with adversity, setting the stage for violent confrontations.

Key Variables and Concepts

History of Policing in the United States

The history of American policing began in the original 13 colonies when volunteers stood watch against fires, raids, criminal acts, and pirates. The first law enforcement officer position in the colonies was in New Amsterdam (later New York) when the office of the sheriff was created for that community. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, established the first daytime police agency in 1833. New York City followed in 1844 with the first 24-hour police department. During a similar period in Great Britain, the London Metropolitan Police Department, under the reorganization of Sir Robert Peel, promulgated policies and organized methods of policing that served as the blueprint for those newly created police departments in the United States (Swanson Territo, & Taylor, 2018).

As the United States grew and expanded, law enforcement agencies likewise spread across the continent. In different eras of law enforcement, the citizens saw

different problems (e.g., corruption and a lack of professionalism and uniformity). Political interference with law enforcement because of the patronage system resulted in the abuse of police power that was not beholden to the citizenry, but to political machines (Swanson et al., 2017).

As the profession of law enforcement became professionalized in the 20th century, different models of policing appeared, reflecting the culture and scientific theories of organizational management that ranged from the military models of the early 1900s to the community policing models of the 1990s. As each period of societal and criminal change appeared in the United States, law enforcement changed likewise. In this manner, the specialization and adaptation of law enforcement response to social and criminal problems of American society reflexively evolved (Swanson et al., 2018).

School Violence

In the aftermath of the 1999 mass murders in Littleton, Colorado (Theriot, 2016; Wolf, 2012, 2014), and the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School mass murders (Theriot & Orme, 2016; Wolf, 2014) a strong focus toward the security of schools resulted in the placement of full-time law enforcement officers in school buildings. Noteworthy features relating to the nexus of school violence include the extent and likelihood of school violence, fear of being assaulted in school, and school security measures (Crawford & Burns, 2016). A short delineation of each feature follows:

Extent and likelihood of school violence. Some researchers have concluded that the danger to students in schools is overblown (Parker et al., 2014). These writers

reference data analysis trends that suggest that violent crime was falling, even as communities increased the level and number of school security personnel. However, that trend has reversed in recent years. Data from 2013 reveal that of 1,420,900 total victimizations, more than 900,000 of them involved violence (Crawford, 2016; Crawford & Burns, 2016). This increase in violent victimization suggests that students are at greater risk of violence in school (37 attacks per 1,000) than away from school (15 attacks per 1,000). This statistic can be contrasted against the 7.04 per 1,000 that Beger (2002) cited from data obtained in the late 1990s. This comparison suggests that the risk of becoming a victim of violence in schools is not an overreaction, as early researchers attempted to claim. In addition to prior findings, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016, as cited in Peguero, Connell, & Hong, 2016) have listed school violence as a significant health threat to students. In summary, earlier claims that the hazard to students is overblown are no longer valid.

Furthermore, the presence of law enforcement and security enhancements might have resulted in an increase in reported incidents of violence. Crawford and Burns (2016) found in their quantitative study, that when any type of security personnel was integrated into the school environment, the number of reported serious violent acts increased. However, Crawford and Burns also reported that security sweeps in predominately White schools correlated to decreased incidents of violence. The same finding occurred when teachers were trained in increased safety procedures in predominately White schools. However, the authors did not explain increase in reporting.

Another aspect of the extent of school violence is the fear of school administrators in taking disciplinary action against violent students. In December 2017, the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington filed a lawsuit on behalf of several special education students whom fellow students had assaulted (Francovich, 2017). However, according to Francovich (2017), when the parents of the students complained to the administration of their children's schools, they were informed, "They couldn't do anything and that it was part of the reality of attending a poor and diverse school" (para. 15). Spokane, Washington, suspension, expulsion, and arrest rates have fallen, particularly among minority students, but at what cost to school community?

Fear of being assaulted at school. Levels of student fear causally relate to the efficacy of a learning environment. For example, Carroll (2007, as cited in Servoss, 2017) reported that after the 1999 Columbine High School rampage, "55% of Americans indicated that they feared for their child's safety at school" (p. 757). Part of the level of fear is related to the environment of the communities in which the school is situated (Crawford & Burns, 2016). A dilemma that has appeared in current discussion involves teachers' fear of school violence and more relaxed methods of discipline. Current trends in school discipline involve less punitive methods of discipline, particularly where restorative justice and reducing suspensions are concerned (Francovich, 2017). For example, in Spokane, Washington, teachers have expressed their fears of assaults up to and including threats of death that have increased because of their school systems focus on reducing suspensions and expulsions. One recent incident in that community involved

a male student who made death threats against teachers and students. Administrators did not search the student for weapons until receiving threats of teachers not returning to school (Francovich, 2017).

School security measures. In the post-September 11, 2001 (9/11) era, coupled with critical events such as the 1999 mass murders in Littleton, Colorado (Theriot, 2016; Wolf, 2012, 2014) and the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School mass murders (Theriot & Orme, 2016; Wolf, 2014), a strong focus toward the security of schools has also resulted in the target hardening of public schools (Connell, 2016; Crawford & Burns, 2016). The debate about school security measures has evoked strong feelings both for and against this technology. Servoss (2017) reported binomial regression findings, showing that high-security schools are 11.78 times more likely to be composed of African American students than are their White peers. This finding also correlated with students though not as strongly (Servoss, 2017). Although increased Hispanic–Latino security in minority schools was found to predominate, the number of self-reported student acts of misbehavior was lower, suggesting that the increased security features influenced misconduct and delinquent behavior (Servoss, 2017). These conclusions would suggest that a tradeoff must be made between closer surveillance and reduced crime in schools.

The relationship between security measures in combination and juvenile involvement with illegal drug activity, fighting, taking part in property crimes, and firearms, has revealed that security measures have provided a moderating effect upon criminal behavior (Tanner-Smith, Fisher, Addington, & Gardella, 2018). Although

perceptions of school safety might be reported as lower because of their daily visibility, the use of such measures has resulted in findings that they are effective, at least in the area of property crime victimization.

Recent events and the responses related to school violence suggest that target hardening of schools is increasing. A school shooting in January 2018 in Marshall County, Kentucky, in which a 15-year-old fellow student killed two students and injured 21 other students, resulted in a policy change requiring all students to have bags checked for weapons prior to entering school (Kentucky high school, 2018). As incidents of school violence continue to erupt, school administrators and stakeholders will be pressured to act, further increasing potential tension between students, school administrators, and law enforcement.

The level of school crime in Tennessee increased 13.5% between 2015 and 2017. The crime reported most frequently to law enforcement was simple assault, accounting for 37% of all offenses. Of all offenses during that period, 78% were solved or cleared by arrest (Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, 2018). This increase reverses the downward trajectory that juvenile crime had taken over the last 10 years.

School Resource Officers

The presence of law enforcement officers in schools is not a recent development; however, the increase in the numbers of officers assigned has risen significantly in the last two decades. According to McKenna et al. (2016), the Police–School Liaison Program instituted by the Flint Police Department in Michigan in the late 1950s was the

first SRO program. The growth of SRO programs expanded rapidly in the aftermath of the 1999 mass murders in Littleton, Colorado (Theriot, 2016; Wolf, 2012, 2014), and the 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School mass murders (Theriot & Orme, 2016; Wolf, 2014). Thus, much of the growth in SRO programs is related to tragic events that triggered interest in school security.

SROs are the image of law enforcement to the public (Crawford, 2016). Those who choose to work as SROs have represented their profession well overall, with exceptions like every other profession. SROs criminally charged with offenses are overwhelmingly male and involve sexual misconduct with female students (Stinson & Watkins, 2014).

SRO programs across the United States have developed along different law enforcement philosophies. Many SRO programs use what is called the triad model, integrating SROs as counselors, educators, and enforcers of the law (McKenna et al., 2016; Wolf, 2014). The proponents of this model recommend that the SRO spend an equal amount of time counseling and mentoring students, presenting in classrooms, and enforcing laws and ordinances. Additionally, the triad model has the benefit of having been used effectively since 1991 (Canaday, James, & Nease, 2012; NASRO, n.d.). The theory behind the triad model is that SROs will engage students in and out of the classroom, becoming trustworthy mentors and positive role models exemplifying law enforcement behavior.

The enforcement dimension of the triad model is the most visible part of the

SRO's duties. Parents, teachers, and administrators view this dimension as the most important. According to McKenna et al. (2016), SROs share this view, for 69% of them believed that "law enforcement was their key role" (p. 433). The educational part is the most important and least-utilized part of the triad model. McKenna et al. (2016) noted this underutilization in their findings, stating, "Only 19% of SROs agreed that teaching was an important part of their job" (p. 35). This reluctance to teach negatively affects the SRO because speaking to students in the classroom environment allows an SRO to explain to students what and why they do what they do. The final part of the triad model is that of mentor–counselor. According to McKenna et al., SROs are more comfortable in this role because "54% described mentoring students as important to their roles" (p. 434). The problem with the imbalance of roles in the triad model means that important opportunities to redirect negative opinions toward law enforcement are lost.

Much of the confusion related to SRO roles might have occurred because of the type of policing style with which the SRO most closely identifies. McKenna and White (2017) suggested in their findings that the inclination toward enforcement, as opposed to counseling or mentoring students, was identifiable among SROs in Texas. McKenna and White also found that, even among SROs with an inclination toward an enforcement style of policing, SROs still demonstrated a willingness toward counseling and allowing school administrators to carry out the disciplining of students, though they were willing to arrest if they believed it to be necessary.

Furthermore, in one of the few studies that compared SROs and their policing

styles, May and Higgins (2011) found little difference between SROs who were "veterans" and SROs who were new to the assignment. Both groups were compared, using an independent samples *t* test, which revealed differences in experience and training in the role, as well as a slight difference in age, and relationships with administrators (May & Higgins, 2011). However, one of the factors that might have accounted for the similarities in the two groups was the relative closeness of age and length of overall law enforcement service. May and Higgins' (2011) intent in their study was to assess whether law enforcement officers who were very new to the role were more likely to criminalize student conduct.

The presence of law enforcement officers in schools is controversial and it has generated conflicting points of view in current SRO literature. For example, Ryan, Katsiyannis, Counts, and Shelnut (2017) noted heavy-handed motives involving SRO behavior with students. In fact, Ford, Bothelo, and Conlon (2015, as cited in Ryan et al. 2017) related an accusation of an assault against a student by an SRO in Richland County, South Carolina, in October of 2015, specifically, "where a high school girl who was seated in her desk was physically assaulted by an SRO for being noncompliant and refusing to give up her cell phone which was captured on video and widely disseminated" (p. 188).

The event related by Ford, Bothelo, and Conlon (2015, as cited in Ryan et al., 2017) appeared in print months after investigations by both the State of South Carolina and the United States Justice Department produced investigative findings of the incident,

clearing the SRO of criminal wrongdoing. Neither agency sought to bring charges against the SRO who was alleged to have committed the assault (Summerfeldt, 2016; Byrd, 2017). Such perpetuation of incorrect facts omits the legal findings and context relating to such events and makes an objective evaluation of prior researchers' conclusions difficult.

Admittedly, questionable episodes have occurred that cast doubt on the value of having law enforcement officers in schools. Several arrests of students have had their origin in innocuous beginnings (Nance, 2016). One such incident involved the dropping or throwing of a slice of cake onto a floor, the escalation of which resulted in a student's arrest. Another episode involved an SRO whom a teacher summoned to a classroom because the teacher was trying to confiscate a cell phone from a student (Nance 2016). However, what Nance omitted in the first example was that the incident attributed to SROs did not involve an SRO, but a school security guard (Simmons, 2007). In the second example that Nance cited, relating to a 5-year-old being arrested, likewise, did not involve an SRO, but instead was a dispatched patrol officer (Herbert, 2007; Tobin, 2005). Nance also did not relate that, in the case of the 5-year-old, administrators tried for more than 20 minutes to contact a parent, who refused to come to the school and address the child's behavior (Tobin, 2005). This type of scenario is a recurring theme in prior SRO research, where law enforcement or security guard actions are conflated with the actions of SROs.

The conflict of roles and responsibilities is a dilemma unique to SROs, for they are in many cases expected to be mentors, teachers, and enforcers, yet at times, there is

strain between roles. Depending on the individual SRO and school administrator, the role of enforcer might dominate (Schlosser, 2014). Administrators who seek a greater role for an SRO as a counselor/mentor might be rebuffed or vice versa, depending upon the temperament and inclination of the individual SRO.

The presence of law enforcement SROs has generated mixed reviews in studies that concern effectiveness and benefit to students. Paradoxically, the presence of uniformed SROs has resulted in student beliefs that their school environment is more dangerous, while other students report the opposite (Theriot, 2016). Stinson and Watkins (2014) conducted a study and found that students and school personnel view SROs in a favorable light. However, that favorability has also been linked to even higher levels of law enforcement reporting because of increased communication between students, administrators, teachers, and SROs (Devlin & Gottfredson, 2016). In each case, the mere presence of SROs is a threat to students, depending on which researchers' conclusions are considered.

Among criticism of SRO programs regularly referenced in the literature is the idea that the danger to students in schools is overblown (Parker et al., 2014). These writers have said that, although SRO programs were ramping up, violent crime was falling from 1997–2009, according to statistical data. However, that trend has reversed in recent years. Crawford (2016) reported that data from the National Center for Education Statistics (2014) revealed that of 1,420,900 total victimizations, over 900,000 involved violence. This increase in violent victimization suggests that students are at greater risk of

violence in school (37 attacks per 1,000) than away from school (15 attacks per 1,000). This statistic can be compared to the 7.04 per 1,000 that Beger (2002) cited from data obtained in the late 1990s. This comparison suggests that the risk of becoming a victim of violence in schools is not an overreaction, as early researchers tried to claim. In addition to prior findings, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016, as cited in Peguero, Connell, & Hong, 2016), have listed school violence as a significant health threat to students. In summary, earlier claims that the hazard to students is overblown are no longer valid.

In addition to student victims of school violence, teachers and administrators likewise have reason for concern in becoming the target of criminal behavior. Recently, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) listed violent assaults against teachers (5%) at the highest levels recorded (Musu-Gillette et al., 2017). Therefore, the risk of teachers being assaulted contradicts the claim that teachers can physically intervene to break up acts of violence when they are oftentimes the victims themselves.

Additionally, the decisions in favor of school systems against employees whom students have assaulted have hampered the legal options available to teachers regarding their students victimizing them. Two recent decisions against teachers, *Field v. Lafayette Parish School Board* (2016) and *Ekblad v. Independent School District* (2017), involved liability claims in which a student injured a pregnant teacher while she was trying to break up a fight, and a student injured another teacher who was also trying to break up a fight (James, 2017). In the second example, the teacher claimed that the assailant had

targeted the teacher because of the teacher's race (James, 2017). These are examples of school staff, who formerly handled such incidents, not being trained or practically equipped to act as peacemakers by physically separating violent combatants of either sex.

Overall, the security and protection of students must always be weighed against the unintended consequences of students being arrested and potential future harm. Students might be pulled into the juvenile or adult criminal justice system via arrest because of incidents that occur in schools in the presence of SROs and during their investigations of reported crime. Although studies have been conducted that described the consequences of students being arrested because of the SROs' presence in their schools, little to any research has been carried out examining the decision-making processes of SROs in making arrests as compared to non-SROs making arrests (Wolf, 2012, 2014). The incidents that Nance (2016) reported did not involve SROs, but non-SRO law enforcement officers. Therefore, the researcher seeks in the current study to fill the void in the literature regarding SROs. The researcher has provided in this chapter an overview of the existing literature concerning the presence of SROs and has provided an analysis of the theories relating to SRO and student interactions.

One argument presented suggested that SROs are a contributor to the school-to-prison pipeline. Monterastelli (2017) believed that the presence of SROs or other police in schools is not in the students' best interests. However, no context is offered to support Monterastelli's conclusion that SROs criminalize student behavior. The definition that researchers use to describe what constitutes minor or major criminal behavior is

operationalized in Monterastelli's research, but it not does not fit in most studies concerning the school-to-prison pipeline.

The overreach of what has been called mission-creep is another problem with SROs and school discipline (Ryan et al., 2017). This tendency can be offset with proper language and delineation of SRO responsibilities in a memorandum of understanding, a legal document setting forth the duties and conditions under which SROs will work within schools (Ryan et al., 2017). Without such guidelines, it is difficult to establish the precise roles that SROs will fill, which leads to potential conflict with SROs and students.

Lack of training of SROs is another contributing factor to the school-to-prison pipeline. Even though SROs address developmentally immature adolescents in middle school and high schools, basic law enforcement training programs only spend 1% of their curriculum on matters that pertain to juveniles (Martinez-Prather, McKenna, & Bowman, 2016; Ryan et al., 2017). Additionally, no standardized training curriculum exists for SROs, and only a small number of states mandate a specific number of hours that must be completed before an SRO is assigned to a school (Ryan et al., 2017). The training programs that do exist focus upon topics such as active shooter response and other tactical operational responses, as opposed to learning about child development, teaching, or conflict resolution subjects (Martinez-Prather, McKenna, & Bowman, 2016). The lack of training in areas that SROs will face in schools means that a steep learning curve must be overcome to master this unique form of policing.

In Tennessee, employment and training standards of SROs are found in the

Tennessee Code Annotated § 49-6-4217. Tennessee law requires 40 hours of training for new SROs within the first 12 months of assignment, after which 16 hours of training are required annually. Unfortunately, in many cases, this training is lightly addressed in annual in-service sessions as other parts of needed annual training topics, such as emergency vehicular operations, child abuse, human trafficking, and deadly force, also must be reviewed annually during in-service sessions. Although these topics are equally important, minimal effort is placed on school-specific topics, such as conflict resolution, student psychology, or child development.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2013, as cited in May et al., 2015) offered data showing that 1.6 million juvenile arrests had occurred in 2010. Of this number, 156,000 were for disorderly conduct, many of which incidents had occurred in schools. However, these researchers do not state that, in reality, SRO engagement in schools was modest at best until the Columbine High School massacre of 1999 (Fader, Lockwood, Schall, & Stokes, 2015; McKenna, et al.,2016; Theriot, 2016). The problem of sequential order, where cause and effect are concerned, indicates that SROs were not culpable for that criticism. Although it must be admitted that conduct violations, such as disorderly conduct and assault, are the largest contributors to juvenile arrests, the redefining of these charges as “nonserious” is a conflation of minor discipline versus criminal conduct.

A source of tension that might have contributed to the problem of a school-to-prison pipeline is the SROs’ inability to balance protection of students’ constitutional

rights with performing the law enforcement tasks of prevention and detection of crime. Preiss, Arum, Edelman, Morrill, and Tyson (2016) studied this tension in the context of "fairness." They noted the areas that involved due process and beliefs of fairness concerning student discipline. Case law addressing the tension between students' rights and the security of students, staff, faculty, and administration has appeared over the last several decades. Preiss et al. (2016) named *Goss v. Lopez* (1974), *Tinker v. Des. Moines* (1969), and *New Jersey v. TLO* (1985) as the three most significant decisions.

It must be conceded that the potential risk exists to students when questioned by law enforcement officers in criminal investigations. A lack of knowledge of the law might work against students. Feld (2013) reported, "90% of students waive Miranda rights" (p. 11). The dilemma associated with that statistic is because of the Miranda warning against self-incrimination being developed as a standard for questioning adults, not children. Nevertheless, the courts have found the warning to apply to juveniles as well (Feld, 2013). Consequently, one must question the cognition of juveniles as being competent enough to waive their rights when an adult standard is used to elicit statements from yet-developing adolescents. Feld reported that juveniles willingly waive their rights, not understanding the implications. However, Feld did not show that the waiving of Miranda rights affected the disposition of the cases in which juveniles admitted their responsibility. This is a result of the focus of the juvenile court philosophy of treatment versus retribution.

A question that should be asked about SROs is "Do more arrests of juveniles

occur in schools because the police are in the schools or are more police in the schools because the volume and intensity of criminal or delinquent activity in schools has already increased necessitating more arrests?" For example, Devlin and Gottfredson (2016) suggested that SROs are placed in schools that are already producing higher levels of crime and delinquency. The necessity of showing causality requires, as one of the conditions, to show the cause or independent variable as occurring or preceding the effect or the dependent variable (O'Sullivan, Rassel, Berner, & Taliaferro, 2016). Previous research has blurred the context of the sequential order concerning crime and disorder and the presence of SROs. As an example, Fader et al. (2015) conflated the description of SRO arrests of students as criminalizing behavior.

This conclusion is contestable in two ways. First, it minimized violent behavior that causes school disorder. Fader et al. (2015) gave no context in their research to describe which crimes were typical adolescent behavior or how they operationalized misdemeanor level charges as "nonserious" behavior. Instead, all arrests are lumped together with no attempt to explain what they might have considered as legitimate arrests and worthy of law enforcement intervention. The second flaw in Fader et al.'s conclusions involves the logical fallacy of cum hoc ergo propter hoc (with this, therefore, because of this). In other words, the direction of causation might be the reversal of the originally asserted claim. Gun violence is a useful example when claims of correlation between ownership and violence are asserted. High numbers of guns and elevated levels of violent crime allow the presumption that larger numbers of firearms cause violence

when it is possible that because of the violence more people buy firearms (Curtis et al., 2016).

The School-to-Prison Pipeline

The American Civil Liberties Union (2008, as cited in McKenna et al., 2016) stated that the school-to-prison pipeline is "the policies and practices that push school children, especially the most at-risk children, out of the classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems" (p. 440). Offering support for this claim, Gonsoulin et al. (2012) described how disciplinary referrals to the juvenile justice system have risen over the last 20 years. The increase in delinquency referrals also correlates with the increased number of SROs assigned to schools. However, Gonsoulin et al. did not find whether the SROs' presence created the increase in referrals or whether increased criminal activity created the demand for more law enforcement to stop or deter delinquent behavior.

The effects of the school-to-prison pipeline begin with frequent negative encounters with the juvenile justice system. Added effects are the likelihood of future disciplinary problems, dropout rates, and future encounters within the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. As a result, the United States prison population has tripled since 1987 (González, 2012). Similarly, Monterastelli (2017) asserted that the juvenile justice system is the way that administrators remove students whom they do not desire in their schools.

However, statistical data exist that suggest that the concerns of the school-to-prison pipeline might be exaggerated. Although federal agencies recognized and

documented the danger of school violence, the number of arrests of juveniles for disorderly conduct has steadily declined since 2006 (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017). Concomitant with prior SRO research, the number of SROs in schools has steadily increased during this same time. Thus, the logical conclusion can be drawn that, if researchers were correct in their conclusions that SROs and schools contribute to such a pipeline, the arrests diametrically oppose the statistical data and are unlikely at the national level.

Another dimension of the school-to-prison pipeline that Fader et al. (2015) and May et al. (2015) reported is the tendency of teachers to use SROs as enforcers of discipline, instead of practicing proper classroom management. SROs themselves report that teachers and administrators use SROs for school disciplinary purposes. This short-circuiting of the school administrative process effectively creates a shorter pathway for the removal of problem students. Additionally, this alternate path of student discipline gives ammunition to critics such as Wolf (2014) who claimed that SROs are part of punitive school discipline policies. the overuse of SROs in conjunction with harsh and punitive school discipline might be detrimental to students by (a) increasing the number of student arrests, (b) pushing students out of schools, (c) increasing the likelihood of students dropping out of school, and (d) creating disproportionately harmful situation for minority groups (Fader et al., 2015). Advocates of SRO programs contend that SROs are not the agents of school discipline and school administrators should not place them in that situation. In support of this position, the NASRO (2016, as cited in Lynch, Gainey, &

Chappell, 2016) explicitly stated that SROs should not be part of school discipline.

Zero-Tolerance Policies

The concept of the school-to-prison pipeline begins with allegations of an excessive level of punitive discipline in schools. The mistaken tendency of some adults to treat children as small adults discounts the developmental needs of children in comparison with the intellectual and social skills of adults that come with the maturity that children have not yet reached. From a legal standpoint, the doctrine of parens patriae (the state is a parent) is discounted in favor of a more legalistic punitive approach (Blitzman, 2015). The disparate impact on minority children is more pronounced because of the inclusion of social factors (Blitzman, 2015). Thus, treatment or counseling approaches have given way to criminal prosecution, with authorities disavowing the treatment aspect of juvenile justice initiatives.

Punitive school discipline and the zero-tolerance debate inject the polarized discussion of race when evaluating the effects of discipline on students. Brent (2016) reported that minorities that compose one third of the total population are incarcerated at a rate twice as high as their percentage in the population would represent. Brent used the inflammatory term of “Jim Crow” to describe the criminal justice policies that lead to such an outcome. Instead, understanding of the dilemma in which teachers, administrators, and school officials find themselves each day, Brent (2016) disregarded legitimate concerns as an “enduring disposition” (p. 11). Consistent with zero-tolerance and school discipline research, the focus has been placed on the administrators of

discipline and not the behavior of the student.

One example of how racial disparities have resulted in action concerning the contributions of the alleged school-to-prison pipeline is Champaign, Illinois. In a greater than 10-year period from 2006–2016, the school district was found to have experienced 417 arrest involving 357 Black students or 86% of the total taken into custody. The revelation of this data resulted in complaints of civil rights discrimination among the African American community after the publication of the statistic in a local media publication (Champaign County Board, 2017).

The Joint Ad-Hoc Tennessee Blue Ribbon Task Force on Juvenile Justice (State of Tennessee, 2017) submitted policy recommendations to reduce the disparate impact upon minorities. Among the suggestions proposed were requiring that law enforcement officers, particularly SROs, prepare petitions to document the steps that school administrators took to address acts committed in schools (State of Tennessee, 2017). This recommendation subordinates the discretion that law enforcement officials currently possess to that of administrative policies set by schools, which in turn creates a potential conflict with State of Tennessee law, particularly the Tennessee Code Annotated § 38-8-108 that reads in part that

> It is the duty of all peace officers who know, or have reason to suspect, any person of being armed with the intention of committing a riot or affray, or of assaulting, wounding, or killing another person, or of otherwise breaking the peace, to arrest such person immediately, and take such person before the court of

general sessions.

Although zero-tolerance policies have been blamed for being part of the school-to-prison pipeline, shifts in school disciplinary philosophy have appeared in recent years. The concept of restorative justice has begun to take hold in the United States and a modification of some of the inflexible punishments has become more widespread (James & Johnston, 2017).

Several diverse groups of students have been afforded the status of vulnerable populations or minorities. Mallett (2017) included children living in poverty as a vulnerable population or group, but never specified what constituted poverty, other than asserting that 20% of American children are currently living in poverty (p. 565). Mallett also described the security apparatus of schools in the current post-9/11 climate and claimed that this was part of the "criminalization of school discipline" (p. 564). A familiar argument in response is to predict the overall criminalization of American society if tighter security becomes the standard.

A facet of the debate that involves juvenile arrests and race is what has become known as "disparate minority contact," or the statistical demonstration of minority groups being overly represented in arrest statistics. This term has been asserted as prima facia evidence of discrimination against minority groups (Petrilli, 2015). The Obama Administration's Civil Rights Division found that this form of discrimination occurs when minority groups are not singled out, but even when color-blind disciplinary actions are administered, minority groups are overrepresented (Petrilli, 2015). This presents a

presumption of guilt, as opposed to a presumption of innocence, a bedrock principle of the American justice system (Petrilli, 2015). In such an environment, it is not surprising that teachers and administrators would prefer to shift the responsibility of dealing with antisocial and disruptive behavior to law enforcement.

Not all researchers who have examined school discipline agree with the currently accepted findings concerning race and discipline. For example, Morgan and Wright (2017) contested the accepted paradigm of systematic racism and discipline against minority students. Although acknowledging that disparate impact does occur to minority groups, Morgan and Wright reported that earlier researchers had minimized the variable of student behavior as a contributing cause of school discipline.

Additionally, despite mixed findings concerning school discipline rates between different racial groups, the presumption has been established that the disparate rates are evidence of systematic racism. The question that has been repeatedly unanswered is "Do students become entangled with the juvenile justice system because of culturally related behavior that is generally deemed unacceptable, or because of systematic racism?" Offering support for this view, Mowen and Brent (2016) analyzed data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth over the course of 4 years. They concluded that differences between the races disappear once school disciplinary suspensions are factored into cumulative rates of arrest. Although that discovery does not negate disparate minority contact, it does suggest that individual student behavior, and not systematic racism, accounts for differences in contact with the juvenile justice system.

The issue of race is ever-present in examining crime rates in schools. For example, in Tennessee between 2015 and 2017, Black students (African American students) totaled 44% of offenders compared to White students at 37% (Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, 2018). The disparity is highlighted by the fact that African Americans compose only 17% of the total population of Tennessee (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). In fact, 37% of the total number of crimes, that were committed in Tennessee schools between 2015–2017, were simple assault. Since 78% of them were cleared by arrest (Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, 2018), proximity to law enforcement officers in schools could be considered as a factor in the apprehension rate, but the motivation to offend cannot be laid at the feet of law enforcement.

Interestingly, students themselves might be more honest and candid about their behavior and motivations in schools than adults. In an analysis of self-reported student data, Morgan and Wright (2017) revealed that minority students themselves reported higher rates of delinquent or unruly behavior than did their White counterparts, including the carrying of weapons. The pattern of observation might then focus on the participants or participants, increasing the likelihood of discovery and apprehension.

An educational system that might appear on the surface to be inclined to harsher levels of school discipline revealed interesting results. Mowen and Brent (2016) analyzed school discipline and racial disparities on an American military installation. Their findings suggested that economic status and employment negated the effects of race and ethnicity where school discipline was concerned. The research of Morgan and Wright

(2017) found that in comparison with Asian and Hispanic minorities, White students were disciplined more often than Asian students and at the same rate as Hispanics. Morgan and Wright concluded that, for the systematic racism argument to be logically concluded, White students should have been disciplined the least. Therefore, an argument exists that policies of schools are less the cause of disparate minority impact than the unfortunate economic circumstances and home environment from whence the student appeared.

Ironically, the researchers who have examined the topic of school violence have found that the presence of SROs has reduced suspensions in schools and school crime (Johnson, 1999, as cited in Crawford & Burns, 2016). Although contradictory findings exist regarding the levels of school violence, the statistic concerning the decrease of suspensions was not among those found to be contrary. This would suggest that a more punitive approach overall does at least reduce the number of students suspended.

The possibility that students contribute to the phenomenon of the school-to-prison pipeline has been minimized or has been ignored in most of the research on the topic. Mowen and Brent (2016) in their analysis of cumulative arrest and suspension rates of students found that higher numbers of suspensions correlated to higher number of arrests, confirming what researchers had also reported. Mowen and Brent's conclusions suggest that, over time, negative reinforcement might contribute to future delinquency and the likelihood of arrest. Mowen and Brent attributed stricter school discipline with the cause of a school-to-prison pipeline, as opposed to the influence of SROs. However, Mowen

and Brent did not provide in their conclusions any recommendations for how those concerned could help a student reorient his or her life course, or how the school administrators ought to keep order in the whole school, while they tailor individual interventions to minimize the adverse effects of justifiably sanctioning unacceptable actions or conduct.

Special Education

A final area of examination into the school and the relationship to students is in the area of special education. Opponents of zero tolerance policies such as Monterastelli (2017) make the argument that zero tolerance policies adversely affect special education students by using such policies to remove students with disabilities from the school setting to avoid having to address their emotional issues. Monterastelli referenced students who might be diagnosed with disorders such as oppositional defiance disorder or conduct disorder as two diagnoses that cause conflict in schools. However, Monterastelli provided no evidence in the findings to show what proportion of student arrests are composed of special educational students.

The courts and investigative agencies have supported SRO arrests of students named as “Special Ed.” For example, an SRO in Southlake, Texas, was fired for aiding in restraining an 8-year-old who began cursing, throwing items, and attacking a school principal with a coffee cup (Mitchell, 2017). After helping in handcuffing the child, it was discovered that he was autistic. The child had a history of assaulting school staff and was in possession of what was described as “home-built nun-chucks.” In the decision, the

court decided that the SRO acted appropriately under the circumstances, even when factoring in the child's autism. The former SRO was later hired as the Chief of Police of Blue Mound, Texas, where he currently serves (Mitchell, 2017).

Another recent decision, shielding SROs when taking special education students into custody, was handed down in October 2017 in *Quentin Scott v. City of Albuquerque* (2017), in which case a 13-year-old student who was diagnosed with bipolar and oppositional defiant disorder was arrested for skipping class. Although finding that the arrest itself was unconstitutional, the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed the plaintiff's claim that a constitutional rights violation occurred by the SRO making the arrest and denied the plaintiff's claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act that the plaintiff was arrested because of a disability.

School Security Features

Another feature attributed to the school-to-prison pipeline is the presence of higher levels of security in schools. The presence of metal detectors, surveillance cameras, and identification credentials mirror those of a prison environment (Mowen & Brent, 2016). These types of technologies are also found throughout the United States in the post-9/11 environment. Logically, if these features contribute to the criminalization of schools, the same argument can be made for airports, courthouses, and other access points where individuals are screened to prevent terrorist attacks or other acts of violence. Ryan et al. (2017) indirectly made the case for such security features when describing how the mission of SROs has changed according to events such as the mass shootings in

schools.

Instrumentation

Wolf (2012) developed and used an instrument to consider the responses of all SROs in Delaware. Using the same instrument in Tennessee to compare SROs and non-SROs was a larger undertaking because the number of SROs in Wolf's study was small (n = 31). Nevertheless, despite the disparate sample sizes, the basic constructs that were measured were the same. The only difference between this researcher's study and Wolf's study was the researcher's inclusion of non-SROs as part of the overall sample frame for this study.

Gap in School Resource Officer Arrest Literature

The topic of SROs and arrest decision making has received scant coverage in the research literature. The research findings reviewed showed that most studies focus on how SROs contribute to a school-to-prison pipeline. Only two studies focused on comparing how SROs arrive at the decision to arrest students. The primary gap that this study seeks to address is how law enforcement officers in dissimilar roles are inclined to take students into custody.

This study was also unique in that the researcher determined that a statistically significant relationship exists between groups of law enforcement officers who have historically been conflated as identical, and the strength of that relationship where an increased likelihood of harming students because of excessive enforcement is concerned. Without the addition of context, which this researcher provided, informed policy-making

decisions could not occur, thereby possibly increasing the risk of harm to students. Thus, the positive social change in this researcher's study was viewed as mitigating a worse outcome for students should SROs be eliminated from the school setting. Law enforcement officers would still respond to calls in schools, but those officers who would be strangers might be less inclined to consider the impact upon students when considering whether to take them into custody, especially for misdemeanor offenses.

Summary

Chapter 2 detailed the current literature and findings relating to the phenomenon of SRO programs in the United States. The findings in current studies were presented, whose authors suggested that the presence of law enforcement officers in schools is harmful to students, along with current school disciplinary practices. This harm to students is manifested in what has been described as a school-to-prison pipeline. The relationship to school discipline and SROs and their effects upon the school-to-prison pipeline was examined from multiple research perspectives. This researcher also examined the components of Black's (1971) theory of arrest, and the way that those elements form the framework for this researcher's study. Although the research that was compiled in the researcher's literature review addressed in detail the potential harm to students through SROs, no literature exists concerning how SROs and non-SROs compare when deciding whether to arrest students. Most studies conflate SROs with non-SROs, including when citing prior school incidents. The framework and research methods for this study are explained in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

Introduction

This study was conducted to examine the harm that is caused to students who are arrested in schools. Researchers have explained the nature of the harm to students arrested at an early age (Nance, 2016) and how they believe that the SRO presence might contribute to those harms (Monterastelli, 2017). I evaluated the relationships and the decision-making processes of SROs and non-SROs and measured the arrest inclinations of both groups and how this tendency leads to a school-to-prison pipeline. The specific problem and overarching research question was "Does a relationship exist among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision making involving middle school and high school students?"

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to examine the relationships in arrest inclination of juveniles between two groups of the overall population of law enforcement officers: SROs and non-SROs. To address the gap that currently exists in the literature, a quantitative correlational approach occurred. Correlational data analysis using multiple and logistical regression revealed whether significant relationships existed in the arrest tendency of SROs compared to non-SROs. Chapter 3 includes the (a) research method and design, (b) appropriateness of design, (c) population and sample plan, (d) instrumentation, (e) data collection, analysis, and triangulation, and (f) ethical consideration of participants. Chapter 3 also includes the rationale for how a correlational design was chosen in answering the research questions

and hypotheses, and the parameters used to decide whether to confirm or reject the null hypotheses.

Research Method and Design

A quantitative correlational design was used to discover whether and to what extent a relationship exists among SROs, non-SROs and arrest decision-making in Tennessee involving middle school and high school students. Quantitative research involves numerically examining the relationship between variables to test hypotheses or research questions. A correlational design is built on relational statements (Reynolds (2007, as cited in Burkholder et al., 2016). I used a correlational design to measure the strength of relationships between the independent variable of law enforcement officer with its two attributes of SRO and non-SRO, years of total law enforcement experience, years of assignment as an SRO, prior SRO experience, section of the state the respondent serves (e.g., eastern, middle, or western), and the type of community the officer serves (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural). The dependent variable was the arrest likelihood of middle school and high school age students, allowing inferences about the level and likelihood of harm to juveniles.

The operationalization of the independent variable of type of law enforcement officer, for measurement purposes, was identical to that in Wolf's (2012) study concerning the varied factors that SROs used to decide whether to arrest a student. Higher scores on the Likert instrument show greater levels of importance for each factor. These decision-making factors included (a) the quality of evidence, (b) the guidelines

provided by laws or regulations, (c) the nature of the misbehavior, (d) the impact on victim, (f) the wishes of victim's parents or guardian, (g) the students attitude when confronted, (h) the student's history of misbehavior, (i) the need to ensure student is punished, (j) the wishes of school administrators, (k) the potential consequences of student involvement with juvenile justice system, (l) the expectations of continued misbehavior, (m) the wishes of teachers, and (n) the student's academic achievement (Wolf, 2012).

A self-administered Internet survey incorporated descriptive demographic data, including the *School Resource Officer Survey* that Wolf (2012) designed and used, and whose permission was sought and granted for use and modification in this study (see Appendices A & B). The original name of the survey did not appear when this survey was deployed. This change was made to capture a greater sample of non-SROs who might have been less inclined to take part in the survey, believing that it does not apply to them.

Added descriptive information was used to capture the data forming the other independent variables, including (a) their years of total law enforcement experience, (b) their years of assignment as an SRO, (c) their prior SRO experience, (d) the section of the state in which they serve (e.g., eastern, middle, or western), and (e) the type of community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

Appropriateness of Design

The selected correlational design was the most proper choice to collect and

analyze numerical data from naturally occurring variable relationships and to measure a naturally occurring effect without external manipulation (Burkholder et al., 2016). In each research question causation is not proven, only the study of relationships through the analysis of data from law enforcement officers about a decision-making process to affect the arrest of a student.

A correlational design was chosen based on empiricism, which is rooted in the belief that scientific knowledge is observable and quantifiable. Ideal empiricism involves a true experimental design to control all variables and to observe and record any cause and effect (Burkholder et al., 2016). The weakness of the correlational design is the lack of controls for spurious effects, which does not prove causation (Burkholder et al., 2016). No external manipulation of any variables took place in this study; instead, the natural inclination of a routine stimulus will measure the day-to-day decision-making processes of law enforcement officers when considering the arrest of a middle school or high school age student. I also considered a quantitative, causal comparative research design because of the comparison of two preexisting groups (Schenker & Rumrill, 2004). However, I did not attempt to show causation; therefore, it was necessary not to use a causal-comparison design.

Population and Sample Plan

The target population of the study consisted of full-time, county and municipal, sworn, law enforcement officers in Tennessee. According to the *Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-1-201,* Tennessee is divided into three geographical sections or grand

divisions: eastern, middle, and western. Tennessee is a mixture of urban and rural communities throughout all three regions. SROs as well as non-SROs serve all three regions; therefore, all sections of the state sampled allowed for greater generalizability of results at a statewide level. The number of sworn, law enforcement officers in Tennessee was 17,376 members (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). An exact number of Peace Officer Standards and Training-certified, county and municipal, law enforcement officers is unknown; however, according to an official estimate from Dean Lewis, Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Academy Administrative Services Assistant III, the closest estimate, from in-service salary supplements paid by the State of Tennessee to county and municipal officers, was 13,556 personnel. Of this number, 991 currently serve in Tennessee schools as SROs (Aldrich, 2018). A convenience sample of sworn law enforcement officers, 991 SROs and 16,385 non-SROs, was drawn to produce an effect size large enough to show medium effects.

The sampling frame in this study consisted of county and municipal law enforcement agencies found in all three grand divisions of Tennessee. A sampling frame is a list of elements from which samples appear (Babbie, 2017). In this study, county and municipal law enforcement officers were the population from which SROs in Tennessee were chosen. The participants for this study were full-time, Peace Officer Standards and Training-certified, Tennessee law enforcement officers who identify as SROs or non-SROs. These officers were recruited through the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, the Tennessee Association of

Chiefs of Police, and the TNSRO Association (affiliated with NASRO). Additionally, social media was used to reach out to municipal and county agencies to invite their participation by sharing the survey link to their sworn personnel. I used Qualtrics to collect the data in an online survey format.

Nonprobability sampling methods were used to collect data for this study. The use of such a method has drawbacks. The lack of a random selection process removes the possibility of estimating the parameters of sample statistics, generalizing the statistically impossible (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). The outcome of findings drawn from such samples are subjective and must be evaluated so (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). The participants in the study were drawn using convenience sampling techniques. Convenience sampling involves sampling the units that are available for response (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). The risk to convenience sampling is that many of the participants self-select, increasing the risk of bias (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). The advantage to using convenience sampling is the context that it provides in a subject or the collection of background information for later descriptive studies (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). Using this sampling technique was justified in this circumstance because information was lacking on the arrest decision-making processes of SROs compared to non-SROs. The data obtained from the surveys was entered into the most current version of SPSS for calculation.

Though it would have been ideal to survey the law enforcement officers during the months when school was in session, data collection occurred while schools were out of session in summer 2018. One threat to internal validity is maturation or natural change

that affects responses (O'Sullivan et al., 2016). This time-dependent factor would capture current feelings and attitudes instead of capturing a maturation effect, which would affect the responses of an SRO in a regular assignment when school is out of session because he or she might respond differently than when he or she would in an active SRO role.

Additionally, I used G Power 3.1.9.2 to decide the needed sample size. The steps used to carry out the power analysis involved (a) selecting the data analysis test, in this case a linear multiple regression: (b) choosing a fixed model R^2 increase, within the F test family; (c) using an alpha level of .05, a power level of .8, and an effect size of .15. I discovered that a sample size of 98 participants was needed to show a medium-sized effect. This estimate is based on the predictors of total years of law enforcement service, years in an SRO assignment, prior service as an SRO, the urban-versus-rural nature of a participant's assignment, and the region of the state in which the participant serves. These levels were justified because they are accepted standard levels for alpha, effect size, and power.

Instrumentation

This study was created to examine whether, and to what extent, a relationship existed among the independent variables (SROs and non-SROs) and the dependent variable (arrest decision making). The data collection was a self-administered, online survey, using Qualtrics to collect data that included demographic data and data that was collected from the survey instrument that Wolf (2012) designed so that I could evaluate SRO responses to different vignettes to discern arrest inclination of SROs and non-SROS

relative to students. This data collection instrument was used in Delaware in 2012.

Survey research is a method of observation that is used to collect responses from a standardized questionnaire (Babbie, 2017). This type of research is used to collect descriptive data about a subject of interest. Surveys are an effective, inexpensive way of collecting data, and are a minimal risk to research participants. Surveys also collect data about behaviors, attitudes, and descriptions (Burkholder et al., 2016). The strengths of survey research, in helping the researcher to understand the phenomenon of interest in this case (i.e., SROs versus non-SRO arrest inclinations), aligned with using a survey.

The administration of a survey questionnaire to law enforcement officers in Tennessee was the most appropriate method of data collection for investigating the arrest decision making of SROs and non-SROs. Survey information is a useful collector of behavioral and attitudinal data. The arrest of students and the decision to make the arrests are attitudinal and behavioral, or as Wolf (2012) stated, the decision is "a cognitive process" (p. 61).

In this study, surveys were delivered online through the Qualtrics survey platform. The participants for this study were full-time Peace Officer Standards and Training-certified Tennessee law enforcement officers. These officers were identified as SROs or non-SROs, and they were recruited through the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, the Tennessee Association of Chiefs of Police, and the TNSRO Association (affiliated with NASRO), and they agreed to aid the distribution of the survey for data collection in this study. Prior

to the distribution of the link via the partnering organizations, I reached out to the Tennessee law enforcement agencies that maintained via social media sites to contact gatekeepers about the study and the communication with the link via the partnering organizations. Many of these entities throughout Tennessee agreed to disseminate the link to their sworn personnel. Those organizations included large, medium, and small agencies throughout the state.

Content of Survey

I used Wolf's (2012) survey instrument with permission for this study (see Appendix A) to learn whether any significant relationships appeared in arrest decision-making regarding students and whether any relationships appeared between SROs and non-SROs. The original intent of the instrument was to gather data about SRO arrest decision making. For the purposes of this study, the same survey questions were used. The rationale for this change was to broaden the surveyed population of law enforcement officers to include officers who do not work in schools. Confrontations between law enforcement officers and students have involved non-SROs.

Wolf (2012) examined four areas, including "factors that affected the arrest decision-making process, attitudes toward juvenile justice system, training regarding the decision to make an arrest, and demographic information" (p. 63). The factors relating to arrest decision-making processes were measured using a 5-point Likert scale. In Section 1 of the survey, Wolf used eight arrest scenarios that placed the officer in a position to evaluate the frequency and likelihood of making an arrest, coupled with questions to

evaluate the decision-making processes involved in not making an arrest, even when probable cause was present. In Section 2 of the survey, Wolf examined the beliefs and attitudes of the officer toward the juvenile justice system, and whether and to what degree those beliefs and attitudes might affect the officer's decision to make an arrest or to seek an alternate outcome. The attitudes toward the juvenile justice system might influence the officers' beliefs about how the juvenile justice system should be structured, particularly regarding rehabilitation, deterrence, incapacitation, or punitive repercussions (Wolf, 2012). In Section 3 of the survey, Wolf examined training on the arrest decision-making process. In Tennessee, recruits are familiarized with topics relating to the laws of arrest during their recruit training courses. Officers who complete the academy are expected to be fully functional and well versed in the civil and criminal laws of the State of Tennessee (n.d.a.). The 5-point Likert scale survey questions were designed to measure how the officers' academy and later training factored into the arrest decision-making process (Wolf, 2012). In Section 4 of survey, Wolf collected the level of aid received in the arrest decision-making process from peers or supervisors. Finally, in Section 5 of the survey, Wolf collected demographic data from the surveyed officers.

Demographic Factors

The demographic characteristics of the study sample are described using the mean, standard deviation, and range for continuous measurement scaled variables and frequency and percentage for categorical scaled variables. The demographic items included the factors of gender, age, SRO, non-SRO, former SRO, if formerly an SRO

how many years served, urban versus rural school setting, section of the state (western, middle, or eastern), with a brief description of each.

Validity and Reliability

Validity is the gauging of a construct under study. Reliability describes the accuracy of a measuring instrument: Does a measure accurately stand for the concept under review and does the instrument measure what its designers claim it measures (Babbie, 2017; Burkholder et al., 2016; O'Sullivan et al., 2016). To answer partially the validity questions in this study, the researcher used a previously developed instrument that appeared in Wolf's (2012) earlier SRO research. As support for the dimensions were conceived, Wolf developed and provided content validity tables that related to the questions that were developed for a doctoral dissertation and two peer-reviewed journal articles (see Appendices F & G; see also Wolf, 2013, 2014). Wolf (2012) cited earlier researchers for the content validity and used them as the source for the development of each concept measured. Content validity is a more rigorous form of validity as compared to face validity because it measures the content of an operational definition individually against a conceptual definition to show its usefulness (O'Sullivan et al., 2016).

One area of weakness in Wolf's (2012) study was the way that the methodology related to a nonprobability, sampling plan of data collection. This type of plan weakens or reduces the generalizability of findings to a larger population. However, this shortcoming does not reduce the study's value to the field as descriptive information and background data on a topic that currently has a dearth of data on the topic of SRO versus non-SRO

arrest inclination toward students.

Internal validity references the cause and effect nature of an independent variable. In a nonexperimental correlational study (O'Sullivan et al., 2016), cause and effect is not possible. The weakness of the correlational design is the lack of controls for spurious effects, which does not allow one to prove causation. Nevertheless, one advantage of Wolf's (2012) study was that the author's research is replicated in this researcher's study allowing the researcher to compare the findings of the two studies. As more replications of Wolf's study occur, internal validity threats will be reduced (O'Sullivan et al., 2016).

Additionally, surveying SROs when school is out of session presented a threat to internal validity because of the history and maturation effects. The natural inclination that occurs when school is in session might be discarded if the officer is in a different setting when the survey questions are answered or if time has elapsed since a school year ended. Ideally, it would be advisable to survey the law enforcement officers during the months when school would be in session. O'Sullivan et al. (2016) described the maturation effect as time dependent, which could affect SRO responses about juveniles and the decision to arrest. To overcome this threat, scheduling the survey toward the end of the school year would have been the ideal time to collect the data for this study.

External validity threats are threats to generalizability. Warner (2014) explained how external validity might be increased as internal validity decreases. In this researcher's study, although no causation is claimed, real-world circumstances are used to frame the questions as found in Wolf's (2012) survey. Statistical conclusion and

construct validity threats in this researcher's study are addressed by including a suitable statistical power in the sampling method. Additionally, statistical conclusion and construct validity are reinforced by prior studies (Wolf, 2012, 2013, 2014) whose authors used the same survey instrument.

Ethical Protection of Research Participants

The researcher's study followed the established procedures of Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure the ethical protection of research participants. Babbie (2017) identified four areas of major concern in how human research is conducted: voluntary participation, no harm caused to participants; informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality; deception, right to privacy; and prevention of harm. The psychological, economic, professional, and physical risk to participants were minimal. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and confidentiality will be ensured.

After the approval of the IRB was obtained (approval no. 07-11-18-0322041), an e-mail was sent to the directors of the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, and the TNSRO Association (affiliated with NASRO). Additionally, municipal and county law enforcement agencies throughout Tennessee were contacted via social media and were invited to take part in data collection by forwarding the survey link to their sworn personnel.

Upon final IRB approval, the survey instrument was deployed via the Qualtrics online survey platform. To distribute the survey, the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Training Officer's Association, the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, and the

TNSRO Association forwarded the email to the training officers of each law enforcement agency in Tennessee, and to the different municipal and county agencies with sworn personnel. The introductory email contained the Internet link to the survey, the purpose of the study, how information would be used and secured, the risks to participants, and the time estimated to complete the survey. No personal identifying information was collected or recorded; therefore, the researcher has guaranteed privacy. The researcher is in possession of all research records; therefore, confidentiality agreements were not necessary.

As part of the survey, an electronic consent statement was embedded at the beginning of the online survey. Participants were unable to continue with the survey until they gave their consent. Participants received my contact information, and the results of the study were available upon request via an executive summary. Additionally, an information page was created on a social media platform and was included with the email information to share findings of the study. At the time of the proposal and data collection period no conflicts of interest appeared. Participant responses were stored electronically in a password-protected database for 5-year storage, and no paper copies were kept.

A final area of ethical consideration was the researcher's proximity to the topic under study. Having served as an SRO for several years, and as an SRO supervisor, the researcher undoubtedly came to the study with conscious or unconscious biases and perspectives. Objectivity was the most important requirement to overcome these biases, realizing that the data would reveal whatever they would reveal, and that the greatest

service provided to SROs everywhere and to law enforcement in general would be to conduct this study and present the findings in as objective and unbiased manner as possible.

Usefulness to the Field

This quantitative correlational study consisted of six research questions and hypotheses to examine the relationship between arrest inclination of students in middle school and high schools and SROs versus non-SRO law enforcement officers to determine whether one group of the sample population (i.e., SROs) would be more likely, less likely, or the equally as likely as non-SROs to arrest students. Chapter 2 contained a review of the current literature and findings that related to the phenomenon of SRO programs in the United States, and that suggested that the presence of law enforcement officers in schools is harmful to students, along with current school disciplinary practices. This harm to students is manifested in what has been described as a school-to-prison pipeline (Nance, 2016). Studies of SRO arrest decision making has received little attention, with only two researchers examining these cognitive processes when measured against non-SROs (Hall, 2015; Wolf, 2012, 2014). The gap in the literature is filled by the findings in this researcher's study.

The findings of prior researchers into the phenomenon of school policing, as reported in the review of the literature, has focused on law enforcement officers in schools as a significant contributor to a school-to-prison pipeline (Monterastelli,, 2017; Nance, 2016). As analyzed in the review of the literature, researchers who have examined

the topic have conflated law enforcement incidents in schools with SROs or have repeated assertions from prior outlets that were incorrect. The cases that this researcher has cited as examples in this study involved arrests of students over trivial matters (Nance, 2016). One incident involved a school security guard and not an SRO, while the second involved a dispatched patrol officer and not an SRO, who might otherwise have deescalated a situation such that an arrest would not have been necessary. This recurring theme in prior SRO research, such that non-SRO law enforcement officers or security guard's actions were conflated with those of SROs, has shown the need for this researcher to evaluate relationships in arrest inclination between SROs and non-SROs. Hastily made policies, without evidence-based findings, might result in the removal of SROs from schools, which might worsen the problem and contribute to more arrests instead of fewer arrests.

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to examine the relationship in arrest inclinations toward juveniles between two groups of the overall population of law enforcement officers: SROs and non-SROs. To address the gap that currently exists in the literature, a quantitative correlational approach was conducted. To collect data for analysis, the researcher replicated a previously validated survey instrument (Wolf, 2012) to evaluate relationships between SROs and non-SRO arrest inclinations in Tennessee. Correlational data analysis, using multiple and logistical regression, revealed any significant relationships in arrest propensity.

Chapter 3 included the (a) research questions and hypotheses; (b) research method and design: (c) appropriateness of design; (d) population and sample plan; (e) instrumentation; (f) data collection, analysis, and triangulation; and (g) ethical consideration of participants. Chapter 3 also included the rationale for how a correlational design was chosen in answering the research questions and hypotheses, and included the parameters used to decide whether to confirm or reject the null hypotheses. Once data collection was completed, a comprehensive analysis of the data took place, as described in Chapter 4. This data analysis revealed whether a statistically significant correlation existed between SROs, non-SROs, and their inclinations toward the arrest of students in middle schools and high schools. Chapter 5 includes the interpretation of findings, recommendations for policy-makers, implications for social change, limitations of the study, areas of future research, and conclusions.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to discover whether and to what extent a relationship existed between SROs and non-SROs regarding arrest decision-making involving middle school and high school students as well as potential harm to students because of in-school arrests. The review of the current literature suggested that SROs are contribute to this problem (Monterastelli, 2017; Nance, 2016). I evaluated the relationships between SROs and non-SROs and measured the arrest inclinations of both groups with consideration of how arrest tendencies may lead to a school-to-prison pipeline. A quantitative evaluation of the independent variable of SROs and non-SROs on the dependent variable of the arrest likelihood of middle school and high school students allowed inferences about the level and likelihood of harm to juveniles. Chapter 4 includes a detailed account of how the study was conducted, the data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques.

Data Collection

Data Generation

After the approval of the IRB was obtained, an e-mail was sent to the directors of the Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Officers Association, the Tennessee Sheriffs Association, and the TNSRO Association (affiliated with NASRO). Additionally, municipal and county law enforcement agencies throughout Tennessee were contacted via social media and were invited to take part in data collection by forwarding the survey

link to their sworn personnel.

As part of the survey, an electronic consent statement was embedded at the beginning of the online survey. Participants were unable to continue with the survey until they gave their consent. Participants received my contact information, and the results of the study were available upon request via an executive summary. Additionally, an information page was created on a social media platform and was included with the email information to share findings of the study. At the time of the proposal and data collection period no conflicts of interest appeared.

Data Gathering

A total of 134 municipal and county law enforcement officers throughout all three divisions of Tennessee took part as participants in the data collection survey. Participants received an e-mail invitation to participate in the study, which included an informed consent statement with an embedded hyperlink to access the anonymous Internet survey. The data were collected beginning in July 2018 through August 2018 using the Qualtrics online survey platform. The survey consisted of 22 questions to gauge the likelihood of arrest of juveniles by SROs and non-SROs.

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables were among the first statistical analyses performed. The average (and standard deviation) number of years of experience as a law enforcement officer was 15.5 (9.1) and the range was 0–45. The number of non-SROs surveyed was 86 (64%) the number of SROs surveyed was 48 (36%). The 48

(36%) officers serving currently as SROs averaged a mean 5.4 years of service in schools. Six officers (5%) who are not currently SROs reported prior service in an SRO assignment. The average age of the officers surveyed was 43 years.

The geographical location of Tennessee officers was disaggregated with 45 officers (34%) working in the East Tennessee Grand Division, 27 (20%) working in the Middle Tennessee Grand Division, and 62 (46%) working in the West Tennessee Grand Division. Sixty-four (48%) of participants reported that they worked in an urban area, 43 (33%) participants stated that they worked in a suburban community, and 25 (19%) participants reported that they work in a rural community. One hundred twelve (84%) of participants reported being male, 18 (13%) participants reported being female, and four (3%) participants preferred not to answer. One hundred three respondents reported their race to be White non-Hispanic (77%), 13 (10%) participants reported being Black or African American, two (2%) participants reported being White-Hispanic, two (2%) participants reported being Asian American, and one (1%) participant reported being Native American. All other participants reported being other or did not wish to answer the question. Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics for respondent demographic data. Appendix H includes frequency tables for independent variable participant demographic information.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Participant Demographics

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Total years of experience as a law enforcement officer	134	0	7	3.27	1.900
Officer is an SRO or non-SRO	134	1	2	1.63	.485
Previous experience as an SRO	134	0	2	1.02	.977
Length of service in SRO assignment	134	0	8	.63	1.095
Section of state the officer works	134	1	3	2.10	.892
What type of community officer serves	134	0	3	1.69	.797
Officers sex	134	0	2	1.10	.393
Officers race or ethnicity	134	0	7	1.51	1.444
Officers age	134	0	5	2.93	1.272
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

Note: SRO = school resource officer.

The statistical data of these demographic factors, apart from officer's race, sex, or ethnicity, served as the independent variables in the regression models in the different research questions. The focus of this study was the correlations between SROs and non-SROs and the arrest of juveniles. The type of community and section of state were useful data, but overall did not produce any statistical significance in the regression models. Based on the variables involved, a reasonable representation of all population demographics were captured in this study, thereby strengthening external validity.

Descriptive Statistics for Arrest Decision-Making Variables

Forty-three variables were disaggregated from Wolf's (2012) survey questions for arrest decision-making analysis. Each variable was measured using a Likert scale that measured the intensity of the participant's response. The justification of using a Likert scale in this study was that, although Likert scales might not describe exact difference in the intervals between choices, prior researchers have applied data analysis tests of

parametric and nonparametric categorical level variables with success (Warner, 2014). In many of these types of studies, the shape of the distribution of scores is the most important feature. Data that are normally distributed are amenable to data analysis procedures, particularly in the case of Likert scales. The following sections contain results for select survey questions based on their support of the research questions.

Survey Question 2

Survey Question 2: For the following factors, please indicate how important each factor is to your decision of whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior. Please respond using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating *Not important at all* and 5 indicating *Extremely Important*. Table 2 displays these data.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Question 2 Factors Affecting Arrest Decisions in School

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Quality of rules and regulations	134	3	5	4.78	.465
Nature of misbehavior	134	0	5	4.45	.914
Victim impact	134	0	5	4.15	1.121
Student attitude	134	0	5	3.72	1.133
Students history of misbehavior	134	0	5	3.64	1.210
Students' academic record	134	1	5	1.94	1.116
Expectations of continued misbehavior	134	0	5	3.44	1.329
Wishes of administrators	134	0	5	2.28	1.186
Wishes of teachers	134	0	5	1.92	1.090
Wishes of victims parents	134	0	5	3.13	1.368
Ensuring punishment	134	0	5	2.93	1.380
Consequences of being involved in juvenile justice system	134	0	5	2.62	1.243
Quality of evidence against student	134	0	5	4.25	1.484
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

The descriptive statistics listed as factors regarding arrest decision-making in school provide partial support for Black's (1971) theory, the theoretical framework of this study. The impact of a crime on the victim and the victim's wishes were strongly related with a mean of $M = 3.13$. For comparison the wishes of teachers mean was significantly lower in the minds of law enforcement officers with $M = 1.92$. This supports one of the components of Black's theory, the wishes of the victim. A second factor that lends support for Black's theory is the quality of the evidence against a student. In the case of Tennessee law enforcement officers, this factor had a mean of $M = 4.25$ of 5. This factor was the third highest determinant of whether an officer was inclined to make an arrest of a student in a school setting. A third factor that supported Black's theory was the nature of the offense. In the descriptive statistics, this factor had the second highest mean of $M = 4.45$ of 5. This finding provided strong support for Black's theory that the nature of the offense was a determining factor in arrest decision-making.

Survey Question 4

Survey Question 4: The following questions ask about your previous experiences with students who have misbehaved. For the following scenarios, please indicate how often each has occurred in the past by choosing *This has never occurred*, *This has rarely occurred*, or *This has frequently occurred*. Table 3 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Respondent Previous Experience With Arrests

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
I have arrested because only way to calm student down.	134	0	3	1.78	.801
I have arrested to show student there are consequences.	134	0	3	1.72	.732
I have arrested because teacher wanted student arrested.	134	0	3	1.14	.445
I have arrested to stop group of students from disrupting class.	134	0	3	1.40	.673
I have not arrested because student had never been in trouble before.	134	0	3	1.73	.777
I have not arrested because student cooperated.	134	0	3	1.87	.799
I have not arrested because students promised to stop misbehaving.	134	0	3	1.31	.581
I have not arrested because a group of students fighting stopped.	134	0	3	1.39	.813
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

The descriptive statistics related to the factors of previous experience with arrest also provided support for Black's (1971) theory from a perspective of past benchmarks of performance. The highest mean score in this category was the cooperation of the student being a determinant of what kept the officer from making an arrest. This aligned with Black's label of suspect demeanor. Two factors related to suspect demeanor: student cooperation and the need to make an arrest to calm down a student. In the case of student cooperation, the mean was $M = 1.87$, the highest in this category, ahead of the second factor at $M = 1.78$.

Survey Question 5

Survey Question 5: For the following statements about the juvenile justice system and school discipline, please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement, with

1 indicating *Strongly disagree* and 5 indicating *Strongly agree*. Table 4 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Juvenile Justice and School Discipline

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Juvenile justice system deters future misbehavior of individual student.	134	0	5	2.23	1.082
Witnessing student arrested deters other student misbehavior.	134	0	5	3.08	1.292
JJS services provided can prevent future problems.	134	0	5	2.42	1.210
Arresting students preserves order in school.	134	0	5	3.15	1.306
Arresting students allows other students to learn.	134	0	5	3.28	1.380
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

One of the most notable findings in the descriptive statistics of juvenile justice and school discipline involved the belief that the juvenile justice system works as a utilitarian remedy to allow other students to learn by intervening legally in school misbehavior. The participants ranked this factor the highest of all choice factors with a mean of $M = 3.28$. The second highest factor was order maintenance with a mean of $M = 3.15$. General deterrence rather than specific deterrence was indicated as a motivating factor in arrest decision-making with a mean of $M = 3.08$ as compared to $M = 2.23$.

Survey Question 6

Survey Question 6 was What effect does involvement in the juvenile justice system have on misbehaving students? This question was disaggregated into six options, also a Likert scale measurement of attitudes. Options 1–5 were coded 1–5, while the

selection for *I don't know* was coded 0. Table 5 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Respondent Attitudes About Juvenile Justice System

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Juvenile justice system deters future misbehavior of individual student.	134	0	5	2.23	1.082
JJS services provided can prevent future problems.	134	0	5	2.42	1.210
Level of harm to students by being involved in juvenile justice system.	134	0	5	2.19	1.754
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

Respondent attitudes about the juvenile justice system revealed an almost normal distribution of answers, all scores of which were close. This suggests that law enforcement officers do not have a consensus belief on the level of impact upon students by being introduced to the juvenile justice system. These scores indicate that the level of harm is more of an afterthought, if a consideration at all.

Survey Question 7

Survey Question 7: Is the arrest decision-making process different when you are in school than when you are on the street? This question was coded as *Yes*, *No*, or *I don't know*. *Yes* was coded 1, *No* was coded 2, and *I don't know* was coded 0. Table 6 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Decision-making in School Versus on the Street

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Is arrest decision different in school versus outside school.	134	0	2	1.41	.651
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

The responses suggested that participants believed that there is less of a difference between the arrest decision-making in school versus on the street than one might intuitively suspect. In this case, the mean of $M = 1.41$ was closer to 1 than 2. Nevertheless, this score indicates that the respondents acknowledged a difference overall but were split almost evenly.

Survey Question 9

Survey Question 9: When you have strong evidence that a student has committed an arrestable offense in school, how often do you arrest the student? This question was the most important in predicting and analysis of officer arrest inclination. Seven responses were listed with interval–ratio level responses ranging from 0–100%. Table 7 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Arresting Students for Offenses in School

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?	134	0	6	1.88	1.332
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

Survey Question 12

Survey Question 12: For the following training types, please indicate the extent to

which each has been helpful to your arrest decision making when you are in the school setting. Please indicate the extent to which the training type has been helpful using a scale of 1–5, with 1 being *Not helpful at all*, and 5 being *Extremely helpful*. Table 8 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Training for Arrest Decision-making in School Settings

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Inside school setting, formal training (e.g., academy classes, in-service)	134	0	6	3.27	1.618
Inside school setting, informal "on-the-job" training	134	0	6	3.84	1.598
Inside school setting, information/training from the attorney general's office	134	0	6	2.80	1.851
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

The descriptive statistics in this category suggest that experience carried more weight than training, where arrest decision making is concerned. The mean of $M = 3.84$ compared to the mean of $M = 3.27$ suggests that a possible training gap exists to assist officers in reducing the learning curve that experience provides when evaluating all the possible factors that relate to in-school arrest decision making.

Survey Question 13

Survey Question 13: For the following training types, please indicate the extent to which each has been helpful to your arrest decision making when you are NOT in the school setting. Please indicate the extent to which the training type has been helpful using a scale of 1–5, with 1 being *Not helpful at all*, and 5 being *Extremely helpful*. Table 9 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Training for Arrest Decision-Making Outside of School Settings

Descriptive statistic	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Outside school setting, formal training (e.g., academy classes, in-service)	134	0	6	3.83	1.464
Outside school setting, informal "on-the-job" training	134	0	6	4.17	1.505
Outside school setting, information/training from the attorney general's office	134	0	6	3.19	1.792
Valid *n* (listwise)	134				

The participant responses in the area suggest that law enforcement officers have a smaller gap between training and informal on-the-job experience in an out of school setting. In the category of training for in-school arrest decision making a .57 difference existed as compared to a .34 difference in the out of school arrest decision-making factor. From the comparison, a gap exists, and is possibly one that more evidence-based data can fill.

Survey Question 14

Survey Question 14: In the past, when deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, have you sought guidance from any of the following? Six responses were available to respondents to choose for guidance among these were; school administrators, superior officers, SROs, teachers, probation officers, and the Office of the Attorneys General. Table 10 displays participant responses for these variables.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Seeking Guidance When Deciding to Arrest a Student

Statistic		Supervisor guidance	SRO guidance	Teacher guidance	Administrator guidance
N	Valid	134	134	134	134
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		.8507	.7313	.2015	.4104
Median		1.0000	1.0000	.0000	.0000
Std. Deviation		.35768	.44492	.40262	.49376
Variance		.128	.198	.162	.244
Range		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Interestingly, in the case of this category, SROs are a highly rated resource, second only to the direction of their supervising officers. Administrator guidance was nearly at the midpoint of the scale and teacher guidance at less than 25% of supervisor or SRO guidance. This information suggests that SROs have a value-added dimension because of the nature of their specialization.

Data Analysis and Results

Pearson's correlation coefficient and bivariate and multiple linear regression analyses were performed to test hypotheses and answer the research questions. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS for Windows with a two-sided 5% alpha level. A *p* value of less than .05 was established to support rejecting the null hypotheses

Research Question 1

The overarching research question was "What, if any, relationship exists among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision making involving middle school and high school students?" and Research Question 1 was "Does a significant relationship exist between

the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students?" To answer Research Question 1, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$1: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

H_a1: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

A bivariate linear regression was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and whether the officer was an SRO to assess whether a relationship existed. Additionally, symmetric measures of strength of relationship were examined. The categorical variable of whether an officer was an SRO was recoded into a dummy variable to perform regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. The choice of coding as a scale level variable was necessary to perform bivariate linear regression analysis and the choice is supported by prior use among researchers (Warner, 2014) to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed between the variables. The variable frequency of arrest contained seven different choices, which were coded as follows:

1 = 100% of the time

2 = 80% of the time

3 = 60% of the time

4 = 40% of the time

5 = 20% of the time

6 = Never

0 = I don't know

Once the regression analysis was completed the scores on the correlation coefficient were contrasted with the scores coded above. In this circumstance, an increase in the score would indicate a reduction in the likelihood of an officer making an arrest. To test this hypothesis, a bivariate regression was performed to evaluate how well arrest could be predicted from whether the law enforcement officer was an SRO. Preliminary data screening indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated that the relation between X and Y were separate because dummy variables were created. The correlation between frequency of arrest and whether the officer was an SRO was statistically significant, r (.302) = 13.238, $p < .001$. The regression equation for predicting arrest frequency was found to be $Y' = 1.571 + .829 \times X$. The r^2 for this equation was .084; that is, 8.4% of the variance in arrest frequency was predictable from the officer's role as an SRO. This is a weak positive relationship; which predicts that SROs are less likely to arrest students than non-SROs. Table 11 displays the model summary, Table 12 displays the ANOVA results and Table 13 displays the correlation coefficients of the bivariate regression analyses.

Table 11

Model Summary for Research Question 1

					Change statistics					
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.302[a]	.091	.084	1.275	.091	13.238	1	132	.000	1.724

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Predictors: (Constant), is SRO. b. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 12

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 1

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21.518	1	21.518	13.238	.000[b]
	Residual	214.571	132	1.626		
	Total	236.090	133			

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? b. Predictors: (Constant), is SRO.

Table 13

Coefficients for Research Question 1

		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			Collinearity statistics	
Model		B	Std. error	Beta	T	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.571	.139		11.296	.000		
	Is SRO	.829	.228	.302	3.638	.000	1.000	1.000

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

A test of directional and symmetric measures of nominal X nominal factors also showed a statistically significant relationship between the factors of "Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?" and officer is an SRO or non-SRO dependent. In this circumstance the Cramer's *V* coefficient revealed a strong relationship between the variables, $V = .395$. This analysis revealed that, in this instance, a strong relationship

exists between the frequency of arrests and the role of the officer. Table 14 displays the relationship between the variables and Table 15 displays the results of the Cramer's *V* coefficient.

Table 14

Directional Measures for Research Question 1

Directional measure			Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.048	.031	1.513	.130
		Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
		Officer is an SRO or non-SRO dependent	.120	.075	1.513	.130
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.030	.015		.000[d]
		Officer is an SRO or non-SRO dependent	.156	.046		.002[d]

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero. d. From chi-square approximation.

Table 15

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 1

Symmetric measure		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Phi	.395	.002
	Cramer's V	.395	.002
	Contingency coefficient	.367	.002
N of valid cases		134	

From the results of these statistical tests, the null hypothesis—a significant relationship will not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students—is rejected in favor of the alternate

hypothesis—a significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

Research Question 2

Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience? To answer Research Question 2, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$2: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience.

H_a2: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience.

A bivariate linear regression was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and whether the officer was an SRO to assess whether a relationship existed. Additionally, symmetric measures of strength of relationship were examined. The ratio level variable of officer number of years of law enforcement experience was chosen to perform regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. To test this hypothesis, a bivariate regression was performed to evaluate how well arrest could be predicted by the law enforcement officer's years of experience. Preliminary data screening indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated no linear relationship between the variables. The correlation between frequency of arrest and the number of law

enforcement officers' years of experience was not statistically significant, r (.007) = 0.006, $p > .05$. Table 16 displays the model summary, Table 17 displays the results of the ANOVA, and Table 18 the correlation coefficients of this test.

Table 16

Model Summary for Research Question 2

					Change statistics					
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.007[a]	.000	–.008	1.337	.000	.006	1	132	.938	1.653

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), Total years of experience as a law enforcement officer. b. Dependent Variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 17

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 2

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.011	1	.011	.006	.938[b]
	Residual	236.079	132	1.788		
	Total	236.090	133			

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?
b. Predictors: (Constant), Total years of experience as a law enforcement officer.

Table 18

Coefficients for Research Question 2

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			95.0% confidence interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(constant)	1.865	.230		8.091	.000	1.409	2.321					
	Total years of experience as a law enforce-ment officer	.005	.061	.007	.078	.938	–.116	.125	.007	.007	.007	1.000	1.000

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

The test of directional and symmetric factors did not show a statistically significant relationship between the factors of based on evidence, how often do you arrest, and total years of experience as a law enforcement officer. Table 19 displays the directional measure of the relationship between the variables and Table 20 displays the symmetric measures between the two variables.

Table 19

Directional Measures for Research Question 2

Directional measure			Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.083	.048	1.684	.092
		Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? Dependent	.027	.056	.472	.637
		Total years of experience as a law enforcement officer dependent	.123	.062	1.882	.060
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? Dependent	.072	.024		.056[c]
		Total years of experience as a law enforcement officer dependent	.056	.015		.137[c]

Note. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. From chi-square approximation.

Table 20

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 2

Symmetric measure		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Phi	.602	.225
	Cramer's V	.246	.225
	Contingency coefficient	.516	.225
N of valid cases		134	

From the results of these statistical tests, the researcher chose not to reject the null hypothesis for Research Question 2. In this circumstance, the null hypothesis—a significant relationship will not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-

SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience—is supported as opposed to the alternate hypothesis—a significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience.

Research Question 3

Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment? To answer Research Question 3, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$3: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

H_a3: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

A bivariate linear regression was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and whether the officer had previously served in an SRO assignment to assess whether a relationship existed. Additionally, symmetric measures of strength of relationship were examined. The categorical variable of whether the office had prior service as an SRO was recoded into a dummy variable to perform regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. Preliminary data screening

indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated that the relation between X and Y were separate because dummy variables were created. The correlation between frequency of arrest and whether the officer had previously served in an SRO assignment was not statistically significant, r (.029) = .114, $p > .05$. Table 21 displays the model summary, Table 22 displays the ANOVA results and Table 23 the correlation coefficients of the bivariate regression analyses.

Table 21

Model Summary for Research Question 3

					Change statistics					
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.029[a]	.001	–.007	1.337	.001	.114	1	132	.736	1.659

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Predictors: (Constant), Prior SRO. b. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 22

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 3

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.204	1	.204	.114	.736[b]
	Residual	235.885	132	1.787		
	Total	236.090	133			

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? b. Predictors: (Constant), Prior SRO.

Table 23

Coefficients for Research Question 3

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			95.0% confidence interval for B		Collinearity statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(constant)	1.890	.119		15.931	.000	1.655	2.124		
	Prior SRO	–.175	.519	–.029	–.338	.736	–1.202	.851	1.000	1.000

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

The test of directional and symmetric measures of nominal X nominal factors, in contrast to the bivariate regression model, showed a statistically significant relationship between the factors of based on evidence, how often do you arrest, and prior SRO service. In this circumstance the Cramer's *V* coefficient revealed a moderate relationship between the variables, $V = .281$. This analysis revealed that, in this instance, a moderate relationship exists between the frequency of arrests and prior service as an SRO. Table 24 displays the relationship in the directional measures between the two variables. Table 25 displays the symmetric measures with the significant Cramer's *V* coefficient.

Table 24

Directional Measures for Research Question 3

Directional measure			Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.125	.054	2.190	.029
		Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
		Previous experience as an SRO dependent	.261	.104	2.190	.029
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.031	.016		.016[d]
		Previous experience as an SRO dependent	.127	.041		.001[d]

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero. d. From chi-square approximation.

Table 25

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 3

Symmetric measure		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.398	.047
	Cramer''s V	.281	.047
	Contingency coefficient	.370	.047
N of Valid Cases		134	

From the results of these statistical tests, the evidence to support the rejection of the null hypothesis for Research Question 3 is mixed. The researcher chose to reject the null hypothesis in this circumstance because both variables had been manipulated from a categorical and ordinal level to interval level by the creation of dummy variables. Additionally, the directional and symmetric measures in this circumstance are intuitively more closely related to Research Question 1 and Research Question 4; therefore, those outcomes lend support to rejecting the null hypothesis in the case of Research Question 3.

Therefore, in this circumstance, the null hypothesis—a significant relationship will not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment—is rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis—a significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 4

Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment? To answer Research Question 4, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$4: No significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

H_a4: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

The interval level variable of length of service as an SRO was selected to perform regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. Preliminary data screening indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated that the relation between X and Y revealed a minor level of linearity. The correlation between frequency

of arrest and the length of prior service as an SRO was statistically significant, r (.191) = 4.993, $p < .05$. The regression equation for predicting arrest frequency was found to be $Y' = 1.735 + .232 \times X$. The r^2 for this equation was .036, indicating that 3.6% of the variance in arrest frequency was predictable from the officer's length of service as an SRO. The Table 26 displays the model summary, Table 27 displays the ANOVA results and Table 28 the correlation coefficients of the bivariate regression analyses.

Table 26

Model Summary for Research Question 4

					Change statistics					
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.191[a]	.036	.029	1.313	.036	4.993	1	132	.027	1.653

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), Length of service in SRO assignment. b. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 27

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 4

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.605	1	8.605	4.993	.027[b]
	Residual	227.484	132	1.723		
	Total	236.090	133			

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? b. Predictors: (Constant), Length of service in SRO assignment.

Table 28

Coefficients for Research Question 4

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients[a]			95.0% confidence interval for B		Collinearity statistics	
		B	Std. error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(constant)	1.735	.131		13.263	.000	1.476	1.994		
	Length of service in SRO assignment	.232	.104	.191	2.235	.027	.027	.438	1.000	1.000

Note. SRO = school resource officer. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

The test of directional and symmetric measures of the factors showed a statistically significant relationship between the factors of "Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?" and length of SRO service. In this circumstance the Cramer's *V* coefficient revealed a moderate relationship between the variables, $V = .286$. This analysis revealed that, in this instance, a moderate relationship existed between the length of service in an SRO assignment and the likelihood of arresting students. Table 29 displays the directional measures of the both variables. Table 30 displays the symmetric measures of both variables, including the Cramer's *V* coefficient.

Table 29

Directional Measures for Research Question 4

Directional measure		Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by Lambda nominal	Symmetric	.048	.026	1.752	.080
	Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.000	.019	.000	1.000
	Length of service in SRO assignment dependent	.118	.058	1.923	.054
Goodman and	Based on evidence, how	.060	.016		.020[c]

Directional measure		Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Kruskal tau	often do you arrest? dependent				
	Length of service in SRO assignment dependent	.159	.035		.000[c]

Note. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. From chi-square approximation.

Table 30

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 4

Symmetric measure		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.639	.004
	Cramer's V	.286	.004
	Contingency Coefficient	.539	.004
N of Valid Cases		134	

From the results of these statistical tests, the null hypothesis—no significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment—is rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis—a significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 5

Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural)? To answer Research Question 5, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$5: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

H_a5: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

To answer Research Question 5 a multiple regression test was performed on the

variable of frequency of arrest and the type of community the officer serves. Additionally, directional and symmetric measures of both variables' relationships were examined. The categorical variable of community served was converted into three dummy variables of urban, suburban, and rural community for multiple regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. Preliminary data screening indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated that the relation between X and Y were separate because dummy variables were created. The correlation between frequency of arrest and the community the officer served was not statistically significant, r (.067) = .291, p > .001. Table 31 displays the model summary, Table 32 displays the ANOVA results and Table 33 the correlation coefficients of the bivariate regression analyses.

Table 31

Model Summary for Research Question 5

					Change statistics				
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.067[a]	.004	–.011	1.290	.004	.291	2	129	.748	1.702

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), rural, suburban. b. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 32

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 5

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.969	2	.485	.291	.748[b]
	Residual	214.576	129	1.663		
	Total	215.545	131			

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? b. Predictors: (Constant), rural, suburban.

Table 33

Coefficients for Research Question 5

		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			95.0% confidence interval for B		Collinearity statistics	
Model		B	Std. error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(constant)	1.905	.162		11.722	.000	1.583	2.226		
	Suburban	–.161	.255	–.059	–.629	.530	–.665	.344	.881	1.134
	Rural	.057	.301	.018	.189	.851	–.538	.652	.881	1.134

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

The test of directional and symmetric measures did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between the factors of "Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?" and urban, suburban, or rural communities the officer served. Table 34 displays the output for the tested symmetric measures.

Table 34

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 5

Symmetric measure		Value	Asymptotic standard error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Phi	.358			.142
	Cramer's V	.253			.142
	Contingency coefficient	.337			.142
Interval by interval	Pearson's R	–.129	.077	–1.499	.136[c]
Ordinal by ordinal	Spearman correlation	–.162	.082	–1.882	.062[c]
N of valid cases		134			

Note. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. From normal approximation.

These results did not allow the researcher was to reject the null hypothesis—no significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

Research Question 6

Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (e.g., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee)? To answer Research Question 6, the following hypotheses were formulated:

$H_0$6: A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (i.e., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee).

H_a6: A significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (eastern, middle,

or western Tennessee).

To answer Research Question 6 a multiple regression test was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and the section of the state the officer serves (eastern, middle, or western Tennessee). Additionally, directional and symmetric measures were analyzed. The categorical variable of section of state the officer served was converted into three dummy variables of eastern, middle, and western Tennessee for multiple regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. Preliminary data screening indicated that the scores on arrest frequency were reasonably normally distributed. A scatter plot indicated that the relation between X and Y were separate because dummy variables were created. The correlation between frequency of arrest and the section of the state the officer served was not statistically significant, r (.145) = 1.414, p > .001. Table 35 displays the model summary, Table 36 displays the ANOVA results and Table 37 the correlation coefficients of the multiple regression analyses.

Table 35

Model Summary for Research Question 6

					Change statistics					
Model[b]	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	R square change	F change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.145[a]	.021	.006	1.328	.021	1.414	2	131	.247	1.711

Note. a. Predictors: (Constant), western, middle. b. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

Table 36

ANOVA[a] for Research Question 6

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.989	2	2.495	1.414	.247[b]
	Residual	231.100	131	1.764		
	Total	236.090	133			

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?
b. Predictors: (Constant), western, middle.

Table 37

Coefficients for Research Question 6

		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients[a]			95.0% confidence interval for B		Collinearity statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(constant)	2.043	.194		10.543	.000	1.659	2.426		
	Middle	.032	.321	.010	.098	.922	–.603	.666	.795	1.257
	Western	–.376	.259	–.141	–1.453	.149	–.888	.136	.795	1.257

Note. a. Dependent variable: Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?

The test of directional and symmetric measures did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between the factors of based on evidence, how often do you arrest, and the section of the state an officer served. Table 38 displays the directional measures between the variables and Table 39 displays the symmetric measures between the two variables.

Table 38

Directional Measures for Research Question 6

Directional measure			Value	Asymptotic standardized error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.027	.055	.478	.632
		Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]
		Section of state the officer works dependent	.054	.110	.478	.632
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Based on evidence, how often do you arrest? dependent	.016	.010		.364[d]
		Section of state the officer works dependent	.057	.024		.232[d]

Note. a. Not assuming the null hypothesis. b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis. c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero. d. Based on chi-square approximation.

Table 39

Symmetric Measures for Research Question 6

Symmetric measure		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by nominal	Phi	.358	.142
	Cramer's V	.253	.142
	Contingency coefficient	.337	.142
N of valid cases		134	

These results did not allow the researcher to reject the null hypothesis—No significant relationship will exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (i.e., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee).

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the harm to students arrested in schools.

The review of the current literature suggested that SROs are a contributing agent to this problem. A total of 134 municipal and county law enforcement officers throughout all three divisions of Tennessee took part as participants in the data collection survey for this study. Participants received an e-mail invitation to participate in the study. Descriptive statistics of participant demographic data and responses to individual questions were disaggregated and arranged at the beginning of this chapter.

All six of the research questions were individually listed with the null and alternate hypotheses, and with the data analysis techniques to fail to reject or to reject the null hypotheses. Two different data analysis techniques were used in this study, bivariate and multiple regression. The results of the data analysis reveal mixed results for the overall model of law enforcement and juvenile arrest inclination. These results will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 includes an interpretation of the research findings, recommendations for law enforcement practitioners, implications for social change, suggestions for future research, recommendations for action, and limitations of this research study. Chapter 5 also includes a discussion on how the findings from the current study align or diverge from findings of prior research studies in the literature review.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Overview

This study was conducted because research has indicated the harm to students arrested in schools (Nance, 2016) and the SRO presence might contribute to these harms (Monterastelli, 2017). Therefore, I evaluated decision-making processes of SROs and non-SROs and measured the arrest inclinations of both groups with regard to how this might lead to a school-to-prison pipeline. The overarching research question was "Does a relationship exist among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision making involving middle school and high school students?" The independent variables in this study were law enforcement officers who were an SRO or non-SRO, years of total law enforcement experience, years of assignment as an SRO, prior SRO experience, section of the state the respondent serves (eastern, middle, or western), and the type of community the officer serves (urban, suburban, or rural). The dependent variable is the arrest likelihood of middle school and high school students, allowing inferences about the level and likelihood of harm to juveniles. This sample of the SRO and non-SRO population might then be generalizable to larger groups of SROs and non-SRO law enforcement officers.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the research study, which includes the (a) interpretation of significant findings, (b) limitations, (c) recommendations for future research, (d) recommendations for criminal justice practitioners, (e) implications for social change, and (f) conclusions.

Interpretation of Findings

Participants of the study included municipal and county law enforcement officers (n = 134) from Tennessee. The average (and standard deviation) number of years of experience as a law enforcement officer was 15.5 (9.1) and the range was 0–45. The number of non-SROs surveyed was 86 (36%) the number of SROs surveyed was 48 (36%). The 48 (36%) officers who currently serve as SROs reported on average a mean 5.4 years of service in schools. Six officers (5%) who are not currently SROs reported prior service in an SRO assignment. The average age of the officers surveyed was 43 years.

The geographical location of Tennessee officers was disaggregated with 45 (34%) working in the East Tennessee Grand Division, 27 (20%) working in the Middle Tennessee Grand Division, and 62 (46%) working in the West Tennessee Grand Division. Sixty-four (48%) of participants reported that they worked in an urban area, 43 (33%) participants stated that they worked in a suburban community, and 25 (19%) participants reported that they work in a rural community. One hundred twelve (84%) of participants reported being male, 18 (13%) reported being female, and four (3%) preferred not to answer the question. One hundred three respondents reported their race to be White non-Hispanic (77%), 13 (10%) participants reported being Black or African American, two (2%) participants reported being White–Hispanic, two (2%) participants reported being Asian American, and one (1%) participant reported being Native American. All the other participants reported being *Other* or did not wish to answer the

question.

Descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables were performed. Forty-three variables were disaggregated from Wolf's (2012) survey questions for arrest decision-making analysis. Each variable was measured using a Likert scale that measured the intensity of the participant's response. Pearson's correlation coefficient and bivariate and multiple linear regression analyses were performed to test hypotheses and answer the research questions. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS for Windows with a two-sided 5% alpha level. A *p* value of less than .05 was established to support rejecting the null hypotheses. This section provides an interpretation of the findings presented in Chapter 4.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students?" The null hypothesis was "A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures.

According to the results of the data analysis, a statistically significant, weak correlation existed between the evidence-based arrest frequency and the officer being an SRO or a non-SRO. The correlation between frequency of arrest and if the officer was an SRO was statistically significant, r (.302) = 13.238, $p < .05$. The r^2 for this equation was

.084; that is, 8.4% of the variance in arrest frequency was predictable from the officer's role as an SRO. From these findings, the null hypothesis was rejected, meaning a significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs in relation to middle school and high school students.

Research Question 2

Research Question2 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience?" The null hypothesis was *"*A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures. A bivariate regression using dummy-coded variables was also conducted to test the hypothesis. The correlation between frequency of arrest and the number of law enforcement officers' years of experience was not statistically significant, r (.007) = 0.006, $p > .05$. Additionally, the test of directional and symmetric factors did not show a statistically significant relationship between evidence-based arrest frequency and total years of experience as a law enforcement officer. From the results of these statistical tests, I did not to reject the null hypothesis for this research question, meaning a significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of law enforcement experience.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment?" The null hypothesis was "A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures. A bivariate regression using dummy-coded variables was also conducted to test the hypothesis. The correlation between frequency of arrest and whether the officer had previously served in an SRO assignment was not statistically significant, r (.029) = .114, $p > .05$. The test of directional and symmetric measures of nominal X nominal factors, in contrast to the bivariate regression model, showed a statistically significant relationship between evidence-based arrest frequency and prior SRO service. In this circumstance the Cramer's V coefficient revealed a moderate relationship between the variables, $V = .281$. This analysis revealed that a moderate relationship existed between the frequency of arrests and prior service as an SRO.

From the results of these statistical tests, the evidence to support the rejection of the null hypothesis for this question is mixed; therefore, I rejected the null hypothesis because both variables had been manipulated from a categorical and ordinal level to interval level by the creation of dummy variables. Additionally, the directional and symmetric measures in this circumstance are more related to Research Question 1 and

Research Question 4; therefore, these outcomes support rejecting the null hypothesis for Research Question 3, meaning a significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their earlier law enforcement service in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment?" The null hypothesis was "A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures. The interval level variable of length of service as an SRO or not was selected to perform regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations. The correlation between frequency of arrest and the length of prior service as an SRO was statistically significant, r (.191) = 4.993, $p < .05$. The r^2 for this equation was .036, indicating that 3.6% of the variance in arrest frequency was predictable from the officer's length of service as an SRO.

The test of directional and symmetric measures of the factors showed a statistically significant relationship between arrest frequency and length of SRO service. In this circumstance the Cramer's *V* coefficient revealed a moderate relationship between

the variables, $V = .286$. This analysis revealed that a moderate relationship existed between the length of service in an SRO assignment and the reduced likelihood of arresting students. From the results of these statistical tests, the null hypothesis was rejected, meaning that a significant relationship does exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on their number of years of experience in an SRO assignment.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural)?" The null hypothesis was "A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural)." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures. To answer this question a multiple regression test was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and the section of the state the officer serves (eastern, middle, or western Tennessee). Additionally, directional and symmetric measures were analyzed. The categorical variable of section of state the officer served was converted into three dummy variables of eastern, middle, and western Tennessee for multiple regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations.

The correlation between frequency of arrest and the community the officer served was not statistically significant, r (.067) = .291, $p > .05$. The test of directional and symmetric measures did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between frequency of arrest and the type of community the officer served. These results did not allow me to reject the null hypothesis, meaning no significant relationship exists between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the community in which they serve (e.g., urban, suburban, or rural).

Research Question 6

Research Question 6 was "Does a significant relationship exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (e.g., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee)?" The null hypothesis was "A significant relationship does not exist between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (i.e., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee)." This hypothesis was tested using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis and using directional and symmetric measures.

To answer this question a multiple regression test was performed on the variable of frequency of arrest and the section of the state the officer serves (eastern, middle, or western Tennessee). Additionally, directional and symmetric measures were analyzed. The categorical variable of section of state the officer served was converted into three dummy variables of eastern, middle, and western Tennessee for multiple regression analysis. The variable of evidence-based arrest frequency was used as the dependent

variable. This variable was coded as a scale-level variable for use in quantitative operations.

The correlation between frequency of arrest and the section of the state the officer served was not statistically significant, r (.145) = 1.414, $p > .05$. The test of directional and symmetric measures did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between arrest frequency and the section of the state in which an officer served. These results did not allow me to reject the null hypothesis, meaning there is no significant relationship between the arrest inclinations of SROs and non-SROs, depending on the section of the state in which they serve (i.e., eastern, middle, or western Tennessee).

Black's General Theory of Arrest

Black's (1971) general theory of arrest was the theoretical framework for this study. It is useful to revisit how the results of this study can support the theory. According to Black (as cited in Wolf, 2012, 2014), five factors are present that relate to arrest decision-making, including the amount of evidence, seriousness of the offense, the wishes of victims, suspect demeanor, and the relationship between victim and suspect. As part of the theory, police discretion serves as a filter in how the arrest decision-making process occurs. The findings of this study are generalizable and might strengthen those of Wolf, adding another layer to current SRO knowledge. Additionally, by carrying out a similar study in a southern state and including non-SROs, broader inferences may be made on a national level as opposed to one area of the northeastern United States.

When considering the elements of Black's (1971) theory with the responses in

this study, the mean scores in each of the factor categories displayed in Chapter 4 supported four of the five factors that relate to arrest decision-making, including the amount of evidence, seriousness of the offense, the wishes of victims, suspect demeanor, and the relationship between victim and suspect. A summary of each factor follows:

1. Amount of evidence: This factor had a mean score of $M = 4.25$ of 5. Question 9 was the predicate question around which measurement responses of overall arrest inclination was used. As referenced in the six research questions, this factor was central to all correlations discovered in the data analysis tests.
2. Seriousness of the offense: This factor had mean score of $M = 4.45$ of 5.
3. The wishes of victims: This factor had a mean score of $M = 3.13$ of 5. For comparison, the factor of wishes of administrators had a mean of $M = 2.28$ and wishes of teachers had a mean of 1.92. This suggests that the wishes of crime victims are given considerably more weight in the arrest decision-making process than administrators or teachers.
4. Suspect demeanor: This factor had a mean score of $M = 3.72$ of 5. This factor ranked 6th of 13, placing it in the top 50% of factors relating to arrest decision making. As additional support for this factor the choice factor of not arresting because the student cooperated, received the highest mean score of $M = 1.87$ of 3.
5. The relationship between victim and suspect: This factor was not specifically addressed beyond the wishes of the victim.

Limitations of the Study

This researcher's study had several limitations. The correlational design itself was the first limitation because of the inability to establish causation. Several relationships were found to exist in the research questions examined, but future researchers might benefit by changing or modifying the research design. The second limitation of the study was the use of an Internet survey that increased the risk of participants not answering all the questions in an accurate manner. It also precluded the researcher from asking probing questions to gain additional information from participants. The third limitation was the use of a convenience sampling method, in which participants were self-selected. Despite this threat to external validity the use of this method provided a wide cross-section of law enforcement officers from small, medium, and large police departments, throughout each grand division of Tennessee, adding previously unknown knowledge in an area of law enforcement that has a dearth of information at present.

As the fourth limitation, content validity limitations were certainly present in this study. Content validity is used to analyze the different dimensions of a construct and whether test items represent all possibilities (Warner, 2014). This type of validity is concerned with whether test items represent all theoretical dimensions or content areas. A high number of responses indicating confusion about a question might indicate that some dimensions might have not been adequately described.

As a fifth limitation, construct validity (i.e., did the data collection instrument measure what it was designed to measure) limited this study because of design of the data

collection instrument. Although it was acceptable for this study, future researchers in this area might wish to develop a new, validated instrument that would be designed for both SROs and non-SROs. However, the tradeoff was necessary to capture the attitudes measured in the current data collection instrument and how officers who do not work in schools react as a matter of course when responding to school incidents. Nevertheless, several correlations of predictors (e.g., prior experience as an SRO, and the length of service in an SRO assignment) suggest that coefficients in those factors were concurrent, thereby lessening validity threats.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current study contributes not only to the knowledge of SRO arrest inclinations toward students, but to the topic of juvenile arrests and a school-to-prison pipeline. The researcher's first recommendation for a future study is that it be replicated in different states to compare the findings in those states with this researcher's findings conducted in Tennessee. A larger response pool than the population used in this study (n = 134) should be sought in each case to reach the maximum statistical power. Additionally, with a larger response pool, other statistical tests (e.g., logistical regression) should be conducted because they were used in this researcher's study.

The researcher's second recommendation for a future study is that the researchers who conduct it should narrow the focus of the target population. In this researcher's study, all the sworn, county and municipal, law enforcement officers were permitted to participate. Depending upon the agency or the rank structure of the population to be

studied, undue responses from superior law enforcement officers could have affected the generalizability to regular echelons of officers.

The researchers third and final recommendation for a future study is to include the stratification of survey respondents or matching respondents as closely as possible to assess differences across SROs and non-SROs. The demographic response in this researcher's survey was heavily skewed toward White male participants who dominate law enforcement; however, stratifying the samples to include other demographic groups might collect insights that are otherwise overlooked at present.

Recommendations for Law Enforcement Policymakers

This study is relevant to the public policy and administration field according to the necessity of limiting youth involvement in the juvenile justice system wherever possible. Different stakeholders whom are this research affects include school administrators, law enforcement executives, and elected officials. Strategies from evidence-based research that the researcher has proposed in this study, aid in mitigating or not increasing juvenile arrests. These strategies are area of significance that is now overlooked will have a baseline of research that can provide policymakers with the developing of guidance about law enforcement operations and practices.

Several questions in the data collection instrument for this study reference training and guidance in the arrest decision-making process. It would be worth the time to consider the responses of the participants in deciding where training needs might exist. Training is an expense; therefore, it is incumbent upon law enforcement decision-makers

to allocate training resources to areas that are deficient or that potentially pose future threats from a risk management perspective. The responses of the participants relative to arrest decision making are worth the time and effort to report as part of this recommendation process.

Informal on-the-job training heavily influenced the factors of training for arrest decision making in and out of the school setting. These were followed in significance by formal training, then guidance from the state Attorney General's Office. These findings suggest that officer behavior in and out of schools is heavily influenced by how daily organizational operations are carried out, with secondary guidance in the training realm. Interestingly, the descriptive statistics for juvenile arrest guidance suggest that SROs' opinions are heavily sought when deciding on whether to make a juvenile arrest. This factor was second only to seeking advice from the officer's supervisors, with administrator wishes third, and teacher wishes a distant fourth factor.

These responses demonstrate that a need exists for training throughout all areas of SRO duties at the school level, and upward through the police department itself. In an era in which constant monitoring of law enforcement conduct occurs, it is vital to maximize all areas in which law enforcement officers are in close contact with the citizenry. Nowhere is this interaction as close as it is in the educational setting with students and law enforcement officers interacting daily.

Implications for Practitioners and Social Change

The problem that guided the purpose and significance of this study was student

arrests and the likelihood that SROs as compared to non-SROs would arrest them. According to McKenna et al. (2016), the comparison of arrest likelihood of students by law enforcement officers might have provided or discounted alignment with the concept of a school-to-prison pipeline, being "the policies and practices that push school children, especially the most at-risk children, out of the classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems" (p. 440). Similarly, legitimate concerns exist concerning the impact that arresting a student creates in his or her life. Additionally, concerns extend to whether the presence of SROs is a contributing factor.

Currently, a generation of children looks to the schools for the socialization that used to occur in homes and neighborhoods across the United States. The burden will not go away, nor will the problem lessen, simply by arresting, suspending, or expelling students from school. From an economic standpoint, keeping students in school and out of facilities is cost effective compared to the expense of warehousing. The incarceration cost of one juvenile for 1 year nationally averages $148,767, going as high as $300,000 annually (Nance, 2016, p. 954). The cost to the State of Tennessee (2017), for example, is as high as $230,000 annually per bed on certain placements. Rural areas of Tennessee are the most significantly affected because of costs that range as high as 27 times what state probation incurs (State of Tennessee, 2017). The implementation of hastily crafted policy by removing SROs from schools might increase the costs that already burden the juvenile justice system. The economics of the problem alone, if not the morality, show the need for greater research into this issue.

Transforming knowledge into policy and directives is a benefit to the criminal justice professionals as stakeholders because they are the recipients of the training. SRO training gaps might exist if no discernible relationship in arrest inclination between the two groups of officers appears. Parents and guardians of students are also beneficiaries as are enforcement professionals. The direct effects upon parents and guardians include the necessity to attend juvenile court proceedings or court-mandated programs. Additionally, parents and guardians face financial hardships because of fines, court costs, and lost wages because of absence from work to attend disciplinary hearings at school and court.

Conclusion

The problem that guided the purpose and significance of the study was harm that is caused to students who are arrested in schools. Researchers have described the nature of alleged harm to students who are arrested at an early age (Nance, 2016), and how the SRO's presence might contribute to those harms (Monterastelli, 2017). This researcher evaluated the correlational relationships regarding arrest decision making of SROs and non-SROs, how to measure the arrest inclinations of both groups, and whether this proclivity aligns with the concept of what has been described as a school-to-prison pipeline. The specific problem and overarching research question was "Does a relationship exist among SROs, non-SROs, and arrest decision making involving middle school and high school students?" When evaluating the findings of Research Problem 1, the answer appeared to be "yes."

The contents of this researcher's study included the topic of SROs and the claim

that they contribute to a school-to-prison pipeline. The findings of prior researchers described some of the harm that comes to students through an early involvement with the juvenile justice system, and its correlation with early dropping out and future incarceration probability. This researcher evaluated the relationships of SROs and non-SROs where arrest decision making of students is concerned to determine whether significant relationships existed between the overall population of law enforcement officers and arrest decision making. Black's (1971) theory and its relationship to the arrest decision-making process provided the theoretical framework of this study. The implications for positive social change include mitigating greater harm to students when implementing hastily crafted policy changes that are not driven by data or research, but by emotional reaction.

References

Active shooter at Stoneman Douglas High School. (2018, February 14). Retrieved from http://www.sheriff.org/

Airasian, P., & Gay, L. (2005). *Educational research, competencies for analysis and applications and study guide package*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Aldrich, M. W. (2018, April 3). Five things to know about school resource officers in Tennessee. Retrieved from https://chalkbeat.org

Babbie, E. R. (2017). *The basics of social research* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Beger, R. R. (2002). Expansion of police power in public schools and the vanishing rights of students. *Social Justice*, *29*(1/2), 119–130.

Black, D. J. (1971). The social organization of arrest. *Stanford Law Review*, *23*(6), 1087–1111. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1227728

Black, D. (1980). *The manners and customs of the police*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Blitzman, J. D. (2015). Are we criminalizing adolescence? *Criminal Justice*, (1), 22–28.

Brent, J. J. (2016). Placing the criminalization of school discipline in economic context. *Punishment and Society*, *18*(5), 521–543. doi:10.1177/1462474516642858

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016, October 4). *National sources of law enforcement employment data.* (BJS Publication No. NCJ 249681). Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/nsleed.pdf

Burkholder, G., Cox, K., & Crawford, L. (2016). *The scholar–practitioner's guide to research design*. [VitalSource e-book].

Byrd, C. (2017, January 13). *Former South Carolina school officer won't face civil rights charges for throwing high school student out of desk*. Retrieved from http://www.postandcourier.com

Canaday, M., James, B., & Nease, J. (2012). *To protect and educate: The school resource officer and the prevention of violence in schools*. Retrieved from https://nasro.org/

Carroll, J. (2007). The divide between public school parents and private school parents. *Gallup News Service.* Retrieved from from http://www.gallup.com

Champaign County Board. (2017, October). Racial Justice Task Force. Retrieved from http://www.co.champaing.il.us/CountyBoard/meetings_RJTF.php

Community Oriented Policing Services. (n.d.). *What is a school resource officer?* Retrieved from https://cops.usdoj.gov

Collins, D. (2018, April 10). School security bill first to be signed by Gov. Hogan from 2018 session. Retrieved from http://www.wbaltv.com

Connell, N. M. (2016, December 27). Fear of crime at school: Understanding student perceptions of safety as function of historical context. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*(2), 1–13. doi:10.1177/1541204016680407

Crawford, C. (2016). Guest editorial. *Policing, 39*(3), 434–437. doi:10.1108/PIJPSM-05-2016-0061

Crawford, C., & Burns, R. (2016, June 12). Reducing school violence. *Policing: An*

International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 39(3), 455–477. doi:10.1108/PIJPSM-05-2016-0061

Curtis, E. A., Comiskey, C., & Dempsey, O. (2016). Importance and use of correlational research. *Nurse Researcher, 23*(6), 20–25. doi:10.7748/nr.2016.e1382

Devlin, D. N., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2016). The roles of police officers in schools: Effects on the recording and reporting of crime. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*(2), 208–223. doi:1541204016680405

Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society*. Retrieved from https://www.gutenberg.org/files/53910/53910-h/53910-h.htm

Drawve, G., Thomas, S., & Walker, J. T. (2013). The likelihood of arrest: A routine activity theory approach. *Southern Criminal Justice Association, 39*(3), 450–470. doi:10.1007/s12103-013-9226-2

Fader, J. J., Lockwood, B., Schall, V. L., & Stokes, B. (2015). A promising approach to narrowing the school-to-prison pipeline: The WISE arrest diversion program. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 13*(2), 123–142. doi:10.1177/1541204014521249

Fambrough, K. (2018, April 13). Sheriff tells school board tax proposal for resource officers in motion. *Livingston Parish News.* Retrieved from https://www.livingstonparishnews.com

Feld, B. C. (2013). Real interrogation: What actually happens when cops question kids. *Law and Society Review, 47*(1), 1–36.

Ford, D., Bothelo, G., & Conlon, K. (2015). Spring Valley high school officer suspended after violent classroom arrest [video file]. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2015/10/27/us/south-carolina-school-arrest-video/

Francovich, E. (2017, June 8). ACLU files suit against Washington state education agency on behalf of special education students. *The Spokesman Review*. Retrieved from http://www.spokesman.com

Gonsoulin, S., Zablocki, M., & Leone, P. E. (2012). Safe schools, staff development, and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 35*(4), 309–319. doi:10.1177/0888406412453470

González, T. (2012). Keeping kids in schools: Restorative justice, punitive discipline, and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Law and Education, 41*(2), 281–335.

Hall, M. S. (2015). *Functionality of school resource officer arrests in schools: Influencing factors and circumstances* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3742829)

Hashmall, M. J. (2009, October 26). *Arrest*. Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/arrest

Herbert, B. (2007, April 9) 6-year olds under arrest. *New York Times*. Retrieved December from http://www.nytimes.coml

Hockenberry, S., & Puzzanchera, C. (2018). *Juvenile court statistics 2015*. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstabb/njcda/pdf/jcs2015.pdf

Ivey, C. A. S. (2012). Teaching, counseling, and law enforcement functions in South

Carolina high schools: A study on the perception of time spent among school resource officers. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 7*(2), 550–561.

Irwin, K., Davidson, J., & Hall-Sanchez, A. (2013). The race to punish in American schools: Class and race predictors of punitive school-crime control. *Critical Criminology*, *21*(1), 47–71. doi:10.1007/s10612-012-9171-2

James, B. (2017, Winter). School safety and the courts: Top cases of 2017. *The Journal of School Safety: The Official Publication of the National Association of School Resource Officers*, 20–24.

James, B., & Johnston, K. (2017, Summer). School discipline reform and restorative justice: A policy analysis. *The Journal of School Safety: The Official Publication of the National Association of School Resource Officers*. 14–17, 38.

Jihoon, K., Yeungjeom, L., & Leban, L. (2016). A comprehensive investigation of youth deviance: Theoretical distinction by deviant behavior sub-types. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(6), 684–697. doi:10.1080/01639625.2016.1197630

Johnson, R. R. (2016a). Suspect demeanor and arrest: A triggered displacement of aggression explanation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*(1), 170–187. doi:10.1007/s12103-016-9352-8

Johnson, R. R. (2016b). *What effects do school resource officers have on schools?* (Research Brief). Retrieved from http://www.dolanconsultinggroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Research_Brief_SRO_October-2016.pdf

Kentucky high school adds new security rules after shooting. (2018, January 31). Retrieved from WRAL-TV Web site: http://www.wral.com/kentucky-high-school-adds-new-security-rules-after-shooting/17303839/

Kim, J., Lee, Y., & Leban, L. (2017). A comprehensive investigation of youth deviance: theoretical distinction by deviant behavior sub-types. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(6), 684-697. doi:10.1080/10639625.2016.1197630

Klinger, D. A. (1994). Demeanor or crime? Why "hostile" citizens are more likely to be arrested. *Criminology*, 32, 475–493.

Klinger, D. A. (1996). More on demeanor and arrest in Dade County. *Criminology, 34*, 61–62.

Lynch, C. G., Gainey, R. R., & Chappell, A. T. (2016). The effects of social and educational disadvantage on the roles and functions of school resource officers. *Policing, 39*(3), 521–535.

Mallett, C. A. (2017). The school-to-prison pipeline: Disproportionate impact on vulnerable children and adolescents. *Education and Urban Society, 49*(6), 563–592. doi:10.1177/0013124516644053

Martinez-Prather, K. E., McKenna, J. M., & Bowman, S. W. (2016). The impact of training on discipline outcomes in school-based policing. *Policing an International Journal, 39*(3), 478–490. doi:10.1108/PIJPSM-02-2016-0022

May, D. C., Barranco, R., Stokes, E., Robertson, A. A., & Haynes, S. H. (2015). Do school resource officers really refer juveniles to the juvenile justice system for

less serious offenses? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. doi:10.0887403415610167

May, D. C., & Higgins, G. E. (2011). The characteristics and activities of school resource officers: Are newbies different than veterans? *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, *11*(2), 96–108. doi:10.1080/15332586.2011.581510

McKenna, J. M., Martinez-Prather, K., & Bowman, S. W. (2016). The roles of school-based law enforcement officers and how these roles are established: A qualitative study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *27*(4), 420–443. doi:10.1177/0887403414551001

McKenna, J. M., & White, S. R. (2017). Examining the use of police in schools: How roles may impact responses to student misconduct (Doctoral dissertation). *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. doi:10.1007/s12103-017-9426-2

Merkwae, A. (2016). Schooling the police: Race, disability, and the conduct of school resource officers. *Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, *21*(1), 147–181. Retrieved from http://repository.law.umich.edu/mjrl

Mitchell, M. (2017, December 8). *Court dismisses suit against former Southlake officer fired for handcuffing autistic child*. Retrieved from http://www.star-telegram.com

Monahan, K. C., VanDerhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(7), 1110–1122. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0103-1

Monterastelli, S. (2017). Every hand's a loser: The intersection of zero-tolerance policies,

mental illness in children and adolescents, and the juvenile justice system. *Law and Psychology Review*, *41*, 209–228. Retrieved from http://link.galegroup.com.ezp

Morgan, M. A., & Wright, J. P. (2017). Beyond Black and White: Suspension disparities for Hispanic, Asian, and White youth. *Criminal Justice Review*. doi:10.1177/0734016817721293

Mowen, T., & Brent, J. (2016). School discipline as a turning point: The cumulative effect of suspension on arrest. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *53*(5), 628–653. doi:10.1177/0022427816643135

Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2017). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2016*. National Center for Education Statistics Web site. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017064.pdf

Nance, J. P. (2016). Students, police, and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Washington University Law Review*, *93*(4), 918–997. Retrieved from http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview

National Association of School Resource Officers. *About NASRO*. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://nasro.org/about/

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *Fast Facts* Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics: https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts

New Jersey v. T.L.O. 469 U.S. 325 (1985). Retrieved from https://supreme.justia.com/

cases/federal/us/469/325/case.html

Newton, A. (2015). Crime and the NTE: Multi-classification crime (MCC) hot spots in time and space. *Crime Science, 4*(1), 1–12. doi:10.1186/s40163-015-0040-7

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2017, November 5). *Juvenile arrest trends*. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov

O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. R., Berner, M., & Taliaferro, J. D. V. (2016). *Research methods for public administrators* (6th ed.). Routledge [VitalBook file].

Parker, M. M., Glenn, J. W., & Turner, A. (2014). Criminalizing childhood: The social development of juvenile crime in a rural North Carolina school. *Social Development Issues, 36*(2), 35–52.

Peguero, A. A., Connell, N. M., & Hong, J. S. (2016). School Violence and Safety. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. doi:1541204016680404

Petrilli, M. J. (2015, January 28). Detention dysfunction: the government wants to force a racial quota system onto student punishment. This is an even worse idea than you might suppose. *Hoover Digest*, Winter, 69–73. Retrieved from https://www.hoover.org/research/detention-dysfunction.

Preiss, D. R., Arum, R., Edelman, L. B., Morrill, C., & Tyson, K. (2016). The more you talk, the worse it is: Student perceptions of law and authority in schools. *Social Currents, 3*(3), 234–255. doi:10.1177/2329496515616813

Quentin Scott v. City of Albuquerque, Ray Schultz, and D. Hensley. 15-2154 (2017). Retrieved from http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-10th-circuit/1876980.html

Reiss, A. J. (1971). *The police and the public*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rotter, K. (2014). IEP use by general and special education teachers. *Sage Open, 4*(2). doi:10.1177/2158244014530410

Russ, H., & Kearney, L. (2018, April 10). Factbox: States shift funding for school safety after Parkland shooting. *U.S. News.* Retrieved from https://www.usnews.com/news/top-news/articles/2018-04-10/factbox-states-shift-funding-for-school-safety-after-parkland-shooting

Ryan, J. B., Katsiyannis, A., Counts, J. M., & Shelnut, J. C. (2017). The growing concerns regarding school resource officers. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 53*(3), 1–5. doi:1053451217702108

Schenker, J. D., & Rumrill, J. D. (2004). Causal-comparative research designs. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 21*(3), 117–121. Retrieved from http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp

Schlosser, M. D. (2014). Multiple roles and potential role conflict of a school resource officer: A case study of the Midwest police department's school resource officer program in the United States. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 9*(1), 131–142.

Servoss, T. J. (2017). School security and student misbehavior: A multi-level examination. *Youth and Society, 49*(6). 755–788. doi:10.1177/0044118X14561007

Simmons, A. M. (2007, October 11). *High school scuffle exposes a racial rift*. Retrieved

from http://articles.latimes.com/2007/oct/11/local/me-palmdale11

State of Tennessee. (n.d.a.). *Basic law enforcement school.* Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/content/tn/ commerce/let/basic-police-school.html

State of Tennessee. (n.d.b.). *Peace Officer Standards Training Commission.* Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/commerce/post.html

State of Tennessee. (n.d.c.). *Rural areas.* Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/health/cedep/environmental/healthy-places/healthy-places/land-use/lu/rural-areas.html

State of Tennessee. (n.d.d.). *Suburban areas.* Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/health/cedep/environmental/healthy-places/healthy-places/land-use/lu/suburban-areas.html

State of Tennessee. (n.d.e.). *Urban areas.* Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/health/cedep/environmental/healthy-places/healthy-places/land-use/lu/urban-areas.html

State of Tennessee. (2017, December). *Joint Ad-Hoc Tennessee Blue Ribbon Task Force on Juvenile Justice: Final report*. Retrieved from https://www.tn.gov/content/dam /tn/tccy/documents/jj/JJ-BlueRibbon-Report-2018.pdf

Stinson, Sr., P. M., & Watkins, A. M. (2014). The nature of crime by school resource officers: Implications for SRO programs. *Sage Open, 4*(1), 1-10. doi:2158244014521821

Summerfeldt, C. (2016, September 3). *Disgraced South Carolina officer will not face*

charges for hurling student across classroom. Retrieved from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/s-won-face-charges-hurling-student-classroom-article-1.2776576

Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Principles of criminology* (4th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lipponcott.

Swanson, C. R., Territo, L., & Taylor, R. W. (2018). *Police administration: Structures, processes, and behaviors*. (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tanner-Smith, 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*(1), 102–119. doi:http://dx.doi.org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9409-3

Tennessee Bureau of Investigation. (2018). *School crime 2015–2017*. Retrieved June 19, 2018, from https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tbi/documents/tibrs/2017%20School%20Crime_Final.pdf

Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-1-201. Retrieved from https://advance.lexis.com

Tennessee Code Annotated § 38-8-108. Retrieved from https://advance.lexis.com

Tennessee Code Annotated § 49-6-4217. Retrieved from https://advance.lexis.com

The Law Dictionary. (n.d.). What is arrest? In *Black's Law Dictionary Free* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from The Law Dictionary Web site: https://thelawdictionary.org

Theriot, M. T. (2016). The impact of school resource officer interaction on students' feelings about school and school police. *Crime and Delinquency, 62*(4), 446–469.

doi:10.1177/ 0011128713503526

Theriot, M. T., & Orme, J. G. (2016). School resource officers and student's feelings of safety at school. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 14*(2), 130–146. doi:10.1177/1541204014564472

Tobin, T. C. (2005, April 22). *Video shows police handcuffing 5-year-old*. Retrieved from http://www.sptimes.com/2005/04/22/Southpinellas/Video_shows_police_ha.shtml

Uniontown H.S. school shooting thwarted, student found with arsenal of weapons. (2018, January 26). Retrieved from CBS Pittsburgh Local News: http://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2018/01/26/uniontown-high-school-shooting-threat-arrest/

University of California at Los Angeles, Institute for Digital Research and Education. (n.d.). *Multiple Regression Power Analysis | G*Power Data Analysis Examples.* Retrieved from https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/other/gpower/multiple-regression-power-analysis/

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *QuickFacts: Tennessee*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/TN

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.a.). *Building the legacy: IDEIA 2004*. Retrieved from http://idea.ed.gov/

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.b.). *Subpart 3-Gun possession: Laws and guidance elementary and secondary education*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg54.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Planning guide for maintaining school facilities*. Retrieved, from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/maintenance/chapter5_2.asp

Warner, R. M. (2012). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weisburd, D., Groff, E. R., & Yang, S.-M. (2014). The importance of both opportunity and social disorganization theory in a future research agenda to advance criminological theory and crime prevention at places. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 51*(4), 499–508. doi:10.1177/0022427814530404

Whichard, C., & Felson, R. B. (2016). Are suspects who resist arrest defiant, desperate, or disoriented. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 53*(4). 564–591. doi:10.1177/0022427816632571

Wolf, K. C. (2012). *An exploration of school resource officer arrests in Delaware* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Delaware, Newark, NJ. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3526476)

Wolf, K. C. (2013). Booking students: An analysis of school arrests and court outcomes. *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy, 9*(1), 58–87. Retrieved from http:// scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu

Wolf, K. C. (2014). Arrest decision making by school resource officers. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 12*(2), 137–151. doi:10.1177/1541204013491294

Yorke, L., & Dallos, R. (2015). An interpretive phenomenological analysis and repertory grid exploration of anger in young offenders. *Journal of Constructivist*

Psychology, 28(2), 126–138. doi:10.1080/10720537.2014.889585

Zapolski, T. C. B., Garcia, C. A., Jarjoura, G. R., Lau, K. S. L., & Aalsma, M. C. (2016). Examining the influence of ethnic/racial socialization on aggressive behaviors among juvenile offenders. *Journal of Juvenile Justice, 5*(1), 65–79.

Appendix A: Student Arrest Inclination Survey

(to be uploaded to Qualtrics)

This survey is designed to measure the arrest decision-making processes of law enforcement officers who are school resource officers (SROs) or other officers who may respond to calls for service in middle school and high schools in their community. If you are not an SRO, please answer the question based on prior experience in responding to calls within middle school and high schools in your community.

Do you consent to participate in this survey?

- Yes
- No

Q1: Factors Affecting the Arrest Decision in School: For the following factors, please indicate how important each factor is to your decision of whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior. Please respond using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating "Not important at all" and 5 indicating "Extremely Important."

	Not important at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Extremely important (5)	I don't know (6)
How important to the arrest decision are guidelines provided by applicable laws, rules, and regulations?						
How important to the arrest decision is the nature of the alleged misbehavior?						
When there is an identifiable victim, how important to the arrest decision is the impact the behavior had on the victim?						

	Not important at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Extremely important (5)	I don't know (6)
How important to the arrest decision is the student's attitude when you approach him or her about the alleged misbehavior?						
How important to the arrest decision is the student's history of misbehavior?						
How important to the arrest decision are the student's academic achievements?						
How important to the arrest decision are your expectations of whether the student will continue to misbehave?						
How important to the arrest decision are the wishes of school administrators?						
How important to the arrest decision are the wishes of teachers?						
When there is an identifiable victim, how important to the arrest decision are the wishes of the victim's parent/guardian?						
How important to the arrest decision is the need to ensure that the student is punished for his or her misbehavior?						
How important to the arrest decision are the potential consequences of the student's involvement in the juvenile justice system?						
How important to the arrest decision is the quality of the evidence against the student?						

Q2: Please list any factors, not listed above, that are important considerations when you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior.

Q3: Previous Experience with Arrests: The following questions ask about your previous experiences with students who have misbehaved. For the following scenarios, please indicate how often each has occurred in the past by choosing “This has never occurred,” “This has rarely occurred,” or “This has frequently occurred.”

	This has never occurred (1)	This has rarely occurred (2)	This has frequently occurred (3)	I don’t know (4)	I prefer not to answer (5)
In the past, I have arrested a student who was acting in a disorderly manner because it was the only way to calm the student down.					
In the past, I have arrested a student for a relatively minor offense because a teacher wanted the student to be arrested.					
In the past, I have arrested a student for a relatively minor offense to show the student that actions have consequences.					
In the past, I have arrested a student because it was the only way to calm a group of students down who were disrupting classes.					
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because that student had never been in trouble before.					
In the past I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because the student cooperated with my investigation.					
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because the student promised to stop misbehaving.					

Q4: For the following statements about the juvenile justice system and school discipline, please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement, with 1 indicating “Strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “Strongly agree.”

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Strongly agree (5)	I don’t know (6)
Involvement in the juvenile justice system deters misbehaving students from future misbehavior						
Seeing a student arrested for misbehavior deters other students from misbehaving.						
Services provided by the juvenile justice system can help prevent students from misbehaving						
Arresting students when they misbehave is an effective way of preserving order in the school.						

Q5: What effect does involvement in the juvenile justice system have on misbehaving students?

- Involvement in the juvenile justice system always harms misbehaving students.
- Involvement in the juvenile justice system benefits misbehaving students to the same extent it harms them.
- Involvement in the juvenile justice system always benefits misbehaving students.
- I don’t know.

General Thoughts: The following questions ask for your general thoughts on making arrests in schools.

Q6: Is the arrest decision-making process different when you are in school than when you are on the street?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

If you answered "Yes" to the question above, please briefly explain your answer.

Q9 When you have strong evidence that a student has committed an arrestable offense in school, how often do you arrest the student?

- 100% of the time

Q7: When you have strong evidence that a student has committed an arrestable offense in school, how often do you arrest the student?

- 80% of the time
- 60% of the time
- 40% of the time
- 20% of the time
- Never
- I don't know

Training: The following questions ask you about the training you have received regarding the arrest decision-making process.

Q8: To the best of your recollection, please list all training sessions you have completed that have dealt directly with the arrest decision-making process in schools.

Q9: To the best of your recollection, please list all training sessions you have completed that have dealt directly with the arrest decision-making process in general.

Q10: Training for arrest decision making in the school setting: For the following training types, please indicate the extent to which each has been helpful to your arrest decision making when you are in the school setting. Please indicate the extent to which the training type has been helpful using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being "Not helpful at all," and 5 being "Extremely helpful."

	Not helpful at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Extremely helpful (5)	I don't know (6)	I prefer not to answer (7)
Formal training (e.g., academy classes, In-service)							
Informal "on-the-job" training							
Information/training from the Attorney General's Office							

Q11: Training for arrest decision making outside the school setting: For the following training types, please indicate the extent to which each has been helpful to your arrest decision making when you are NOT in the school setting. Please indicate the extent to

which the training type has been helpful using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being "Not helpful at all," and 5 being "Extremely helpful."

	Not helpful at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Extremely helpful (5)	I don't know (6)	I prefer not to answer (7)
Formal training (e.g., academy classes, In-service)							
Informal "on-the-job" training							
Information/training from the Attorney General's Office							

Q12: In the past, when deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, have you sought guidance from any of the following?

	Yes (1)	No (2)	I don't know (3)
School administrators			
Superior officers			
SROs			
Teachers			
Attorney General's Office			
Probation officers			
School administrators			

Q13: If you have sought guidance from any individuals not listed in the previous question, please list them here:

Demographic Information: Please provide the following demographic information.

Q14: What year were you born?

Q15: What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- I would prefer not to answer

Q16: What is your race/ethnicity?

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- I would prefer not to answer
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Other
- White (Hispanic)
- White (Non-Hispanic)

Q17: Are you a school resource officer or nonschool resource officer?

- School Resource Officer
- NonSchool Resource Officer

Q18: In what type of community school do you serve or respond to calls?

- Urban (areas are locations with high population density)
- Suburban (either part of a city or urban area, or exist as a separate residential community within commuting distance of a city)
- Rural (areas found outside of cities and towns, having smaller populations and undeveloped land)

Q19: Approximately how long have you served as a law enforcement officer?

Q20: Approximately how long have you served as a school resource officer (if applicable)?

Q21: If you are not a school resource officer, have you previously served as a school resource officer?

- Yes
- No

Q22: What section of the State of Tennessee do you work?

- East Tennessee Grand Division (contains the counties of Anderson, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Campbell, Carter, Claiborne, Cocke, Cumberland, Grainger, Greene, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Loudon, Marion, McMinn, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, Polk, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Sullivan, Unicoi, Union, and Washington)
- Middle Tennessee Grand Division (contains the counties of Bedford, Cannon, Cheatham, Clay, Coffee, Davidson, DeKalb, Dickson, Fentress, Franklin, Giles, Grundy, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Jackson, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Macon, Marshall, Maury, Montgomery, Moore, Overton, Perry, Pickett, Putnam, Robertson, Rutherford, Sequatchie, Smith, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Van Buren, Warren, Wayne, White, Williamson, and Wilson)
- West Tennessee Grand Division (contains the counties of Benton, Carroll, Chester, Crockett, Decatur, Dyer, Fayette, Gibson, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henderson, Henry, Lake, Lauderdale, Madison, McNairy, Obion, Shelby, Tipton, and Weakley)

THANK YOU!

You have completed the Survey. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Bill Young at [redacted] Thank you very much for your time and effort— it is greatly appreciated.

END OF SURVEY

Appendix B: Content Validity Table for Survey Questions Regarding the Importance of Factors to the Arrest Decision in School

Question	Rationale	Sources(s)
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are guidelines provided by applicable laws, rules, and regulations?	Laws and regulations that provide specific direction have been found to impact arrest decisions. The Delaware Code (and Tennessee Code Annotated) contain specific definitions of criminal offenses and specific mandatory arrest rules that apply in the school setting.	McCluskey, Varano, Huebner, and Rynum (2004); 11 Del. Code § 501 et seq.; 14 Del. Code § 4112. Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-7-103 Tenn. Code Ann. § 39-13-111 Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-4301
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision is the nature of the alleged misbehavior at issue?	The category and severity of the offense at issue has been found to influence whether an arrest is made in studies of police arrest decision making regarding juvenile offenders.	Smith and Visher (1981); Brown, Novak and Frank (2009).
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior that has an identifiable victim, how important to that decision is the impact of the behavior on the victim?	Victim impact has become increasingly important over the past two decades and the juvenile justice system has placed more weight on the impact an offense has on victims when deciding how to treat alleged delinquents. Moreover, victim impact has been found to be influential in arrest decision making for officers operating under the community policing model, which SROs are supposed to follow.	Novak, Fran, Smith, and Engel (2002)
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision is the student's attitude when you approach him or her about the alleged misbehavior?	Prior research reports that the attitude of perpetrators when interacting with police has an impact on whether an arrest occurs. In the school context, anecdotal accounts of students-school resource officer interactions have demonstrated that perceived negative student attitudes can lead to an arrest and disorderly conduct arrests have been found to occur more often in schools with a school resource officer.	Smith and Visher (1981); Mukherjee (2007); Theriot (2009)

(table continues)

Question	Rationale	Sources(s)
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision is the student's history of misbehavior?	One of the claimed advantages of school resource officers (SROs) is their ability to get to know the students in their schools. Indeed, because they walk the halls every day, they are much more likely to know an alleged student perpetrator than most police officers making an arrest on the street. Yet, if the officer has an impression of a student accused of misbehavior based on prior experiences with that student, the arrest decision could be affected.	Kupchik & Bracy (2009); Walerysiak (2006).
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are the student's academic achievements?	See above.	See above.
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are your expectations of whether the student will continue to misbehave?	Incapacitation is a commonly cited rationale for arresting and detaining juveniles who are thought to be threats to society. Additionally, deterrence theory suggests that an arrest might deter future misbehavior of the student arrested (specific deterrence) and of other students (general deterrence). Though both incapacitation and deterrence theories have been seriously challenged, SROs might have these notions in mind when making an arrest decision.	See, e.g., Stahlkopf, Males, & Macallair (2010) testing incapacitation and deterrence theories in juvenile context; Theriot (2009).
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are the wishes of school administrators?	School resource officers do not report to school administrators, but are expected to work with them cooperatively. This suggests that their input might be important to the arrest decision.	Finn et al. (2005); Walerysiak (2005).
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are the wishes of teachers?	School resource officers form relationships with the teachers in the school, which would suggest that their input might be important to the arrest decision. Additionally, teachers are common witnesses to incidents and witness input has been found to be important to the arrest decision.	Finn et al. (2005); Walerysiak (2005); Novak, Frank, Smith, & Engel (2002).

(table continues)

Question	Rationale	Sources(s)
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior that has an identifiable victim, how important to that decision are the wishes of the victim's parent/guardian?	Analysis of community police officers arrest decision making found that witness input impacted the arrest decision. Additionally, victims' rights have become increasingly prominent in juvenile justice in recent decades.	Novak, Frank, Smith, and Engel (2002); Sanborn (2001).
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision is the need to ensure the student is punished?	Punishment has become an increasingly prominent aspect of the juvenile justice system. SROS might have it in mind when they are making the arrest decision.	Feld (1999)
When you are deciding whether to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision are the potential consequences of his or her involvement in the juvenile justice system?	The American approach to juvenile justice was established with the intention of helping "wayward" juveniles reform and become productive members of society. More specifically the Delaware Code states the school discipline should provide services to students to reduce disciplinary problems in the future. SROs might be aware of this goal of juvenile justice system involvement and might take it into account when making the arrest decision.	Feld (1999); 14 Del. Code § 1601 Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-6101
When you are deciding to arrest a student for alleged misbehavior, how important to that decision is the quality of the evidence against that student?	Prior research suggests that the amount of evidence available against a perpetrator will influence the arrest decision.	Brown, Novak, & Frank (2009).

Appendix C: Content Validity Table for Survey Questions Regarding Arrest Scenarios in Schools

Scenario	Rationale	Citation
In the past, I have arrested a student for a relatively minor offense because a teacher wanted the student to be arrested.	Matched with Question 9 from Appendix D.	Finn et al. (2005); Walerysiak (2005); Novak, Frank, Smith, & Engel (2002).
In the past, I have arrested a student for a relatively minor offense to show the student that actions have consequences.	Matched with Question 11 from Appendix D.	Feld (1999)
In the past, I have arrested a student because it was the only way to calm a group of students down who were disrupting classes.	The actions of offenders in the presence of officers and other offenders/bystanders have been identified as important factors in the arrest decision.	Smith and Visher (1981); Brown, Novak and Frank (2009).
In the past, I have arrested a student who was acting in a disorderly manner because it was the only way to calm the student down.	Matched with Question 4 from Appendix D.	Smith and Visher (1981); Mukherjee (2007); Theriot (2009)
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because the student promised to stop misbehaving.	Matched with Question 7 from Appendix D.	See, e.g., Stahlkopf, Males, & Macallair (2010) testing incapacitation and deterrence theories in juvenile context; Theriot (2009).
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a group of students who had been involved in a fight because they demonstrated to me that their fight was over.	If the SRO believes the fight is over, he or she might not feel the need to arrest the students, particularly if they are motivated by the incapacitation rationale. Furthermore, because SROs are seen as counselors as well as law enforcers, they might choose to avoid arrests if the fight is resolved.	See, e.g., Stahlkopf, Males, & MacAllair (2010) regarding incapacitation; Finn et al. (2005); NSSS (2007) regarding the role of counselor.
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because the student cooperated with my investigation.	SROs have been observed using students as informants. Additionally, offender behavior when confronted by the police has been identified as an important factor in the arrest decision.	Kupchik & Bracy (2009) regarding student informants; Smith & Visher (1981) regarding offender attitudes.
In the past, I have decided NOT to arrest a student who had committed an arrestable offense because that student had never been in trouble before.	Matched with Question 5 from Appendix D.	Kupchik & Bracy (2009); Walerysiak (2006).

Appendix D: Content Validity Table for Survey Questions Regarding Rationale for Making Arrests in School

Question	Rationale	Source(s)
Involvement in the juvenile justice system deters misbehaving students from future misbehavior.	Specific deterrence is a commonly cited rationale for the "get tough" approach to juvenile justice.	Theriot (2009); Zimring (2005)
Seeing a student being arrested for misbehavior deters other students from misbehaving.	General deterrence is a commonly cited rationale for the "get tough" approach to juvenile justice.	Theriot (2009); Zimring (2005)
Services provided by the juvenile justice system can prevent students from continuing to misbehave.	Rehabilitation was one of the original rationales for the creation of juvenile justice systems. Further the Delaware Code (and TCA) specifically states that services should be provided for juveniles.	Feld (1999) 10 Del Code § 902. Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-6101
Arresting students when they misbehave is an effective way of preserving order within schools	Just as Delaware's (and Tennessee's) juvenile justice system is intended to benefit delinquent youth, it is also intended to promote the interests of the public. In the school context, the public is the school community, and preserving order in school is a stated rationale for SRO programs.	Finn et al. (2005) 10 Del Code § 902. Tenn. Code Ann. § 37-1-131 Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-4206
Arresting students when they misbehave allows other students to focus on learning.	See above. Additionally, creating a safe environment that enables student learning is a stated rationale for SRO programs.	Finn et al. (2005) 10 Del Code § 902. Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-4206

Note. SRO = school resource officer; TCA = Tennessee Code Annotated.

Appendix E: Frequency Table for Variables Demographic Data

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Total years of experience as law enforcement officer					
Valid	0	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
	1–5 Years	21	15.7	15.7	21.6
	6–10 Years	19	14.2	14.2	35.8
	11–15 Years	25	18.7	18.7	54.5
	16–20 Years	28	20.9	20.9	75.4
	21–25 Years	16	11.9	11.9	87.3
	26–30 Years	7	5.2	5.2	92.5
	30–35 Years	10	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Officer is a school resource officer or non-school resource officer					
Valid	SRO	50	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Non-SRO	84	62.7	62.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Length of service in school resource officer assignment					
Valid	0	83	61.9	61.9	61.9
	1–5 Years	32	23.9	23.9	85.8
	6–10 Years	12	9.0	9.0	94.8
	11–15 Years	4	3.0	3.0	97.8
	16–20 Years	2	1.5	1.5	99.3
	8	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Previous experience as school resource officer					
Valid	0	62	46.3	46.3	46.3
	Yes	7	5.2	5.2	51.5
	No	65	48.5	48.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Officer's age					
Valid	0	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
	59–68	5	3.7	3.7	11.2
	49–58	25	18.7	18.7	29.9
	39–48	52	38.8	38.8	68.7
	29–38	29	21.6	21.6	90.3
	21–28	13	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Section of the state where the officer works					
Valid	East Tennessee	47	35.1	35.1	35.1
	Middle Tennessee	27	20.1	20.1	55.2
	West Tennessee	60	44.8	44.8	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Type of community served					
Valid	0	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Urban	63	47.0	47.0	48.5
	Suburban	43	32.1	32.1	80.6
	Rural	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Officer's sex					
Valid	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Male	112	83.6	83.6	86.6
	Female	18	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Officer's race/ethnicity					
Valid	I Would Prefer not to Answer	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
	White (Non-Hispanic)	102	76.1	76.1	81.3
	White (Hispanic)	3	2.2	2.2	83.6
	Black (or African American)	13	9.7	9.7	93.3
	Asian (or Asian American)	2	1.5	1.5	94.8
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	.7	.7	95.5
	Other	6	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

Appendix F: Frequency Tables for Variables Arrest Decision-Making

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Quality of rules and regulations					
Valid	3	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	4	23	17.2	17.2	19.4
	5	108	80.6	80.6	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Nature of misbehavior					
Valid	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	3	9	6.7	6.7	9.0
	4	41	30.6	30.6	39.6
	5	81	60.4	60.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Victim impact					
Valid	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	1	1	.7	.7	3.0
	2	9	6.7	6.7	9.7
	3	12	9.0	9.0	18.7
	4	44	32.8	32.8	51.5
	5	65	48.5	48.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Student attitude					
Valid	0	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	1	2	1.5	1.5	3.0
	2	16	11.9	11.9	14.9
	3	29	21.6	21.6	36.6
	4	47	35.1	35.1	71.6
	5	38	28.4	28.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Student history of misbehavior					
Valid	0	1	.7	.7	.7
	1	9	6.7	6.7	7.5
	2	12	9.0	9.0	16.4
	3	30	22.4	22.4	38.8
	4	45	33.6	33.6	72.4
	5	37	27.6	27.6	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Student's academic behavior					
Valid	1	66	49.3	49.3	49.3
	2	28	20.9	20.9	70.1
	3	25	18.7	18.7	88.8
	4	12	9.0	9.0	97.8
	5	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Expectations of continued misbehavior					
	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	1	13	9.7	9.7	11.9
	2	13	9.7	9.7	21.6
	3	29	21.6	21.6	43.3
	4	45	33.6	33.6	76.9
	5	31	23.1	23.1	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Administrator wishes					
	0	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	1	41	30.6	30.6	32.1
	2	36	26.9	26.9	59.0
Valid	3	32	23.9	23.9	82.8
	4	18	13.4	13.4	96.3
	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Teacher wishes					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	54	40.3	40.3	43.3
	2	40	29.9	29.9	73.1
Valid	3	25	18.7	18.7	91.8
	4	7	5.2	5.2	97.0
	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Wishes of victims' parents					
	0	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
	1	14	10.4	10.4	14.2
	2	22	16.4	16.4	30.6
Valid	3	34	25.4	25.4	56.0
	4	36	26.9	26.9	82.8
	5	23	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Ensuring punishment					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	20	14.9	14.9	17.9
	2	29	21.6	21.6	39.6
Valid	3	29	21.6	21.6	61.2
	4	33	24.6	24.6	85.8
	5	19	14.2	14.2	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Consequences of juvenile justice system					
	0	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	1	29	21.6	21.6	23.1
	2	28	20.9	20.9	44.0
Valid	3	45	33.6	33.6	77.6
	4	19	14.2	14.2	91.8
	5	11	8.2	8.2	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Quality of evidence					
	0	12	9.0	9.0	9.0
	1	1	.7	.7	9.7
	2	2	1.5	1.5	11.2
Valid	3	2	1.5	1.5	12.7
	4	27	20.1	20.1	32.8
	5	90	67.2	67.2	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Arrested as resort to calm student					
	0	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
	1	46	34.3	34.3	38.1
Valid	2	57	42.5	42.5	80.6
	3	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Arrested because teacher wanted it					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	108	80.6	80.6	83.6
Valid	2	21	15.7	15.7	99.3
	3	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Arrested to stop group of students from disrupting class					
	0	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
	1	79	59.0	59.0	62.7
Valid	2	41	30.6	30.6	93.3
	3	9	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Have not arrested because student had never been in trouble before					
	0	6	4.5	4.5	4.5
	1	45	33.6	33.6	38.1
Valid	2	62	46.3	46.3	84.3
	3	21	15.7	15.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Have not arrested because of student cooperation					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	40	29.9	29.9	32.8
Valid	2	59	44.0	44.0	76.9
	3	31	23.1	23.1	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Have not arrested because student promised to stop misbehaving					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	88	65.7	65.7	68.7
Valid	2	38	28.4	28.4	97.0
	3	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Have not arrested because fighting stopped					
	0	12	9.0	9.0	9.0
	1	74	55.2	55.2	64.2
Valid	2	32	23.9	23.9	88.1
	3	16	11.9	11.9	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Juvenile justice system deters future misbehavior					
	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	1	36	26.9	26.9	29.1
	2	41	30.6	30.6	59.7
Valid	3	37	27.6	27.6	87.3
	4	15	11.2	11.2	98.5
	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Witnessing student arrested deters misbehavior					
	0	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
	1	12	9.0	9.0	12.7
	2	23	17.2	17.2	29.9
Valid	3	38	28.4	28.4	58.2
	4	39	29.1	29.1	87.3
	5	17	12.7	12.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Juvenile justice system can prevent future problems					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	33	24.6	24.6	27.6
	2	32	23.9	23.9	51.5
Valid	3	37	27.6	27.6	79.1
	4	24	17.9	17.9	97.0
	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Arresting students preserves order					
	0	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1	12	9.0	9.0	11.9
	2	25	18.7	18.7	30.6
Valid	3	32	23.9	23.9	54.5
	4	41	30.6	30.6	85.1
	5	20	14.9	14.9	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Arresting students allows other students to learn					
	0	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
	1	7	5.2	5.2	10.4
	2	22	16.4	16.4	26.9
Valid	3	31	23.1	23.1	50.0
	4	39	29.1	29.1	79.1
	5	28	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Level of harm to students being involved in juvenile justice system					
Valid	I don't know	40	29.9	29.9	29.9
	Involvement in the juvenile justice system always harms misbehaving students	14	10.4	10.4	40.3
	Involvement in the juvenile justice system benefits misbehaving students to the same extent it harms them.	60	44.8	44.8	85.1
	Involvement in the juvenile justice system always benefits misbehaving students.	20	14.9	14.9	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Is arrest decision different in school vs. outside school?					
Valid	I Don't Know	12	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Yes	55	41.0	41.0	50.0
	No	67	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Based on evidence, how often do you arrest?					
Valid	0	19	14.2	14.2	14.2
	1	30	22.4	22.4	36.6
	2	59	44.0	44.0	80.6
	3	10	7.5	7.5	88.1
	4	10	7.5	7.5	95.5
	5	2	1.5	1.5	97.0
	6	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Inside school setting, formal training (academy, in-service)					
Valid	0	15	11.2	11.2	11.2
	1	5	3.7	3.7	14.9
	2	16	11.9	11.9	26.9
	3	27	20.1	20.1	47.0
	4	39	29.1	29.1	76.1
	5	28	20.9	20.9	97.0
	6	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Inside school setting, informal training (on the job)					
Valid	0	13	9.7	9.7	9.7
	1	5	3.7	3.7	13.4
	2	4	3.0	3.0	16.4
	3	8	6.0	6.0	22.4
	4	44	32.8	32.8	55.2
	5	58	43.3	43.3	98.5
	6	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Inside school setting, information and training from attorney general's office					
Valid	0	22	16.4	16.4	16.4
	1	15	11.2	11.2	27.6
	2	19	14.2	14.2	41.8
	3	28	20.9	20.9	62.7
	4	22	16.4	16.4	79.1
	5	18	13.4	13.4	92.5
	6	10	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Outside school setting, informal training (on the job)					
Valid	0	12	9.0	9.0	9.0
	1	1	.7	.7	9.7
	2	2	1.5	1.5	11.2
	3	7	5.2	5.2	16.4
	4	29	21.6	21.6	38.1
	5	81	60.4	60.4	98.5
	6	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Outside school setting, information and training from attorney general's office					
Valid	0	17	12.7	12.7	12.7
	1	12	9.0	9.0	21.6
	2	10	7.5	7.5	29.1
	3	30	22.4	22.4	51.5
	4	28	20.9	20.9	72.4
	5	28	20.9	20.9	93.3
	6	9	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
School administrator guidance					
Valid	0	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
	1	55	41.0	41.0	46.3
	2	72	53.7	53.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	

(table continues)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Superior officer guidance					
Valid	0	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
	1	114	85.1	85.1	87.3
	2	17	12.7	12.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
School resource officer guidance					
Valid	0	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
	1	98	73.1	73.1	78.4
	2	29	21.6	21.6	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Teacher guidance					
Valid	0	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
	1	27	20.1	20.1	27.6
	2	97	72.4	72.4	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Attorney general guidance					
Valid	0	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
	1	66	49.3	49.3	55.2
	2	60	44.8	44.8	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	
Probation officer guidance					
Valid	0	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
	1	49	36.6	36.6	43.3
	2	76	56.7	56.7	100.0
	Total	134	100.0	100.0	