

Mississippi's 2011 Concealed Carry Law: Analyzing Reported Criminality among Mississippi's Public Community Colleges

Daniel Adrian Doss
Jackson State University, USA
David Hughes McElreath
University of Mississippi, USA
Balakrishna Gokaraju
North Carolina A&T State University, USA
Stephen L. Mallory
University of Mississippi, USA
Raymond Tesiero
North Carolina A&T State University, USA
Linda Taylor
Jackson State University, USA
Qiuqi Hong
Guangdong University of Finance, China
Don Jones
Northwest Mississippi Community College, USA
Leisa Stuart McElreath
Mississippi Crime Stoppers Council, USA
McKenzie Parker
University of West Alabama, USA

ABSTRACT

This study examined differences in reported campus criminality on selected community college campuses in the years between 2005 and 2016 representing the years preceding and succeeding the implementation of Mississippi's 2011 concealed carry legislation. Each campus included in this study is a public-funded community college in Mississippi. Using a significance level of 0.05 and an analysis of variance approach, the hypothesis testing showed five statistically significant findings reflecting the

cases of Copiah-Lincoln, East Central, Jones County, Mississippi Delta, and Northeast Mississippi Community Colleges.

Keywords: Campus Safety, Clery Act, Concealed Carry, Firearm, Higher Education, Mississippi.

INTRODUCTION

Across the nation, colleges and universities proclaim themselves as safe areas for working, living, studying, and visiting. In fact, institutions incorporate among their marketing strategies a message of institutional safety intended to resonate with potential students and parents alike (Tannehill, 2000). Campus safety is used during marketing and advertising to lure potential students and influence attendance decisions. What is realized is that members of academic communities have experienced violence within the campus setting. Campuses exhibit various dangers, including active shooters, sexual violence, assault, and property crimes.

For instance, in Nevada, Amanda Collins, a student and rape survivor, testified before the Senate State Affairs Committee that weapons prohibition contributed to her “inability to defend herself against her attacker” (Swearer & Becker, 2018, p. 1). Collins, held a Nevada handgun license legally permitting her to carry a concealed firearm (Swearer & Becker, 2018). However, the University of Nevada (Reno) policies disallowed firearms possession within the campus regardless of any weapons licensure (Swearer & Becker, 2018). The sexual assault occurred “just a few feet away from an emergency call box, in the parking garage of the campus police station, which had closed for the day” (Swearer & Becker, 2018, p. 1). Before his arrest, the rapist committed additional sexual assaults and murder before being stopped (Swearer & Becker, 2018).

Campuses seek to achieve a balance between accessibility and security. The nature of most institutions permits easy access to the campus, institutional buildings, offices, classrooms, and often residential facilities. With this openness, combined with the youth and inexperience of many of the students, the campus environment is potentially dangerous. As an example, crimes occurring within or near the academic setting include sexual assault (Waldron, Quarles, McElreath, Waldron, & Milstein, 2009); arson (Chekwa, Thomas, & Jones, 2013); assault (Coker, 2016); burglary (Chekwa, Thomas, & Jones, 2013); homicide (Doss, 2018a; Doss et al., 2017; Rao, et al., 2016); property crime (McGrath et al., 2014); robbery (Doss, 2018b); terrorism support (McElreath et al., 2018); and both theft and motor vehicle theft (McGrath, Perumean-Chaney, & Sloan, 2014). Typically, these categories are expressed within the annual Clery reports required to be provided by institutions of higher education.

For most institutions, the campus security function is an unwanted necessity. Institutions market the positive aspects of college life, especially safety. Parents do not send their offspring to colleges and universities to be arrested or harmed. High crime rates serve to deter enrollment and impact faculty recruitment and retention. For the academic administrator, a desire exists to emphasize a safe campus setting while deemphasizing potential dangers (McElreath, et al., 2013). While campus crime presents a multi-dimensional challenge, steps to ensure campus security and safety require flexible strategies crafted to meet challenges that are specific to individual campuses.

Steps to reduce campus endangerments range from compliance to legislation. Legislation may be applied toward enhancing campus safety and security via crafting and implementing laws that are intended to forbid dangerous items within the campus setting and to curtail dangerous behaviors thereby preventing or abating criminal incidents. Within academia, the issue of weapons within the academic setting is a very emotional topic. Among campuses, modern debates involving these concepts spur staunch opinions regarding weapons issues. Some argued that the presence of weapons within the college or university setting contributed toward enhanced safety (Birnbaum, 2012). Others believed that the presence of weapons represented unacceptable threats within the collegiate setting (Birnbaum, 2012). Given these notions, little consensus has existed regarding whether the presence of weapons enhances or detracts from campus safety.

Several states permitted some form of concealed weapons within the campus setting (Somers, Fry, & Fong, 2017). These states included Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Oregon, Tennessee (faculty possession only), Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin (Somers, Fry, & Fong, 2017). In 2011, Mississippi enacted legislation allowing concealed carry licensing. This legislation intentionally affected its higher education system.

Mississippi has an extensive system of public and private colleges, universities, community colleges, and vocational training institutions. This array included the institutions examined within this study: Coahoma Community College (CCC), Copiah-Lincoln Community College (CLCC), East Central Community College (ECCC), East Mississippi Community College (EMCC), Hinds Community College (Hinds CC), Holmes Community College (Holmes CC), Itawamba Community College, Jones County Junior College, Meridian Community College, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Mississippi Delta Community College, Northeast Mississippi Community College, Northwest Mississippi Community College, Pearl River Community College, and Southwest Mississippi Community College. Each institution offers academic transfer, technical, and vocational programs (Mississippi Community College Board, 2016).

Each campus is a unique entity, with not only a unique physical plant, but also with its own identity, culture, and personality. Although the Second

Amendment facilitates firearm ownership, it is well within the authority of colleges and universities, unless restricted by existing legislation or regulation, to craft policies that defines the possession of weaponry within their respective environments (Somers, Fry, & Fong, 2017). Given these notions, this study examined whether Mississippi's 2011 concealed carry law measurably impacted reported criminality within its community college domain.

Higher Education and Safety Legislation

In the year 1748, in London, England, Henry Fielding conceptualized the foundational premises of crime prevention and meaningful enforcement (Berg, 1999). Fielding emphasized and advocated two concepts: eliminating existing criminality and preventing additional crime (Collins, Ricks, & Van Meter, 2015). Fielding's approach incorporated cooperating between enforcement and the citizenry (Berg, 1999). Fielding's notions emerged and matured historically to influence modern policing and enforcement. The common mission of contemporary policing involved the deterring of crime and the maintaining of societal order (McElreath et al., 2013). The mission also permeated modern higher education settings (McElreath et al., 2013).

British concepts of policing influenced American policing styles and paradigms. Within the U.S. higher education system, Yale University was credited with crafting the first security organization in order to mitigate difficulties between students and residents of the surrounding town (Powell, Pander, & Nielsen, 1994). Such issues were not uncommon within the higher education landscape.

Through time, the endeavors and activities of campus policing and legislators culminated in the concept of campus safety. Usually, modern campus safety paradigms involved student participation toward preventing crime (Hess, 2009). Campus safety also incorporated cooperativeness among factions of faculty, administrators, students for promoting awareness and crime prevention to avoid victimization (Hess, 2009). Examples of such policies and programs included neighborhood watch, awareness programs, office security, escorts, orientation programs, and so forth (Hess, 2009). Policies, programs, regulations, and ordinances affecting higher education settings must comply with law – whether local, state, or federal (Kaplin & Lee, 2014).

At the time of this authorship, within U.S. society, approximately 12.8 million individuals possessed permits, most all of who were law-abiding citizens (Fennell, 2009; Lott, 2016). Although someone may advocate concealed carry, no guarantee existed that an individual would actually carry a concealed weapon (Ghent & Grant, 2015). Constituents voting favorably toward concealed carry could express their advocacy for philosophical or moral reasons (Ghent & Grant, 2015). Others advocated concealed carry for

personal reasons, such as personal safety and protection, fear of crime, or fear of victimization (Hauser & Kleck, 2013). Surveying of the American populace showed that respondents believed that weapons contributed toward overall safety (Wolfson, Teret, Zerael, & Miller, 2017).

Infrequent campus shootings are a reality of higher education settings (McElreath, et al., 2014). Since 2008, following the Supreme Court's affirmation that the Second Amendment assured the self-defense rights of the citizenry and that firearms could not be prohibited among residences, copious debates occurred federally and among the states regarding whether campuses should permit or restrict the presence of firearms (Somers, Fry, & Fong, 2017). Derived from Arrigo and Acheson (2016), contention between concealed carry advocates and protestors involved a straightforward question: should compromise occur between the interests of learning environments and Second Amendment freedoms within the public safety and personal safety contexts? Thus, a consideration of security versus liberty has existed within the higher education domain.

Such a question may be addressed historically via consideration of campus shootings among U.S. higher education institutions. Nedzel (2014) examined various historical accounts from campus shootings between the years 1760 and 2014. Typically, within the examined period, incidents involved the random selecting of victims and some form of "mental imbalance" exhibited by the perpetrator (Nedzel, 2014, p. 431). The implementation of "gun-free school zones" in 1995 contributed toward increases of mass campus shooting incidents (Nedzel, 2014, p. 431). For instance, the initial decade of the twenty-first century produced a total of 21 incidents (Nedzel, 2014). Thus, Nedzel (2014) argued that modern initiatives toward disallowing campus firearms were both "ineffective" and "counterproductive" (Nedzel, 2014, p. 431).

Considerations of firearms laws and policies historically provided insight and perspective concerning modern issues and debates. The 1900s exhibited fluctuations in societal opinion and regulation of firearms marked by some types of legislative action followed by reversals (Vizzard, 2015). The 1930s exhibited the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act which resulted in the banning of "machine guns, sawed-off rifles and shotguns, silencers, and a few other odd firearms" (Vizzard, 2015, p. 882). During the 1960s, the murders of President John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, Jr., coupled with increasing criminality nationally, heralded national debate concerning firearms (Vizzard, 2015). During 1968, the U.S. Congress produced the Gun Control Act (GCA) which became the dominant federal legislation governing commerce related to marketing, sales and possession of firearms (Vizzard, 2015).

During 1971, the notions of prevention culminated in the originating of the National Crime Prevention Institute (NCPI). The NCPI lauded itself as a provider of domestic violence and sexual assault training (National Crime

Prevention Institute, 2019). Over the years, it provided services to Florida State University, University of South Florida, University of Delaware, University of Albany, and Louisiana State University Health Center, Shreveport (National Crime Prevention Institute, 2019).

The 1980s and the 1990s witnessed legislative changes affecting firearms. In 1986, the Firearms Owners Protection Act (FOPA) was enacted which revisited and revised portions of the earlier 1968 GCA legislation. The FOPA forbade forfeiting personal weapons if defendants were acquitted of charges, redefined firearms business and transactions, and disallowed any national gun registration database (Carter, 2012). In 1993, spurred by the 1981 attack on President Reagan in which White House Secretary James Brady was critically wounded, the Brady Act was passed into law. The Act mandated a specific period of waiting and criminal background check before delivery of a handgun between dealers and buyers (Vizzard, 2015). Further legislative change resulted in the crafting of an “instant check system” influencing the sales of all firearms (Vizzard, 2015, p. 883).

Federal law provided the basis for firearms ownership, transfer, and possession. Legislation and policy among the states can and does vary, but conforms to the structure of federal legislation and regulations. This notion holds true for concealed carry considerations. As an example, during March, 2017, Arkansas Governor Asa Hutchinson signed into law a bill that allowed concealed firearms at higher education institutions if the person holding the appropriate permits completed a required training course (DeMillo, 2017). Conversely, in New York, legislation and the State University Board of Trustees disallowed any firearms possession among higher education campuses (other than law enforcement officers) regardless of the existence of any concealed carry permits (State University of New York, 2017).

Arkansas

Within the state of Arkansas, Act 562 and Act 859 expanded the state’s “concealed carry laws to include public colleges and universities” (University of Arkansas, 2019, p. 1). Requirements for carrying a concealed weapon included a minimum age of 21 (generally),” possession of an “Arkansas concealed handgun permit,” and completion of “additional training of up to eight hours, as specified by the Arkansas State Police, to receive an enhanced concealed carry permit” (University of Arkansas, 2019, p. 1).

Colorado

Swearer and Becker (2018) indicated that the 2003 Concealed Carry Act established the state’s processes for concealed carry permits and restrictions. Later, in 2012, the Supreme Court of Colorado decreed that the Colorado education system could not prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons among the state’s higher education campuses (Swearer & Becker, 2018). Although the law failed to define the meaning of concealment, it did

indicate that holders of permits were to make reasonable attempts to keep the weapon from view (University of Colorado, 2019). After implementation of the legislation, after 2004, reported criminality at the University of Colorado increased 35% whereas reported crime at Colorado State University decreased by 60% (Cramer & Burnett, 2012). The former prohibited weapons whereas the latter permitted weapons within the higher education setting (Cramer & Burnett, 2012).

Georgia

Georgia also passed legislation permitting concealed carry among its higher education institutions. Bluestein (2017) indicated that concealed carry legislation became active in 2017. The law affected institutions in both the Technical College System of Georgia and the University System of Georgia (Stirgus & Prabhu, 2018). The law permitted concealed carry of weapons for individuals over the age of 21 years who possessed a firearms license (Touchberry, 2017). It facilitated higher education students and other individuals to carry concealed weapons among campus settings, tailgating, recreation centers, and various classes (Touchberry, 2017).

Idaho

Idaho, in 2016, also permitted concealed carry of weapons among its higher education settings. Russell (2016) indicated that Idaho became the eighth state to allow residents over the age of 21 to possess concealed carry weapons without a permit. However, excluded were individuals with criminal records, drug users, fugitives, or individuals with mental incapacitation (Hughbanks, 2018). Weapons could be carried provided that individuals possess an enhanced concealed carry permit (Hughbanks, 2018).

Kansas

During 2017, the state of Kansas enacted concealed carry among its higher education institutions (Cagle, 2017). Individuals were permitted to have weapons in dormitories, classes, and laboratories (Cagle, 2017). After implementation of the legislation, reductions of criminality occurred at the University of Kansas (Bisaha, 2018). Patrick (2018) indicated that reported crime decreased by approximately 13% in 2017. Assaults decreased by approximately 50% and car theft by about 66% (Patrick, 2018).

Mississippi

Mississippi established concealed carry among higher education settings in 2011. Beck (2018) indicated that that the legislation facilitated concealed carry among both schools and higher education settings, within courthouses (unless judicial proceedings were occurring), and various other locations. Swearer and Becker (2018, p. 1) indicated that the legislation prohibited public higher education institutions from banning carrying weapons by individuals who possessed “training-endorsed” firearms permits.

Oregon

During 2011, the Oregon Court of Appeals decreed that higher education institutions were unable to deny concealed carry permit holders their firearms among campuses (Johnson, 2015). Specifically, the Court decreed that banning guns among public higher education campuses surpassed institutional authority (Keyes, 2015). Oregon statutes prohibited firearms among public places unless a concealed carry permit existed (Johnson, 2015). Although concealed carry was permitted, a campus shooting occurred at Umpqua Community College in 2015 wherein eight individuals died (Johnson, 2015).

Tennessee

During 2016, the Tennessee legislature enacted legislation that facilitated conceal carry among its higher education campuses provided that qualifying individuals “notified local law enforcement” (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2018, p. 1). Tennessee permitted limited concealed carry among its higher education settings (Swearer & Becker, 2018). Only full-time personnel among state institutions of higher education who possessed concealed carry permits were allowed to be armed within campus boundaries (Swearer & Becker, 2018). Students and others were disallowed and prohibited from carrying firearms (Swearer & Becker, 2018).

Texas

In 2016, legislation was enacted that facilitated campus carry by licensed individuals (University of Texas, 2019). The law stipulated that any campus regulations would neither prohibit, in general, nor have the effect of prohibiting licensees from possessing concealed weapons within the campus settings (University of Texas, 2019). Typically, licensees were over the age of 21 (Flores, 2017). Locational exceptions included sporting areas and certain laboratories (Lee, 2016). Notably, the law became effective on the fiftieth anniversary of the University of Texas clock tower shooting in which Charles Whitman massacred institutional personnel and students (Lee, 2016). Since its implementation, the law did not increase the risk of “firearm-related violence” (Warta, 2018, p. 1).

Utah

Swearer and Becker (2018) indicated that, during 2007, Utah became the initial state to permit concealed carry among public higher education campuses. However, the legislation was contentious and caused debate within the academic setting. For instance, after implementation of the law, a University of Utah graduate student, within her course syllabus, indicated that possessing weapons because of concealed carry was “absurd, antisocial, and frightening behavior” (Tanner, 2018, p. 1). Any students attending her class that possessed, via permit, concealed carry weapons were forced to stand within a “3 x 3 taped square” located in the back of the classroom (Tanner, 2018, p. 1). One day after classes commenced, the syllabus was changed,

and the graduate student was reassigned to other duties (Tanner, 2018). Her actions violated both the U.S. Constitution and Utah's state law (Tanner, 2018).

Wisconsin

During 2011, Wisconsin allowed concealed carry within its higher education settings (Wisconsin State Legislature, 2011). Higher education campuses were to permit concealed carry weapons among campus settings, but individual campuses could prohibit weapons from infrastructure if signs were posted near entrances expressing prohibition (Wisconsin State Legislature, 2011). Within the higher education system, additional restrictions included dormitories and venues of special events (University of Wisconsin, 2019).

Mississippi Community Colleges

Maloney (2003) defined the notion of a community college as a two-year higher education institution that had access to some form of public funding. They may not necessarily be dependent on student tuition revenues (Maloney, 2003). Typically, community colleges offer undergraduate and specialty vocational programs. Degrees offered include the Associate of Arts (A.A.), Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.), Associate of Science (A.S.), or some form of specialty certificate, such as career education. Such programs typically culminated in the completing of the first two years of a four-year university academic parallel transfer curriculum or a two-year terminal job-intensive technical or vocational curriculum (Sumrall, 2006).

During this study, the Mississippi Community College system consisted of 15 institutions that were geographically dispersed throughout the state. Respectively, the vision and mission for Mississippi's community colleges involved fostering an "environment of excellence to promote world-class education and job training for a more prosperous Mississippi" and systemic advancement "through coordination, support, leadership, and advocacy" (Mississippi Community College Board, 2019, p.1).

Mississippi community colleges received some notoriety for campus safety. Out of 490 colleges reviewed by the National Council for Home Safety and Security in 2019 (2019), Coahoma Community College and Northeast Mississippi Community College ranked as #192 and #377, respectively. The rankings were based on Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and crime reports reflecting criminality in areas surrounding campuses (National Council for Home Safety and Security, 2019). In order to eliminate any effects of public relations efforts, institutional reports were excluded from the safety analysis (National Council for Home Safety and Security, 2019).

Research Question

The research question for this study was: Is there a statistically significant difference regarding reported criminality among Mississippi community colleges between the periods before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law across the years 2005 and 2016?

Crime Considerations

Glover and Doss (2017) indicated that crime was defined as anything society said it was via the legislative process; expressed and codified; and such legislation was made enforceable by proper government authority. Using crime categories included within the Campus Safety Database, this study examined several types of crime that impacted higher education settings. The array of crimes included aggravated assault; arson; burglary; murder and non-negligent manslaughter; motor vehicle theft; robbery; and sex offenses. Within this study, definitions of these crimes were as follows:

Aggravated assault – This category represented the “unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury” (Federal Bureau of investigation, 2019a).

Arson – This category represented the “willful or malicious burning or attempting to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc.” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2019b).

Burglary – This category represented the “unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2019c).

Motor vehicle theft – This category represented the “theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2019d).

Murder and non-negligent manslaughter – These category represents the “willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2019e).

Robbery – This category represented the “taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force

or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2019f).

Sex crime – This category represented offenses that exhibited some “element involving a sexual act or sexual contact with another” (Vandiver, Braithwaite, & Stafford, 2017, p. 3).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a cross-sectional design toward examining whether a statistically significant difference existed before versus after the implementing of the 2011 Concealed Carry Law in Mississippi. The examined period ranged between the years 2005 and 2016. The examined higher education institutions consisted of the following public community colleges: Coahoma, Copiah-Lincoln, East Central, East Mississippi, Hinds, Holmes, Itawamba, Jones County, Meridian, Mississippi Gulf Coast, Mississippi Delta, Northeast Mississippi, Northwest Mississippi, Pearl River, and Southwest Mississippi. Sumrall, et al., (2008) indicated that these institutions were relatively homogenous given their common subordinacy to state oversight.

Data sets for each community college were obtained from the Campus Safety and Security database sponsored and maintained by the U.S. Department of Education. These data sets were limited to campus crimes that were reported within the campus setting during the examined period. Crime external to the campus and specialty crime categories were unexamined within this study. The aggregated annual values comprised reported crime quantities in the categories of murder, non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Data were used in aggregate values for each individual year comprising the examined period.

The independent variable within this study represented perspectives of aggregated values of reported annual criminality before versus after the enacting of the legislation. Thompson, Peteraf, Gamble, and Strickland (2012) indicated that strategic periods encompassed five years with respect to organizational long-term planning. Therefore, the independent variable spanned two separate periods representing the years 2005 through 2010 and the years 2011 through 2016. The dependent variable within this study represented criminality throughout the examined period.

For each examined case, data processing occurred through the analysis of variance (ANOVA) method using the *p*-value approach. Within the ANOVA calculations, segregation of data represented two groupings: data between 2005 and 2010 and data between 2011 and 2016. The significance level for hypothesis testing was 0.05. Using the Omega-square method, an examination of effect size was used to determine the magnitude of difference

regarding statistically significant outcomes. Based on the categories specified by Privitera (2017), effect size ranges were deemed as low (effect size value < 0.2), medium ($0.2 \leq$ effect size value < 0.8), and strong (effect size value ≥ 0.8).

Strategic periods typically encompassed an average of five years wherein sufficient understanding of environmental factors existed that facilitated necessary change and adaptation through time (Thompson, Peteraf, Gamble, & Strickland, 2012). Concealed carry legislation, in the State of Mississippi, has existed for well over five years. Thus, a substantial period exists whereby various examinations of its strategic influences among Mississippi’s higher education campuses are feasible. Given this notion, this study examined whether any difference existed regarding annual reporting of criminality among Mississippi’s community colleges concerning the strategic periods preceding and succeeding implementation of the 2011 concealed carry legislation.

Findings

Demographics

This study incorporated yearly crime aggregates for the period spanning the years 2005 and 2016. Table 1 shows the aggregated values for annual crimes for the two examined periods.

Table 1
Annual Crime Aggregates

Year	Reported Crime Aggregates 2005-2010	Year	Reported Crimes Aggregates 2011-2016
2005	155	2011	235
2006	172	2012	185
2007	179	2013	96
2008	238	2014	135
2009	258	2015	115
2010	179	2016	84

Regarding the amounts of reported crime, Table 2 shows measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion cumulatively for the considered periods.

Table 2
Cumulative Period Descriptors

Descriptor	Aggregated Crime Quantities for Entire Period, 2005-2016	Aggregated Crime Values, 2005-2010	Aggregated Crime Values, 2011-2016
<i>M</i>	169.25	196.83	141.67
<i>Median</i>	175.50	179.00	125.50
<i>SD</i>	55.86	41.08	57.89
<i>VAR</i>	3,120.39	1,687.77	3,351.07

Table 3 shows measures of central tendency and dispersion for the periods preceding and succeeding implementation of the legislation.

Table 3
Views Preceding and Succeeding Legislation

Institution	M _{Bef} ore	M _{Af} ter	Median Before	Media n _{After}	SD _{Be} fore	SD _A fter	Var _B efore	Var After
Coahoma	10.67	5.17	10.00	4.50	5.79	5.71	33.47	32.57
Co-Lin	18.83	4.83	17.50	5.00	9.17	2.23	84.17	4.97
East Cent.	3.67	15.33	0.50	14.50	7.12	7.69	50.67	59.07
East MS	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.00	1.67	3.66	2.80	13.37
Hinds CC	35.67	34.83	33.00	31.50	17.61	24.39	310.27	594.97
Holmes	11.33	7.33	12.00	8.00	4.89	3.72	23.87	13.87
Itawamba	3.33	2.17	3.50	2.50	1.21	0.98	1.47	0.97
Jones	15.33	6.17	12.00	5.50	11.27	5.31	127.07	28.17
Meridian MS	8.67	5.33	7.50	4.50	7.84	3.39	61.47	11.47
Delta	5.33	9.17	5.50	8.00	2.25	3.54	5.07	12.57
Gulf Coast	16.00	15.33	13.50	9.50	7.67	14.39	58.80	207.07
North east	13.67	3.33	12.00	2.50	6.62	2.16	43.87	4.67
North west	37.17	15.67	12.50	7.50	16.12	21.03	259.77	442.27

Pearl River	6.00	7.8 3	6.00	8.50	1.90	1.94	3.60	3.77
South west	6.17	4.3 3	6.50	3.50	2.48	3.39	6.17	11.4 7

Coahoma Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Coahoma Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Coahoma Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 2.7486$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.1283$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Copiah-Lincoln Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Copiah Lincoln Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Copiah-Lincoln Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 13.1937$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0045$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected thereby suggesting a statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The effect size corresponding to the statistically significant outcome was 0.5688.

East Central Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to East Central Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between East Central Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 7.44$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0212$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The effect size corresponding to the statistically significant outcome was 0.4266.

East Mississippi Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to East Mississippi Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between East Mississippi Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 0.0103$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.9211$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Hinds Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Hinds Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Hinds Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 0.0046$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.9472$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Holmes Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Holmes Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Holmes Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 2.544$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.1417$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Itawamba Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Itawamba Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Itawamba Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the

null hypothesis ($F = 3.356$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0968$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Jones County Junior College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Jones County Junior College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Jones County Junior College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 13.1937$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0045$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting a statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The effect size corresponding to the statistically significant outcome was 0.5688.

Meridian Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Meridian Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Meridian Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 0.9140$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.3615$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Mississippi Delta Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Mississippi Delta Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Mississippi Delta Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 5.0000$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0493$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting a statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The effect size corresponding to the statistically significant outcome was 0.3333.

Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 0.0100$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.9222$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Northeast Mississippi Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Northeast Mississippi Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Northeast Mississippi Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 13.2005$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0045$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting a statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The effect size corresponding to the statistically significant outcome was 0.5689.

Northwest Mississippi Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Northwest Mississippi Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Northwest Mississippi Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 3.9506$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.0749$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Pearl River Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Pearl River Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Pearl River Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016.

Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 2.7375$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.1290$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Southwest Mississippi Community College

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to Southwest Mississippi Community College crime reports representing the notion that no statistically significant difference existed between Southwest Mississippi Community College reported criminality before and after implementation of the 2011 Mississippi Concealed Carry law throughout the years 2005 and 2016. Hypothesis testing showed no statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 1.1436$, F -Critical = 4.9646, $p = 0.3100$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained thereby suggesting no statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law.

Statistically Significant Outcomes

Hypothesis testing for each of the individual community colleges showed several statistically significant outcomes. Hypothesis testing outcomes reflecting statistical significance corresponded to the institutions of Copiah-Lincoln, East Central, Jones County, Mississippi Delta, and Northeast Mississippi community colleges. Table 4 shows characteristics of the statistically significant hypothesis tests.

Table 4
Individual Hypothesis Testing Outcomes

Institution	F	F-Critical	p-Value	Effect Size
Co-Lin	13.19	4.96	0.0045*	0.5688
East Central	7.44	4.96	0.0212*	0.4266
Jones County	13.19	4.96	0.0044*	0.5687
MS Delta	5.00	4.96	0.0493*	0.3334
Northeast	13.20	4.96	0.0046*	0.5689

Note. *Significance level = .05

Reviewing the means of the institutions exhibiting statistical significance showed fluctuations of reported criminality annually following the enacting of the legislation. Specifically, Copiah Lincoln showed a reduced mean from $M = 18.83$ to $M = 4.83$. East Central showed a mean increase from $M = 3.67$ to $M = 15.33$. Jones County exhibited a decrease from $M = 15.3$ to $M = 6.17$. Mississippi Delta saw an increase from $M = 5.33$ to $M = 9.17$. Northeast exhibited a decrease from $M = 13.67$ to $M = 3.33$.

Cumulative Analysis

The ANOVA method was applied against the data corresponding to aggregated crime reports representing the entire array of examined institutions. Hypothesis testing showed a statistically significant outcome regarding the null hypothesis ($F = 3.8983$, $F\text{-Critical} = 3.8984$, $p = 0.049$; $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected thereby suggesting a statistically significant difference existed concerning reported criminality before and after implementing the 2011 Concealed Carry law. The statistically significant outcome necessitated an examination of effect size. Thus, the effect size value was determined to be 0.02 thereby suggesting weak effect. The mean value for the 2005-2010 period was 196.83 whereas the mean value for the 2011-2016 period was 141.67. Thus, a reduction in the reported amounts of criminality appeared to have occurred with respect to the examined periods preceding and succeeding the implementation of the legislation.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

A total of five statistically significant outcomes resulted from hypothesis testing. Examining the means of crime before and after the implementation of legislation revealed that three institutions showed crime decreases whereas two institutions showed crime increases. Given these outcomes, overall, it appears that decreases of crime were witnessed after the enacting of Mississippi's 2011 Concealed Carry Law. Thus, implications for policy among the state's community college may involve continued supportiveness for the law and the ability of citizens to exercise their Constitutional rights.

This study examined initially only a limited array of reported crimes versus implementation of the 2011 Concealed Carry law. Thus, it represents a starting point from which future research may be spawned using a variety of approaches. Future studies may examine different forms of criminality with respect to the 2011 legislation. For instance, among the examined campuses, additional research may investigate potential differences in the reported quantities of crimes against women or quantities of reported hate crimes preceding and succeeding the 2011 legislation.

Individual humans are the most important resource of any organization, and are the building blocks of any organization. Higher education institutions are no exception. Given these notions, future research endeavors may consider the effects of the 2011 legislation with respect to enrollment among Mississippi's higher education institutions. Essentially, future enquiries may question whether a statistically significant difference exists between institutional enrollment preceding and succeeding the implementation of the legislation.

Campus safety affects all higher education institutions throughout the nation. Thus, some consideration of a national scope is pertinent regarding

concealed firearms among colleges and universities. Using a different array of institutions, future research endeavors may examine similar scenarios among states wherein some form of concealed carry legislation was established. Similarly, future studies may examine the interaction between existence of concealed carry legislation versus enrollment among higher education institutions.

Campus safety data are often used as components of marketing and advertising among university settings. Uses may include recruitment for both potential employees and students. Given these notions, future studies may examine whether a relationship exists between crime reports and institutional enrollment, funding, or personnel quantities. Future studies may also investigate crime rates versus graduation rates.

This study was limited to community colleges in Mississippi. Excluded were four-year institutions of higher education. Future studies may repeat this study using four-year higher education institutions or vocational institutions as the examined population. Besides Mississippi, other states possess similar legislation. Additional studies may examine the legislation of other states.

Crimes associated with firearms are not the only types of criminality that may impact collegiate settings. All forms of crime have the potential to affect higher education settings. Perusal of categories reflected among institutional Clery reports shows an array of crimes that affect colleges and universities, ranging from motor vehicle theft to homicide. Given this notion, future research endeavors may expand the examination of campus criminality beyond the scope of firearms incidents. For instance, future studies may examine the potential interaction and strength of relationship between reported types of crimes versus institutional enrollment through time.

This study examined crime in physical reality. During modern times, given the advent and proliferation of electronic technologies that spawned the virtual worlds of cyberspace, new opportunities for crime exist that may impact academic settings. However, given the newness of cyberspace, policies and laws are emerging to govern and regulate the virtual domain. Regardless, cybercrime may be defined similarly and viewed similarly with its potential to impact higher education settings. Thus, another consideration of crime involves the virtual domain. Among virtual environments, motivations for cyber-crime parallel those catalysts that exist in physical reality (McElreath, et al., 2018). For instance, fake identities may be used to perpetrate enrollment fraud online among virtual settings similar to enrollment fraud that occurs in physical reality. Given such notions, future studies may examine whether the 2011 legislation had any impact regarding reported incidents of cyber-crime.

Law and policy are dissimilar entities. This study examined the 2011 Mississippi law that affected firearms among higher education settings. However, it was beyond the scope of this study to examine any facets of

policies that resulted from the legislation. Frei and Ruloff (1989) indicated that an average of 20 years of data should be collected and analyzed before effective policy assessment or evaluation may occur. Thus, since about two decades of data are required before policy analysis may be performed, future studies may examine various polices that resulted from the 2011 legislation.

Several of the authors of this study possessed law enforcement backgrounds. No consensus existed among the authors regarding the presence of firearms within campus settings. Some believed that they may contribute toward confusion during an attack. In other words, if an incident occurred, how would the responding police personnel distinguish the actual attacker from an innocent citizen wielding a firearm for self-defense purposes? Given these notions, future studies may examine the views of institutional personnel, students, or members of the general public within institutional service areas regarding firearms legislation and institutional policies.

Topics involving weapons among campus settings are pertinent for academic institutions both domestically and internationally. Although this study is applicable primarily for Mississippi institutions, its outcomes may provide insight for similar higher education institutions whose corresponding legislatures are debating and examining concealed carry legislation. Thus, although national generalizability is inapplicable for this study, it represents a starting point from which similar instances of concealed carry legislation may be examined among institutions of higher education.

REFERENCES

- Arrigo, B.A. & Acheson, A. (2016). Concealed carry bans and the American college campus: A law, social sciences, and policy perspective. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, 19(1), 120-141.
- Beck, J. (2018). *Gun law affects MSU campus*. Retrieved from http://www.reflector-online.com/news/article_ba68e50c-0d26-11e8-9506-abf13fb96051.html
- Berg, B.L. (1999). *Policing in modern society*. Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Birnbaum, R. (2012, November). *Ready, fire, aim: The college campus gun fight*. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Las Vegas, NV.
- Bisaha, S. (2018). *One school year later, guns on Kansas campuses draw little notice*. Retrieved from <https://www.kcur.org/post/one-school-year-later-guns-kansas-campuses-draw-little-notice#stream/0>
- Bluestein, G. (2017). *Controversial campus gun measure becomes law in Georgia*. Retrieved from <https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/controversial-campus-gun-measure-becomes-law-georgia/7bGDORS6rz6qmqzQHYZjCN/>
- Cagle, E. (2017). *Kansas universities, students express preparedness for guns on campus starting Saturday*. Retrieved from

- <https://www.kansascity.com/news/politics-government/article159193599.html>
- Carter, G.L. (2012). *Guns in American society*. (2nd ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO Publishing.
- Chekwa, C., Thomas, E., & Jones, V.J. (2013). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 6(3), 325-332.
- Coker, D. (2016). Crime logic, campus sexual assault, and restorative justice. *Texas Tech Law Review*, 49, 147-209.
- Collins, P.A., Ricks, T.A., & Van Meter, C.W. (2015). *Principles of security and crime prevention*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cramer, & Burnett, (2012). *Tough targets: When criminals face armed resistance from citizens*. Washington, DC: CATO Institute.
- DeMillo, A. (2017). *Arkansas governor expands where concealed guns allowed*. Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/arkansas/articles/2017-03-22/arkansas-bill-signed-expanding-where-concealed-guns-allowed>
- Doss, D.A. (2018a). A decade after Virginia Tech: Considerations of campus safety and security for higher education institutions. In M. Deflem (Ed.), *Sociology of crime, law, and deviance* (pp. 81-99). Somerville, MA: Emerald.
- Doss, D.A. (2018b). *A quantitative examination of criminality in relationship to enrollment at selected land-grant institutions of higher education*. Jackson, MS: Jackson State University.
- Doss, D., Lackey, H., McElreath, D., Jones, D., Goza, R., & Sheffield, J. (2017). Revisiting violence in rural academic settings: A school killing impacting Livingston High School and considerations of policy and programs. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 16(2), 156-191.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019a). *Aggravated Assault*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/aggravated-assault>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019b). *Arson*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/arson>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019c). *Burglary*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/burglary>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019d). *Motor Vehicle Theft*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/motor-vehicle-theft>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019e). *Murder*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/murder>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019f). *Robbery*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/topic-pages/robbery>

- Fennell, R. (2009). Concealed carry weapon permits: A Second Amendment right or a recipe for disaster on our nation's campuses? *Journal of American College Health*, 58(2), 99-100.
- Flores, A. (2017). *Texas community colleges allow guns starting Tuesday*. Retrieved <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2017/08/01/campus-carry-texas/527717001/from>
- Frei, D. & Ruloff, D. (1989). *Methods for practical application in foreign policy planning, strategic planning, and business risk assessment*. Boston, MA: Martinus Niihoff Publishers.
- Glover, W., & Doss, D. (2017). *Business law for people in business*. Austin, TX: Sentia.
- Ghent, L.S. & Grant, A. (2015). Concealed carry in the Show-Me State: Do voters in favor of right-to-carry legislation end up packing heat? *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(1), 191-201.
- Hauser, W. & Kleck, G. (2013). Guns and fear: A one-way street? *Crime & Delinquency*, 59(2), 271-291.
- Hess, K. (2009). *Introduction to private security*. (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hughbanks, G. (2018). *UI gun policy under fire*. Retrieved from <https://www.uiargonaut.com/2018/02/28/ui-gun-policy-under-fire/>
- Johnson, E.M. (2015). *Weapons common on Oregon college campus despite 'gun-free zone'*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-oregon-shooting-campus-idUSKCN0RZ1D820151005>
- Kaplin, W. & Lee, B. (2014). *The law of higher education*. (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Keyes, S. (2015). *Oregon shooting occurred in state that 'actually forces colleges to allow guns'*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/oct/04/oregon-shooting-state-universities-campus-gun-laws-concealed-carry>
- Lee, T. (2016). *New Texas law allows college students to carry guns on campus*. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/new-texas-law-allows-college-students-carry-guns-campus-n620911>
- Lott, J.R. (2016). *Concealed carry permit holders across the United States: 2016*. Alexandria, VA: Crime Prevention Research Center.
- Maloney, M. M. (2003). *Faculty participation in the decision making process: Its impact upon job satisfaction at Connecticut community colleges*. Bridgeport, MD: University of Bridgeport.
- McElreath, D. H., Doss, D. A., Jensen, C. J., Wigginton, M., Kennedy, R., Winter, K., . . . Estis-Sumerel, J. M. (2013). *Introduction to Law Enforcement*. Boca Raton: CRC Press/Taylor & Francis.
- McElreath, D., Doss, D., McElreath, L., Lindsley, A., Lusk, G., Skinner, J., & Wellman, A. (2018). The communicating and marketing of radicalism: A case study of ISIS and cyber recruitment. *International Journal of Cyber Warfare and Terrorism*, 8(3), 26-45.
- McElreath, D. H., Jensen, C. J., Wigginton, M. P., Doss, D. A., Nations, R., & Van Slyke, J. (2014). *Introduction to Homeland Security*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

- McGrath, S.A., Perumean-Chaney, S.E., & Sloan, J.J. (2014). Property crime on college campuses: A case study using GIS and related tools. *Security Journal*, 37(3), 263-283.
- Mississippi Community College Board. (2016). *Annual Report Fiscal Year 2016*. Jackson, MS: Mississippi Community College Board.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2018). *Guns on campus: Overview*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsl.org/research/education/guns-on-campus-overview.aspx>
- National Council for Home Safety and Security. (2019). *Safest colleges in America 2019*. Retrieved from <https://www.alarms.org/safest-colleges/>
- National Crime Prevention Institute. (2019). *Advanced training classes*. Retrieved from <https://nicp.net/clients/>
- Nedzel, N.E. (2014). Concealed carry: The only way to discourage mass school shootings. *Academic Questions*, 27, 429-435.
- Patrick, J. (2018). *New statistics show campus carry a success in Kansas*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/new-statistics-show-campus-carry-a-success-in-kansas>
- Powell, J., Pander, M., & Nielsen, R. (1994). *Campus security and law enforcement*. Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Privitera, G. J. (2017). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Rao, A.L., Poon, S., Drezner, J.A., Zigman, M., Asif, I.M., & Harmon, K.G. (2016). Death by homicide in national collegiate athletic association athletes between 2003 and 2013. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 50, 172-175.
- Russell, B.Z. (2016). *Here's who can carry a concealed gun in Idaho starting Friday*. Retrieved from <https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2016/jun/28/heres-who-can-carry-a-concealed-gun-in-idaho-start/>
- Somers, P., Fry, J., & Fong, C.J. (2017). Duck and cover, little lady: Women and campus carry. *Thought & Action*, 2017, 37-50.
- State University of New York. (2017). *Firearms on state-operated campuses*. Retrieved from https://www.suny.edu/sunypp/documents.cfm?doc_id=367
- Stirgus, E. & Prabhu, M.T. (2018). *Georgia's year-old campus carry law still stirs confusion, debate*. Retrieved from <https://www.ajc.com/news/local-education/georgia-year-old-campus-carry-law-still-stirs-confusion-debate/XFyVtliRoxa87GMEafanQJ/>
- Sumrall, W. H. (2006). *The relationship between reported level of faculty participation in institutional decision making and organizational commitment of faculty in the Mississippi community college system*. Jonesboro, AR: Arkansas State University.
- Sumrall, W.H., Cox, D.W., Doss, D.A., & Jones, D.W. (2008). Participative decisions and organizational commitment: A quantitative analysis. *Southern Business Review*, 2008, 39-52.
- Swearer, A. & Becker, K. (2018). *Concealed carry on campus is more common, and useful, than you thought*. Retrieved from

- <https://www.dailysignal.com/2018/04/02/concealed-carry-campus-common-useful-thought/>
- Tannehill, R. L., & McElreath, D. H. . (2000). Safe Schools: Responding to Challenges in US Schools. In M. Pagon, *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Ethics, Integrity, and Human Rights* (pp. 537-544). Ljubljana: NCJ-206270.
- Tanner, C. (2018). *The University of Utah reassigned a graduate assistant after her syllabus restricted students with concealed guns to a 'Second Amendment zone'*. Retrieved from <https://www.sltrib.com/news/education/2018/08/21/university-utah/>
- Thompson, A.A., Peteraf, M.A., Gamble, J.E., & Strickland, A.J. (2012). *Crafting & executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage – concepts and cases*. (18th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Touchberry, R. (2017). *What Georgia's new concealed campus carry law means for students and faculty*. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/college/2017/07/12/what-georgias-new-concealed-campus-carry-law-means-for-students-and-faculty/37433781/>
- University of Arkansas. (2019). *Statement on concealed carry laws*. Retrieved from <https://chancellor.uark.edu/key-communications/statement-on-concealed-carry-laws.php>
- University of Colorado. (2019). *FAQs for concealed carry*. Retrieved from <https://www.colorado.edu/police/crime-prevention/faqs-concealed-carry>
- University of Texas. (2019). *Campus carry*. Retrieved from <https://campuscarry.utexas.edu/>
- University of Wisconsin. (2019). *Weapons policy and storage*. Retrieved from <https://www.uwplatt.edu/departments/safety-and-security/weapons-policy-and-storage>
- Vandiver, D., Braithwaite, J., & Stafford, M. (2017). *Sex crimes and sex offenders: Research and realities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vizzard, W.J. (2015). The current and future state of gun policy in the United States. *The Journal of Criminal law & Criminology*, 104(4), 879-904.
- Waldron, R., Quarles, C., McElreath, D., Waldron, M., & Milstein, D. (2009). *The criminal justice system: An Introduction*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Warta, J. (2018). *The success of concealed carry at Texas public colleges*. Retrieved from <https://www.jamesgmartin.center/2018/10/the-success-of-concealed-carry-at-texas-public-colleges/>
- Wisconsin State Legislature. (2011). *Senate Bill 93*. Retrieved from <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2011/proposals/sb93>
- Wolfson, J.A., Teret, S.P., Azrael, D., & Miller, M. (2017). US public opinion on carrying firearms in public places. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(6), 929-937.

Daniel Adrian Doss, Ph.D., is an alumnus of Jackson State University and the Jake Ayers Institute of Research in Urban Higher Education. His professional career included software engineering, systems integration and testing, and analytical positions in both the defense and

commercial sectors. Credentials also include Colonel, Mississippi State Guard; graduate of the Lafayette County Law Enforcement Officer's Academy. His education consists of a Ph.D., Jackson State University, D.Litt. et. Phil., University of South Africa; and Ph.D., Northcentral University. His research interests are in the areas of business administration, criminal justice, and information systems. Email: daniel.a.doss@alumni.jsums.edu

David Hughes McElreath, Ph.D., Professor of Criminal Justice, University of Mississippi. Research interest: Homeland Security. Law Enforcement History, Military History, Corrections history, and policy. Email: dhmcel@olemiss.edu

Dr. Balakrishna Gokaraju, currently works as Associate Director of Visualization and Computation Advancing Research Center and as Associate Professor in Computational Science and Engineering at North Carolina A and T State University. He has been developing the Machine Learning based Artificial Intelligent models for BIG Data Science problems in Satellite Remote Sensing mainly, for the past 15 years. His in-depth experience consists of developing the Spatio-temporal data mining models, integrating data fusion of multi-sensor and multi-angle camera datasets, etc. His recent pursuits are in optimizing the Proportional and Integral control variables for autonomous robotics, and interactive 3-D Virtual-Reality visualizations. Dr. Gokaraju worked in sponsored Grants in the amount equivalent of \$ 4.65 Million for 14 projects in his academic experience. Email: bgokaraju@gmail.com

Stephen L Mallory, Ph.D., CPM, Professor of Legal Studies, University of Mississippi. Research interest: Organized Crime, Police Police and Procedure, Ethics, and Interview and Interrogation. Email: smallory@olemiss.edu

Raymond Tesiero, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the College of Engineering, Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Engineering Department, North Carolina A&T State University. His major research interests lie in the area of building energy system optimization. Email: rctesier@ncat.edu

Linda Taylor is a scholar at Jackson State University, USA. Email: linda.n.taylor@jsumu.edu

Qiuqi Hong, Teacher of Business Administration, Guangdong University of Finance. Email: hongqiuqi@126.com

Dr. Don Jones is the Dean for Lafayette-Yalobusha Technical Center, at Northwest Mississippi Community College. He specializes in team motivation, training, marketing, customer service management, community relations, software integration, transformational leadership, retention, enrollment, entrepreneurial education recruiting and marketing for online and on-campus university programs. He is a proven retention strategist for a multi-campus, multi-state university system, who led double-digit enrollment growth in a multi-state, multi-campus region for 10+ years. Email: dojones@northwestms.edu

Leisa Stuart McElreath, Mississippi Crime Stoppers Council. Research interest: Recidivism, Crime Prevention, Homeland Security, Corrections, and Correctional policy. Email: leisamcelreath@yahoo.com

Ms. McKenzie Parker attends Mississippi College School of Law where she is pursuing a Juris Doctorate. At the time of this study, she was a research assistant at the University of West Alabama where she earned a degree in sociology with an emphasis on criminal justice. Her career aspirations are to pursue legal venues in California. Her research interests include legal studies, cybercrime, higher education, and workplace discrimination. Email: mlparker@mc.edu

Manuscript submitted: August 21, 2019

Manuscript revised: February 20, 2020

Accepted for publication: April 15, 2020